# HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES <br> SPECIAL MEETING <br> MAY 10, 2022 <br> 7:00 PM 

## CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Board Chair, Mr. Flanagan called the special 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.

## REGULAR MEETING

## ROLL

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

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

Board Engineer, Mr. Fox and Board Planner, Ms. Mertz and Ms. Taglairino were also present. Attorney, Mr. Mlenak was present for the Verizon application.

## 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
Dr. Bruce Eisenstein, RFP Specialist
William Masters, Planner
Peter Steck, Objector's Planner (Via Zoom)
Robert Simon, Objecting attorney for this application.
The applicant re-presented a proposal for a reduced tower of $80-86$ feet in height with a slight shift in location within the lease site.

Mr. Simon presented his questions for Mr. Masters.
Mr. Steck presented planner testimony and Exhibit O-9.

Mr. Schneider had no questions for Mr. Steck.
The Board had questions for Mr. Steck.
The following residents had questions for Mr. Steck:
Christel Engel, Millbrook Road.
Neil O’ Donnell, Millbrook Road.
Jeff Spencer, White Deer Lane.
The following residents made public comments on this application:
Steve Schade, Mt. Kemble Ave.
Mike Koeneke, Coppertree Lane (Objector)
Sarah Conine, Lees Hill Road (Objector).
Nora Carifa, Lees Hill Road
Harsh Bansal, Coppertree Lane (Objector).
Shauna Ratliff, Long Hill Road.
Neil O’ Donnell, Millbrook Road.
Christel Engel, Millbrook Road.
James Carifa, Lees Hill Road (Objector).
Aja Blanco, Lees Hill Road
Jane Riley, Youngs Road
Meghan Lyon, Village Road
Mr. Simon gave his summation.
Mr. Schneider gave his summation.
A motion was made by Mr. Flanagan to approve the application with conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Rosenbaum. A roll call vote went as follows:

For: Mr. Flanagan, Mr. Rosenbaum
Against: Mr. Newlin, Mr. Addonizio, Mr. Symonds, Ms. Sovolos, and Mr. Maselli
A transcript of the testimony is appended to the minutes.

## OTHER BUSINESS

None

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Flanagan adjourned the meeting at 11: 10


Respectfully submitted by Lori Taglairino, Board of Adjustment Secretary


MR. SCHNEIDER: I've lost count, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Well, we're three-some-odd years into this. The only application on the Agenda tonight is the Verizon application. And I believe, and Mr. Schneider since it's your application, where did we leave off? Wasn't Mr. Simon in the midst of cross-examining one of your witnesses?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. Good evening, Mr.
Chairman. For the record, Richard Schneider of the law firm of Vogel, Chait, Collins and Schneider on behalf of the Applicant, Verizon Wireless.

Ill answer your question in a second. Are we going to wait for Mr. Maselli?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. I was going to try to reach him right now. Would you like to just pause for a moment and we'll --

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes, he said pulling in the entrance.
(Pause in the proceedings.)
MR. MLENAK: He's walking in the door.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So for everyone who is here on time, we're all going to leave and make Mr. Maselli wait this amount of time after we play; sounds fair? (Laughter.)

## Page 7

MR. SCHNEIDER: So I will -- unless there's any further housekeeping items I will -- Rob, do you want to step up here?

MR. SIMON: Sure. Whatever order you want first.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think you have to be on a microphone.

MR. SCHNEIDER: So I'll ask Mr. Masters to come up and I'll move to the side so we can pick that up.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sounds good. Would you guys like to sit at the same table, or would you like to sit with Dr. Eisenstein?

MR. SIMON: I'll sit with Mr. Masters. It would be my honor.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Steck, we can turn this so you can see -- that might not be good.
(Secretary Taglairino's computer monitor disconnects from Zoom application.)
(Brief pause in proceedings.)
MR. MLENAK: While we figure that out, Mr. Masters, you understand you're still under oath?

MR. MASTERS: I do.
WILLIAM F. MASTERS, having been previously sworn, testifies as follows:
(The Board and public stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.)

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: For the record, Mr. Maselli is here at 7:05.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you need anything, Dan?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Glass of water? Okay.
All right. Mr. Schneider, I'm sorry.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
The game plan for tonight I think is simple and straight forward. One, we had completed Mr. Master's direct, started his cross. Mr. Simon has some additional cross-examination of Mr. Masters. And my understanding is that he will be presenting his professional planner. After that's completed, being the optimist, and hopefully we can proceed toward public comment, summation, and if all goes well, famous last words, deliberations.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Public comments then summations?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Or summations and public comment? Okay. Public comment then summations. Okay. Sounds good.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I just want to make sure.
Mr. Steck, can you hear me?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We cannot hear you, Mr.
Steck, so hold on one second.
MR. SIMON: So he clearly unmuted himself.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Steck, just be patient with us. We're fixing the camera. Raise your hand if you can hear us. We cannot hear you yet. Just hold on a second.

MR. SIMON: You just have to reset the speaker.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You know, they had it set up perfectly. Steve came in here at like 5:30.

MR. SIMON: I don't doubt that for a
second.
Peter can you hear me?
MR. STECK: Yes, I can.
MR. SIMON: Peter, can you hear Mr.

## Masters?

MR. STECK: I can. Thank you.
MR. SIMON: Rob Simon from Herald Law.
Before I commence the conclusion of my cross-examination of Mr. Masters, just for purposes of housekeeping, as many, if not all of you know, and this is also for the benefit of members of the public, Mr.

|  | Page 9 |  | Page 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Steck unfortunately came down with COVID a couple of | 1 | 55 , which is the Conine property. |
| 2 | days ago and as a result of that he is not able to be | 2 | Q. So it's 25.9 feet closer to the post office |
| 3 | in attendance tonight. However, the Board was kind | 3 | than where it was previously? |
| 4 | enough to make arrangements so to allow Mr. Steck to | 4 | A. 25.9 feet. The prior distance to the |
| 5 | appear via the Zoom platform. So he's sitting at home | 5 | common boundary line with Lot 55 was 93.6 feet. And |
| 6 | but he's able to hear all the testimony. We're able to | 6 | the relocated distance to that property line is |
| 7 | see him during his direct and cross-examination. | 7 | 119.5 feet. So that's a difference of 25.9 feet. |
| 8 | I've spoken to both Mr. Schneider, Mr. | 8 | Q. Okay. Is the measurement the same in terms |
| 9 | Mlenak on behalf of the Applicant, and the Board | 9 | of the distance from the post office? |
| 10 | respectively, explaining the situation, and the | 10 | In other words, the post office distance to |
| 11 | response, no surprise, was that there was no issue with | 11 | the pole previously, versus the post office distance to |
| 12 | Mr. Steck being able to participate virtually and that | 12 | the pole or the tower as relocated, is it 25.9 feet |
| 13 | is why he is so participating in this matter. And I | 13 | closer? |
| 14 | thank the Board for its courtesies and cooperation in | 14 | A. I don't believe there were any specific |
| 15 | allowing that to happen. | 15 | measurements made to the distance of the pole to the |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. | 16 | post office, but given the fact that the post office is |
| 17 | EXAMINATION BY MR. SIMON: | 17 | to the northeast of the compound it would be a distance |
| 18 | Q. Mr. Masters, good evening. | 18 | somewhat close to 25.9 feet. Perhaps not exactly |
| 19 | A. Good evening. | 19 | 25.9 feet, but closer in that general direction. |
| 20 | Q. Just a couple of follow-up questions that | 20 | Q. In that general measurement; correct? |
| 21 | we didn't finish last time. | 21 | A. Correct. |
| 22 | The tower in its new location has just been | 22 | Q. And the tower now is closer within that |
| 23 | shifted approximately 18 feet to the northeast; | 23 | general measurement range to the propane tank shed and |
| 24 | correct? | 24 | the gas station; correct? |
| 25 | A. Actually, 25.9 feet further away from Lot | 25 | A. Correct. |
|  | Page 11 |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | Q. And it's closer to the driveway that | 1 | MR. SCHNEIDER: 29.5? |
| 2 | connects the post office to the recycling center; | 2 | MR. SIMON: 25.9. That was probably my |
| 3 | correct? | 3 | mistake, Rich. Thank you. |
| 4 | A. Correct. | 4 | BY MR. SIMON: |
| 5 | Q. And it also will be closer to where | 5 | Q. 25 feet 9 inches to the Conine property? |
| 6 | recycling patrons patronize and do their recycling; | 6 | A. 25.9 feet further away from the Conine |
| 7 | correct? | 7 | property. |
| 8 | A. The compound is still behind the recycling | 8 | Q. And what about to the O'Donnell property, |
| 9 | shed, so I don't know that -- | 9 | what's the differential there? |
| 10 | Q. Isn't it relocated at an angle to be closer | 10 | A. The differential to the O'Donnell property |
| 11 | to the front? | 11 | would be 8.2 feet. The prior setback to that property |
| 12 | A. It's closer, but it's no closer in terms of | 12 | was 58.1 feet. It is now 66.3 feet. |
| 13 | vehicular accessibility to the recycling shed. I mean, | 13 | Q. And it's your understanding that the |
| 14 | it has no effect whatsoever on the vehicular traffic to | 14 | wireless facility can't be moved further away from the |
| 15 | the recycling sheds. | 15 | residence than what has been proposed throughout this |
| 16 | Q. Just the pedestrian activity; correct? | 16 | application due to the public bidding process; correct? |
| 17 | A. Correct. If they were walking behind the | 17 | A. That's my understanding. |
| 18 | recycling shed. | 18 | Q. So conversely if the project did not need |
| 19 | Q. Or if they're walking on the driveway that | 19 | to be publicly bid, presumably any applicant, including |
| 20 | connects the post office to the recycling area; | 20 | this Applicant, would have more flexibility in the |
| 21 | correct? | 21 | location of the tower in considering of its relative |
| 22 | A. Yeah. I'm not sure why they would to that, | 22 | impacts; correct? |
| 23 | but yes, I guess that would be correct. | 23 | A. That's probably true. |
| 24 | Q. And again the 29.9 feet is the differential | 24 | Q. And with regard to this application since |
| 25 | to the Conine property; correct? | 25 | the tower has been reduced in size, in height to |

86 feet, you have not investigated any other property since that time for possible location of this tower, whether it's Bayne Park or anywhere outside the Historic District; correct?
A. I have not. That's correct.
Q. And you still don't know the extent or the frequency of any activities or uses at the DPW yard; correct?
A. Extent or frequencies?
Q. Yes. Of uses at the DPW yard by the various users, whether it's for the recycling center whether it's for the DPW activities or any other activities at the site?
A. Well, again, as far as the DPW activities that's really something that varies, I would assume, on a day-to-day basis.
Q. But you haven't talked to anyone, Mr. Masters, in regards to how many DPW workers are on-site, how many of them actually stay over in the recent months sleeping --
A. Well, the last time I checked, including the director himself who I don't think sleeps there, maybe he does during emergency situations, there was a total of eight employees.
Q. At 86 feet, as the professional planner on
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Board have any questions for Mr. Masters? (No response.)

Any members of the public have any
questions for Mr. Masters as it relates to his testimony from was when was it, it last month I guess?

MR. SCHNEIDER: March 31st.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Last meeting. (No response.)

All right. I hear no other questions.
MR. SIMON: So then unless Mr. Schneider has any?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I have no re-direct of Mr. Masters.

MR. SIMON: Okay. So I'm going to ask Mr.
Steck -- Mr. Steck can you hear me?
THE WITNESS: I can.
MR. SIMON: And you understand Mr. Steck
that you continue to be sworn with regard to this application?

MR. STECK: That's my understanding.
PETER STECK, having been
previously sworn, testifies as follows:

## EXAMINATION BY MR. SIMON:

Q. And Mr. Steck, I'm letting you know before you start your testimony this evening that I have
the project you would agree that there's still a
difference in terms of height, scale, and proportion as compared to other buildings and structures in the Historic District; correct?
A. Obviously it's taller, yes.
Q. And again, I'll ask it a different way.

You're not aware of any investigation by anyone else of any alternate sites outside Historic District at 86 feet, including those that have larger properties or higher topography; correct?

## A. Correct.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Schneider, bear with me one second. Is Mr. Steck okay up there?

MR. STECK: Yes. I thought you might get bored of looking at me so I --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We would never be bored of looking at you.

MR. STECK: I'll leave my picture on so you know that my eyes are open.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Steck knows I'm very
sensitive about making sure all the attention is mine.
And with that, or course, he's taken my
mojo. So I have no further questions at this time for Mr. Masters.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Anyone from the
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submitted to the Board approximately ten days prior to the date of this hearing, and I have handed out to the Board members, and I have marked as Exhibit O-9 an exhibit that you prepared dated April 28th, 2022, consisting of six sheets, $\mathrm{P}-1$ through $\mathrm{P}-6$, all of which will be marked as $\mathrm{O}-9$; do you understand that?
A. I do.
(Exhibit O-9 is received and marked.)
Q. And so Mr. Steck, you've had an opportunity to review the application materials pertaining to this application as it relates to the revised location of the -- or the relocation of the monopole within the equipment compound and the reduction in size of the equipment compound within the proposed leased area; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you continue to be familiar with the property in the surrounding area; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And with regard to the relocation of the monopole, the reduction in size of the monopole to approximately 86 feet, and the shrinking of the equipment compound, can you please provide your professional planning opinions with regard to those plan revisions and how it relates to the burden of
proof for the Applicant with regard to the subject application?
A. Certainly. Perhaps it might be helpful if I initially go through my exhibit.
Q. Sure.
A. Now, does it make sense that I put it on
the screen?
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes, please.
MR. SIMON: Yes. If you can -- does he
have the ability to share the screen?
MR. MLENAK: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Can the Board see? BY MR. SIMON:
Q. Yes. That's P-4; right? So just scroll down. Okay.
A. Okay. Here we go.
Q. And before we start, Peter, I assume the Board members have copies of what we're marking as O-9? We do? The Board Professionals? Go ahead, Mr. Steck.
A. As indicated O-9 was prepared by me and it's dated April 28th of this year. And I'll go through the slides but I may refer to them later to emphasize certain points.

The first slide which is labeled in the
upper right-hand corner P-1 has excerpts from the plan
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application there still is the potential for up to three additional carriers to come in. That would necessitate expanding the size of the compound to accommodate all four carriers. And it would be then the original size of the compound area.

I note parenthetically by shifting the location of the tower about 16 feet again on the diagram to the kind of right and a little bit up the tower itself actually is more visible because it's now just at the edge of the recycling shed. So someone who visits the compound now is certainly going to be able to see the full length of the tower when they're on the property.

I'm going to flip to the second page of owe nine which is P-two in the upper right hand corner. And there was discussion last time about what vegetation is going to be preserved or removed. And this is a diagram that highlights it. So first of all, I'm going to move my cursor around the new fence line here, which again is 17 -feet deep instead of I guess the 30 feet originally proposed. But the brownish line is still the lease line. So that's in a sense still on the table. Should other carriers come in, and that's certainly the intent of both the bid specs and the intent of public policy is to collocate, that that
that are colorized for emphasis. So the upper half shows the prior height that was proposed, which was a -- there were some alternatives but it was a 120 -foot faux tree with 6-foot branching above it for a total height of 126 feet. And there on the diagram I outlined the initial compound area in red and showed the three potential collocator sites, at least for ground mounted equipment in blue.

Below that I show the revised height on the bottom half of that, and if I recall the testimony correctly from last time the Applicant is suggesting that it would accept the condition that a flagless flagpole of 80 feet in height would be accommodated, would be accepted, or a faux tree with the branching on top would be 86 feet.

You see that there is a reduced compound in size. It's cut in half. And the center point of the tower is shifted I estimate about 16 feet from the old location. So there's a slight improvement in terms of its distance from the O'Donnell property. The tower is shifted, as indicated earlier, 25 feet away from the Conine property. Those dimensions are minor compared with the height and visual impact of the tower.

I note that the lease area has not been changed, and that means that if the Board approves this
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fence line could be increased as part of this process.
So on the -- there are red lines that go from the identification line on the right-hand side under the heading to be removed, and it talks about the trees and numbers there. All of those trees are going to be removed. And that's just to install the reduced size equipment area. Those are -- the applicant admits that those are going to be removed.

There was an initial impression in the presentation that below that is a listing of trees to remain. And there were five trees listed to remain. However, as revealed in the cross-examination by Mr. Simon three of those trees are dead. And they're indicated by the red Xs. So the Applicant is at the end of the day saying we're going to keep two trees. They both happen to be Red Maples commonly known as Swamp Maples. There is a -- tree number 12 will stay and is outside of the lease area, but the largest tree in the area, the 24 -inch diameter Red Maple is going to be preserved but it's within the leased area so that a subsequent collocator in accordance with the bid specs, if they need the space for their equipment and the fenced compound is increased that tree will have to be removed.

So at the end of the day the existing
vegetation that can reliably, reliably be kept is one tree, one of the Red Maples, which is at the edge, and I'll just highlight it with my cursor. That's the one tree that is going to be retained.

Now, on this next page I just make a small point that when you measure setbacks of structures or buildings normally you measure to the closest point of the building, and the Applicant out of convenience likes to measure to the centerline of the pole. So here I just show in blue the compound area as reduced. In yellow I show the enlarged compound area should one, two, or three more collocators appear, and I approximated the actual setbacks from the closest point of the tower. There was a, you know, testimony by Mr. Masters that said that the -- if faux branching is proposed the tower width starts at 5 feet and then it goes down to a smaller I think 18 inches at the top. But the branching, the faux branching extends maybe 10 feet out. So this is an approximation of the setbacks that are going to happen. So the closest point is likely to be approximately 58 feet from the O'Donnell property, and 110 feet from the Conine property.

I've also highlighted in red the
compensating landscaping that the Applicant is proposing. And as you can see in the lower right-hand
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mark that I make there is I think a fair approximation of where the reduced height tower would be.

After the last meeting I took the photograph on the left, and that photograph is about in the same direction approximately, but it's 300 feet away looking across the O'Donnell property. So I'm just at the southern border of the O'Donnell property actually looking through the O'Donnell fence where there isn't landscaping. Actually, I'm standing on the Saganic property. And you can see on the photograph there's a solid hedge -- well, to the right of that I kind of squeezed between it so I'm at the property line. So I'm about 300 feet away. And on March 30th of 2020 I took that picture and that gives you a fair rendition of what it looks like today without leaves on the property, or throughout any Wintertime. Of course, this does not depict what is going to be removed. And the yellow mark shows the -- what I believe to be the 24 -inch Red Maple. That will remain unless other carriers come in and require the compound to be extended.
Q. Peter, can you hear me?
A. I can.
Q. Thank you. Just for clarification, staying on P-4 for ten more seconds, the yellow line that's at
area there are a number of shrubs, rather small vegetation, trees that are being proposed, Hollies. They're all 5- to 6-foot high most of them at the time of planting. So while over a number of years they may have the effect of helping shield what is at the ground level, the compound level, those plantings are clearly ineffective in terms of the cell tower itself, whether it's a flagless flagpole or a faux tree.

The next slide, P-4 portion of Exhibit O-9, actually reproduces photographs that were -- that I took. The one on the right-hand side I took this photo on July 10th of 2021. And if the Board remembers that's when one of the property owners put a crane up on the property, and the top of the crane was 120 feet. So that is an accurate rendition from the Saganic property, and that photo was taken about 400 feet away. So I'm still looking up but because I'm at that distance away I'm starting to approximate, you know, a horizontal view of this. By just linear interpretation I estimated where 86 feet was, as you can see in that red line. And to recall the testimony, although there was not a surveyor that verified this, at the last meeting there was testimony that the top branches, and I believe I got the right tree correctly, that's the 24 -inch Red Maple, were 69 -feet tall. So that 86 -foot
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an angle was not put there by you to demonstrate any particular height but just simply to identify a similar tree in both photographs that you took; correct?
A. That's correct. And according to the testimony at the last meeting the highest branches there are 69 -feet high. That was alleged to be the case even though the surveyors evidence -- the surveyor was not present to verify the accuracy of that, but testimony was at least introduced that suggested that that tree is 69 -feet high. So the yellow line is just to compare the right photograph where the trees are in leaf with the left one which was taken before the leaves appeared this Spring.
Q. Okay. You can go on to $\mathrm{P}-5$, please.
A. P-5 is a photograph that I took on March 30th of 2022, to show you the condition of the vegetation that is behind the recycling shelter. So that brown sloped-roof building on the left is the recycling center. There's some storage equipment in the back, but those trees, and as you are -- are the ones that exist today. And the taller one that's in the foreground in the center of the photo is the one that's apparently going to be left as just outside of the shrunken equipment area. What clearly is apparent is that these trees are not evergreens. And when all
of them are removed initially except for two there is going to be very little effective screening in my opinion. And again, the Applicant was alleging to save five trees but some of those trees were acknowledged as already dead.

The final slide is P-6. And there was a rendition of this submitted previously, but I wanted to -- and when I get into the body of my testimony, wanted to highlight the fact that the proposed site as we all know is not in the National Historic District, which is bounded by the solid red line, and individually designated properties are with the pink coloring. That part of the subject property is surrounded on three sides by the National Historic District, which coincides with the boundaries of the State Historic District.

I did superimpose in blue the limits of the New Vernon Historic District, your local District. And indeed not only is it within the heart of your local Historic District, but the property is designated as the key property in that district. Parenthetically to the lower left of that diagram just at the border of this aerial photo which is a 2020 aerial photo you can see the elementary school, which is just outside of both the National and the local Historic Districts.
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existing tree.
Mr. Masters described the change that was, I guess, invited, the -- Mr. Masters said that the Applicant as part of I guess the third step of the Sica process was suggesting that the Applicant is inviting the condition that the tower location be shifted. Again, that the compound be reduced, at least for this part of the -- this carrier, and that either an 80-foot tall flagless pole or an 86-foot tall faux tree would be accepted as a condition.

I want to kind of characterize this by saying that the Applicant appears to not be -- to be reluctant to amend the application. The Applicant, as I understood the transcript, said that they're not amending their application. So I'm guessing the application is still for a 126 -foot structure, but the testimony was that as of -- if the Board was so willing that the Applicant would not object to a condition that would lower the height, for example, by 40 feet, and that was phrased as step three in the Sica process. So if you recall the Sica process the first step is to kind of quantify the magnitude of the public benefit. And that is how much of the gap in this case is going to be covered by this new cell tower.

The second step is to identify the negative

Maybe I'll put this away for the moment and see if I can --
Q. Okay. So that was P-9 pages P-1 through P-6 that you just went through; right, Mr. Steck? O-9.
A. O-9 with upper right-hand corner $\mathrm{P}-1$ through P-6.
Q. Thank you.
A. So I presume you'd want me to continue, Mr. Simon?
Q. Your presumption is correct, Mr. Steck.
A. Okay. So I'm reappearing because additional testimony was supplied at the last hearing in March, March 31st. And as you recall, the Applicant provided two witnesses. Its professional engineer talked about the changes of the site plan. And again, the character of the cell tower itself was not discussed it was really the placement on the site plan. And again there was an emphasis that 750 -square feet less disturbance was being proposed because the compound is now 17-by-60 feet, but again in my opinion the Board has to take into account that the bidding specs and the public purpose of having multiple locators on the property, in my opinion would automatically expand this to 30-by-60 feet which was the original compound, and again would leave one
consequences. And that's largely visual, but obviously in the context of a property, a zone that doesn't permit this use, and in the context within a local Historic District, and within proximity on three sides to a National and State Historic District.

The third step is really for the Board to consider reasonable conditions that might mitigate any adverse consequences.

And then the fourth step is the so-called balance where acknowledging that there is a certain amount of public benefit the Board is to conclude -- to conclude whether or not the negative criteria are satisfied given these conditions that in theory lessen the adverse impacts of the application.

I want to suggest that the mechanism for introducing this reduced height is misplaced. First of all, rather than amending the application -- so the Board I guess has to understand what the Applicant really wants because the Applicant is not amending the application, but the Applicant is inviting the Board to in some degree lessen the visual impact by lowering the height. And as you recall, pictures were taken from historic locations, historic meaning that there were photos taken four years ago, and these were updated by someone else who we haven't met and we're a little
unsure about how the computer characterized the blockage or non-blockage.

And again, as you recall, the visual analysis did not take into account the removal of trees, which is clearly going to happen. And again, it was done four years ago without updating any of the photos. And it was taken from locations that are not, in my opinion, the most visible locations. The pictures that I took that were in this O-9 Exhibit I picked the most prominent locations, meaning the O'Donnell property and the property just to the south of that, because this is not a wooded area. There are open lawns. It's a highly visible part of it. So the Applicant has not adjusted its analysis for I would consider an accurate evaluation of the negative impacts.

The other, I guess, what I would consider kind of false analysis is that the Applicant had no comment about the magnitude of the public benefit. If going back multiple months and years there was testimony suggesting that an 86-foot tower was not adequate to serve the area. And particularly it was not adequate to serve the elementary school which has, according to the testimony of your police chief, has I guess the greatest concentration of people, a real
concern to have adequate cell connection.
So not addressed by the Applicant is, and
in my opinion needed to be addressed, is the first step of the Sica process. What has happened is the Applicant is saying we'll accept the condition that the tower be reduced, but admittedly there will be less coverage, and in fact less coverage at least in one of the frequency bands of the elementary school which was highlighted as a significant public benefit. And so the first step of the Sica process has not been revisited, but it is clear that the benefit in terms of improved coverage has been reduced.

There has been no explanation -- now that the tower is lower, in other words, closer to the established tree line, in my opinion it opens the door to reconsideration of other sites. It will not be as prominent as initially a 146 -foot tower and then later a 126 -foot tall tower. This will be less prominent, and in my opinion an exploration should be revisited about sites, particularly outside of the local Historic District. This has not been done.

To my knowledge the elementary school has not been approached by the revised plan. Again, if you recall the initial approach to the Board of Education, if I understand the record correctly, was for a very

## Page 31

tall pole right in the front yard of the school. There are other locations on that site, and this is in a sense a significantly different application with a height reduced of 40 feet.

So my understanding is that the Applicant still needs to show particular suitability of a property. It needs to have a good-faith effort of searching other sites, and in recognition of the discouragement of a site in a Historic District. So there has not been in my opinion a credible re-analysis of the Sica criteria. There is kind of a last minute Hail Mary we'll shrink the tower, but that is not in my opinion a credible analysis under the Sica standards.

In my judgment -- my initial conclusion was that the Sica standards have not been satisfied by the initial application, the 126 -foot one. And that is still my opinion given the conditions that were invited. What has not changed is the bidding specifications -- before I go there I just want to comment a little bit on the visual analysis that was redone. It was done by a computer program. We don't know what inputs were put in there other than the original four-year old photos. We don't know what the computer program is capable of doing in terms of eliminating trees. The analysis did not eliminate any
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of the existing trees, which is clearly going to be the case. We have no first-hand knowledge of how it was done, and apparently Mr. Masters does not. He relies on the consultant but is not present when those modifications are done.

The other thing to keep in mind is that there is a policy of collocation. So if you see in the site plan there's a, you know, a 186-foot tall tree with one set of panels from a carrier. But keep in mind the bidding requirements allow up to four carriers, and that's clearly but a changed view of the tree. And the Federal law allows without under certain conditions, which I believe are fairly easy to meet, the Applicant doesn't have to come back for site plan review by state law by increasing the height by ten percent, or the Federal law I understand allows it to be increased by 20 feet. So while you're approving one view, one visual analysis of this there are capabilities that will in my opinion reasonably automatically appear in the future that obviously have an impact on the aesthetics that are simply not being addressed.

What has not changed is that the bidding requirements still require the Applicant to address the historic impact on the local and the state district,
$-$
and presumably that means that the State Historic Preservation Office would chime in. And I would expect them to because of my experience with a tower at the DelBarton School where the State Preservation Officer, or a representative of the office, was there during one of the visual impact tests.

This "P" Zone still is does not permit cellular facilities. This is still in a local Historic District. It is towards the center and is surrounded on three sides by a State and National Historic District. It is adjacent to a B-1 Zone that has a historic theme both in the name of the zone and the purposes of the zone. This is in a redevelopment plan where the governing body has the ability to modify what you might look at as an overlay zoning, but the redevelopment plan they could address just this property. The council has not done that.

And the ordinance that sets the standards for the complete municipality has not changed. And as you recall those standards treated a new tower as a conditional use. It treated in the north end of the municipality in the B-2 -- in the old "B" Zones. And the principles there were that it be the one use on the property. It be the principal use of the property. There was language that it would have to be not in a
residential area because it's a business zone, and it would have to be at least a thousand feet from a Historic District. Those are policies that were in place and remain in place.

And although certainly the governing body has the ability to change standards and it's been a four-year long process now, clearly enough time to change it, the governing body has decided not to do that.

So in summary --
Q. Peter, before --
A. I've listened to the testimony --
Q. Peter, before you get to your summary, I know that you covered the positive criteria. You covered the first prong, second prong of the negative criteria. With regard to the third prong of the negative criteria, namely, whether the applicant can impose or suggest any conditions that would mitigate against the detrimental impacts of the proposal. When I talk about the proposal we're talking about the proposal at this point at 86 feet and not at 126 feet and reducing it by 40 feet. Do you agree with that?
A. The proposal -- the application is still for 126 feet, as I understand it. The Applicant is choosing not to amend the application.
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Q. Right. And the question is whether the Applicant should be amending the application and having a different application at 86 feet, because that is what is being proposed before this Board currently.
A. In my opinion, the only way to handle this, or the proper way to handle this as an amendment to the application. And this is a substantial change. And clearly when you lower it there's potentially less of a visual impact. But it also opens the door to, as I mentioned, the step one of the Sica process. Is this site particularly suited? Are there other sites that are better suited to this and maybe haven't been explored because of the new height?
So I think it's -- it's maybe one way to
put it. I think it's an incorrect or improper vehicle for the Applicant to hint at conditions it might accept but not amend its application. I think the Applicant is dodging the requirements of walking through its burden of proof with respect to the Sica case.
Q. Okay. And now getting to your summary that I cut you off on.
A. Let's see if I remember what that --I do.
Q. That's a good thing.
A. In my opinion, the Applicant still has not satisfied its statutory criteria. As indicated, and I
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agree with Mr. Masters, the impact of this application is largely visual. The standards in my opinion, the screening to whether the aesthetic negatives have been addressed are enhanced by the fact that there is a State and National Historic District and a local district. And there's a Redevelopment Plan that even suggests that new utilities should be under ground.

The municipality has for a number of years now adopted an ordinance that allows a Distributed Antenna System where you can put up new poles that are
I think ten percent taller than maybe existing poles along the street, but it accommodates alternate technologies which have not been addressed by the Applicant.

So I've listened to the change. In my opinion the Applicant cannot still satisfy the negative criteria even on balance. Yes, the height has been reduced, but this structure, especially with the removal of trees that have some shielding effect but none in the Wintertime, the removal of all trees except for two and maybe at the end of the day if the compound is expanded only one tree remains, there's still a major adverse visual impact on this Historic District.

And again the Sica test is to evaluate that negative criteria based on the benefits, which is the
fulfilling of the gap. And what has happened at the same time is that the Applicant has, in my opinion, reduced the public benefit that it was originally relying upon.

So my conclusion is on balance the Applicant still fails to meet the negative criteria under the Sica balancing test. The public benefits have been dramatically reduced. The public purpose is to have multiple carriers. If the bidding regs and the desires of the wireless ordinance are met you're going to have a full compound of 30 -by- 60 feet with one existing tree remaining. The shielding will be initially 6 -foot high evergreens, which over a number of years will help shield the base of this, the equipment area, but will do nothing for the tower itself. And because of the nature of the vegetation in the area even though it's a faux evergreen, in my opinion, it's going to stick out like a sore thumb. If it's a flagpole it's going to be a structure twice as tall than is permitted in the zone, and very apparent in this Historic District that it has, in my opinion, an injurious result.

And to look at the magnitude of it we have to return to your ordinance that says a new tower has to be at least a thousand feet away from an Historic
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the Applicant is now proposing a tower, whether it's a faux tree or flagless flagpole at 86 feet, and with the 8 -foot distance differential from the O'Donnell property and the 26 -foot approximate differential from the Conine property, do your opinions change with regard to the Applicant's ability to meet the negative criteria in particular?
A. In my opinion, because of the overall proximity of these residential properties, and the height being either 80 feet for a flagless flag pole or 86 for a faux tree those distances are insignificant in terms of addressing the negative criteria.
Q. So your opinion for all the reasons that you stated in your testimony is that the Applicant still fails to satisfy the positive and negative criteria required for the variance relief that's required for this application; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And otherwise, other than what you've stated here this evening, the prior opinions that you've testified to under oath have not changed; correct?
A. They have not changed, and the answer is -the ultimate conclusion of mind has not changed, even with the invited conditions as of the March 31st

District. This is in the Historic District.
Q. And Peter your opinion is the same whether it's a flagless flagpole or a faux tree; correct?
A. That is correct. There obviously is some difference, but the flagless flagpole it doesn't even try to be a natural appearing thing. But the evergreen tree will stand out because if they -- with this kind of proximity of residential properties that are substantially well maintained residential properties it's clearly apparent that this is a faux cell tower and not a tree that blends into the forest because there is no forest.
Q. And what about the positive criteria? I know you touched upon the investigation or lack thereof at 86 feet. Do you have a professional planning opinion as to whether the Applicant has met the positive criteria given the revised application?
A. They have not met it because there is no effort to look at alternate technologies. There is no effort to evaluate other sites that may open up because of the reduced height. But there is an acknowledgment that the coverage of the gap that was originally intended has now been reduced.
Q. And getting back to the negative criteria and the four-part Sica Balancing Test, the fact that
hearing.
MR. SIMON: I have nothing further for Mr.
Steck at this time. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Schneider?
MR. SCHNEIDER: I have no questions for Mr. Steck.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Does the Board have any questions?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I do.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Just make sure your mic is on.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe this is for Mr.
Simon or Mr. Steck. I'm looking for quite concise answers, so not long answers to this otherwise we won't get through it. Why don't they want to amend the application? Maybe that's for Rob.

## MR. SIMON: I'm sorry, Alf.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Why do you think they don't want to amend the application? I'm sorry. Why do you think that Verizon doesn't want to amend the application?

MR. SIMON: First of all, I'm not under oath. I have no idea why they would want to or don't want to amend the application. What I will tell you is that as a matter of law I humbly believe that it is

1 crystal clear that they have to amend the application. And they have to present at an 86-foot application, and they cannot as a matter of law with regard to the balancing test, with regard to the first prong, with regard to the third prong say, well, we're going to mitigate the detrimental impact by reducing it to 86 feet.

That's as if I came in with an application for an 180-foot or 190-foot tower and say, hey, guess what? I'm going to reduce it to blank, whatever blank is and that's mitigating the detrimental impact.
That's not the way it works in terms of the analysis of the Sica Balancing Test.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Mr. Simon, I understand your position, I'm just curious --

MR. SIMON: Yes. I don't --
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Second question is
for Mr. Steck. With regard to the visual aspect of the towers, do you have any opinion about which of the flagless flagpole or the tree is least worse for the site?

I realize it's not a fair question but I'm going to ask it anyway. And you can say no, you have no opinion, or you do have an opinion.

THE WITNESS: In summary, I think they both
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unsatisfactory.
What would you look to see for a
landscaping plan? And again I realize that this is a very narrow question and you're opposed to --

THE WITNESS: I don't think a landscaping
plan can remedy the visual impact of the tower.
There's very little -- you know, there are areas --
there are residential properties that are large. There
is a Board of Education property with a large wooded
area. There are areas that have higher elevations. If
this is placed in the midst of a forested area I think
it's a whole different ball game.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Thank you, Mr. Steck.
You've answered my question. Thank you, Mike.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone else on the Board? Hugh?

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Mr. Steck, one quick question, or I hope it will be quick. You mentioned a number of times with regard to alternative sites you mentioned the school as a possible alternative site. Can you tell me in your experience do you know is it common, uncommon? Have you ever seen a school used as a cell tower site for a use of a facility like this?

THE WITNESS: I think the Applicant testified that they were aware of instances. Now,
failed. But the difference is while a faux tree, you know, might be acceptable, and if you look at the photographs that Mr. Masters presented such as on the DelBarton site, a faux tree in a mass of other trees where there are, let's say, evergreens can be effective. Here it's not the case. And because of the proximity of residential uses there's no one on this -in the United States that's going to look at that and say that's a wonderful tree. The answer is it's a cell tower.

Obviously the flagless flagpole has less mass, but it doesn't even pretend to be natural.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I know these things. I'm looking for your opinion.

THE WITNESS: That's my opinion.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So you have no -- it doesn't matter?

THE WITNESS: It doesn't matter. And again, whether one is slightly better than the other if the Applicant doesn't meet the statutory criteria I don't think the Board has the ability to legitimately approve the application.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Okay. Third question
with regard to landscape. I agree with actually most of your criticism of the landscape plan. I think it's
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there are certainly examples in like New York City where, you know, facilities could be on buildings. It's a different environment. And I know that there are, you know, appearance considerations, but --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I'm sorry. Doesn't
DelBarton have a tower?
THE WITNESS: DelBarton has a tower on its,
you know, on its many-acre campus. It is remote from
-- it's near some of its athletic fields. It's remote
from any of the buildings. It's almost on a separate site that happens to be forested.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: You know, I know
I've seen cell towers on DPW sites before, but I've never, because over the last three years I've been looking at cell towers, but I have never seen one at a public school. Have you?

THE WITNESS: I think it's rare in New Jersey, simply, I guess I would put it because of political considerations. There is a unjustified fear of electromagnetic radiation. Boards of Ed don't want to be put in the position of being criticized. But I invite you to look at the characteristics of the elementary school site where it's very deep. There's a heavily forested area back by the play fields. If you put a tower in that forested area that would have some
similarity to the DelBarton campus, well away from classroom buildings, et cetera, et cetera.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: While we're on that topic of alternate sites, so we've looked at a few, right, and I'd just like to run through with Mr. Steck what the alternative sites were, and just get your view on whether they remain possible alternative sites. So one was the Presbyterian Church.

THE WITNESS: Well, it's not my job to reevaluate sites. When the Applicant early in this process --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can I just interrupt you for a second? I understand that, but I just want for my own recollection to go through the alternatives we discussed and see where you think it fits best among these -- let's phrase it that way.

So of the following sites which do you think is the best? So I believe the Presbyterian Church was approached and they dismissed the possibility of putting in a cupola on the roof. Is that your recollection?

MR. SIMON: Well, wait. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I don't really understand what the question is for Mr. Steck.
that if it were placed there that would be a better location than back by the DPW site?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, but I can't answer that because it's not my job -- it's my job to analyze the evidence presented by the Applicants. And the Applicant approached -- did an analysis with either a 146- or 126-foot tall structure, and there were rejections in some cases of that offer. The Applicant never looked at any large residential property that happened to be wooded.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Well, let me ask you this.

THE WITNESS: And I'm afraid I just can't --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask my question and you can do your very best to answer it. If you can't answer it you can just say you can't answer it.

Do you think this tower will be better on a residential property in the Township?

THE WITNESS: In a large wooded residential area in my opinion I think it would have a better chance of meeting the negative criteria. And again, I'm only comparing it --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So can you --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we're talking
about alternative sites. I think he's proposed
alternative sites.
MR. SIMON: But he as the witness is not proposing any alternative sites. If there's a question about a particular alternative site from a Planning perspective it would arguably be an appropriate question. So that's why I'm asking --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So from his Planning perspective I want to see which one he thinks would be best.

THE WITNESS: Well, I don't want to -- the answer is it's not my study to look for alternate sites. The Applicant has the burden of proof. And as I understand the case law the Applicant is burdened with a, you know, a fair analysis of other sites. The Applicant never looked at any residential sites, and it was my opinion before that they should be eligible if they're a heavily wooded large site.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So let me ask you, from your Planning perspective then. So the Presbyterian Church was looked at, they said no. The Firehouse, it was proposed on their side yard by the softball field.
Do you know what I'm talking about? I think that area to the back, left corner of the Village. Do you think
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MR. SIMON: Well, wait. I think he should be allowed to finish his answer.

THE WITNESS: -- and that means that at
least the tower could be put outside of the Historic District.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So can you point me to a large wooded residential property in the target area?

THE WITNESS: I have not done a separate search. I believe the Applicant needs to revisit the search with the new dimensions. But it's not my --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So are you familiar with any large residential wooded properties that would have been suitable at the previous height of 120 feet?

THE WITNESS: I did not do that analysis because my job is to review the Applicant's case because it's the Applicant's burden of proof.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. But you're proposing that it may be better on a site which may or may not exist?

THE WITNESS: It may not exist, but the Applicant in my opinion is required to do a re-exploration of sites given the dramatic reduction in height.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. But would they

1 not have been required to do that inspection, that
survey at the original height?
THE WITNESS: Yes. They're required to do a fair analysis of other sites. I criticized it initially because they artificially said we're not going to look at any residential properties. And again, the Applicant's position as I understand it is, look, this site was put out for bid. I'm entitled to rely on this one site. And I don't think the Applicant did as comprehensive an analysis as would have been the case if this was an application for a site that didn't happen to be on public property that had already been put out to bid.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. But to summarize, is it your position that you think this would be better in another place, yet for either because it's not your job -- which is a fair answer -to identify that other place, you cannot point me to that other place where it will be better; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: It's not my job, and I did not do that analysis.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So you cannot point to me, point out a property to me where it would be better?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So the answer to the Chairman's question is, yes, there is another alternative site that is better in your opinion?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I'm thoroughly confused now, but I'll let it rest. Anybody else?

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Just a follow up to that is, the school property abuts to the New Vernon Historic District, as well as the National and State District boundary. So because it's more densely wooded your opinion is, even though it's within a thousand feet of Historic District, that it's better?

THE WITNESS: In my opinion if -- first of all, most sites because of the restrictive nature of your ordinances are going to need some kind of variance. That doesn't mean that all variances are equal, or that the statutory proofs could be satisfied.

If the impact of this -- if the adverse impact of this proposal is because of the lack of a wooded backdrop, a treed backdrop and the proximity to homes, if that's the adverse consequences of this site, at least at that level of visual impact in my opinion back in the woods behind the elementary school, on that alone is a superior site. Yes, it would be, you know, maybe a hundred feet from the edge of the local and
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THE WITNESS: At this time, no.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.
Anyone else?
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Just a follow-on
to Mike's question. Just to be clear, if we did put
this in a residential there would still be a variance involved?

THE WITNESS: Definitely.
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Okay. That's it.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And to piggyback on the same. I guess I'm not sure, Mr. Steck. To answer Mike's question you said you didn't know of another property, but now I think previously we heard you say that the elementary school might be a better property. So is the elementary school better or not better?

THE WITNESS: I would say the elementary school is definitely better. It's the one site that was touted as having the most need. It has a heavily wooded area in the rear, but is not a substantially different elevation than the subject site. It has a wooded area in the rear where -- and there's already a gravel trail that goes back there. It would seem to me in my opinion that on it's face that would be a superior site. And it's outside of the Historic District.
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State Historic District, but its impact on the district would be substantially less.

This proposed site that the Applicant is talking about, again, is toward the very center of your one Historic District. And it clearly has a visual impact that is a significant adverse effect associated with this application.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, can I ask you a question?

MR. SIMON: I'm not under oath.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Not under oath. Did
you ever reach out to the school to ask them to reconsider, and I guess there would have been post testimony is that the school was approached, shown a plan. The school wrote us a letter, right. We have a letter I think from the Superintendent saying we're not interested.

Did you ever reach out to them again and ask them to come back and talk to us and --

MR. SIMON: I've never asked the school to provide testimony at this hearing, no.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So do you know if there was any efforts --

MR. SIMON: I can't --
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Fine. So

1 there was no effort to reach out to get them to say,
hey, would you reconsider this?
MR. SIMON: I know at some point I may have written a follow-up letter or just a letter, but I don't recall receiving any response whatsoever one way or another.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So the Applicant testified they approached the school and we saw a whole bunch of e-mails back and forth. We have testimony they spoke. Testimony that the Superintendent wrote back to the Applicant and said, I'm going to paraphrase, but we're not interested. It was a fairly quick letter, I think.

Subsequent to that you may have written a letter to the school asking them to reconsider or whatever, to which you got no response. Is that -does that make sense, is that the timeline?

MR. SIMON: But this was a while ago and this was well before any proposal at 86 feet.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So this was at 140 feet; is that correct?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. It was the original application and nothing to do with 86 feet. And I believe, you know, frankly that the record, and I'll state it later, the record's unclear admittedly in
terms of location at the school property.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think I agree
with Mr. Steck. I disagreed, then George spoke then I
started to agree. Personally, I think the school would be a great place for this. But there's been absolute radio sounds from the school. The only thing we have is a letter saying we're not interested. So I --

MR. SIMON: Well, I believe that goes to whether the Board determines that the Applicant has made a reasonable effort. And I will tell you, and I believe Mr. Steck has opined on this in his sworn testimony, that whether you think that the Applicant has made an effort at 140 whatever it is feet, and whether you think that the response had some clarity to it not withstanding the particular location as to where that 140 -foot tower was to go, certainly I believe the record is clear that there's been no effort to reach out to the school at 86 feet, or to further investigate whether there's a location that can be where a tower can be appropriately sited.

BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: Mike, I would ask the same question about this property as well. So I know they were approached and they said no. I'm not sure what the reasoning was behind that. I don't know if it was at 120 or 140 .
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MR. MLENAK: Just so the record because the record needs to reflect what you're pointing. You're talking about this building we're sitting in today?

BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: Yes, the municipal building. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But to that end, the
Township Committee is well aware that this application is before us, right? So my view, personal view is, if they were interested they would have put their hand up. They probably would have said it.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Who is they? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They the Township Committee would have simply just put it here. There's a lot of things they can -- so if they wanted it --

MR. SIMON: I think there are public bidding considerations too that might have gone to the point where Elizabeth is saying that they didn't look at this and they should have, and I think they should have, this property, Kirby Building property.

Bayne Park is the same thing. Because they had a bid -- it was publicly bid based on request for a proposal, and somebody was the "Winning bidder." They entered into a lease that was subject to them going before this Board for this publicly bid application at the DPW site. And that does not obviate
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the need for any Applicant, including Verizon, including for a publicly bid site to meet the positive criteria in looking at alternative sites in a reasonable manner, especially now that we're talking about a reduced compound by the way, which is also very significant in terms of where the location can be.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, my view is if they wanted it here they would be here already. It's not that they're unaware.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Mike, from a practical perspective I agree with you, but that's not what the law says. The case law says the burden of ensuring that the alternative sites have been properly explored falls to the Applicant. It doesn't fall to Defense Counsel, it falls on the Applicant to have done that analysis and present it to us.

BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: It doesn't fall on the Township Committee either.

MR. MLENAK: That's correct. To bring this whole circle to where you and I had conversations the last meeting about this issue, and I agree with Mr. Simon on this point, that being that the Board at the end of this when they deliberate you are going to be asked whether or not you believe based on the facts presented to you on the record before you that the
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Applicant has fulfilled its burden and made a | 1 | alluded it to -- where do you believe the Applicant |
| 2 | reasonable and good-faith effort to find an alternative | 2 | propose the tower on the school site? |
| 3 | less intrusive site than the application. | 3 | MR. SIMON: Where? In the front. In the |
| 4 | And that was presented, of course, at the | 4 | front. Within the -- I mean, whatever the record said, |
| 5 | time when the height being applied for is much higher. | 5 | but my recollection is it was in the front. |
| 6 | So you have to determine whether those facts are such | 6 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: As far as you know, |
| 7 | and the reasons why those sites aren't available could | 7 | it was not the back property, it's the big expanse -- |
| 8 | be altered into a similar inquiry. That's a factual | 8 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do have testimony. |
| 9 | based inquiry for the Board. | 9 | I asked this question. It's in the transcript. |
| 10 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And the fact for a | 10 | MR. MLENAK: Can I ask, Rich, do you know |
| 11 | 140 feet, I believe that's what the record said -- | 11 | the exhibit number that we can pull up of the e-mails |
| 12 | MR. MLENAK: The application was for -- oh, | 12 | that were used in response to this? Because rather |
| 13 | no. That's what the Board will have to look into the | 13 | than guess, and I don't think the Board -- I think the |
| 14 | record and you can, of course, look at those e-mails | 14 | Board should have their memory refreshed on this point. |
| 15 | again. They are useful to your deliberations. | 15 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And Mr. Schneider, |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, on that point, | 16 | while we're at it, I recall asking this question of I |
| 17 | and we'll ask the Applicant to restate it, but my | 17 | think it was your site acquisition person, about the |
| 18 | recollection is we have testimony that a plan was | 18 | back property specifically, and she did testify to |
| 19 | proposed at 140 feet to the School Board, which | 19 | something. I know that is in there, which transcript I |
| 20 | ultimately resulted in a letter back to the Applicant | 20 | couldn't tell you. Maybe back property or playing |
| 21 | saying no thanks. | 21 | fields or something, if you have an index. |
| 22 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: A plan with a certain | 22 | MR. SCHNEIDER: If you give me a second, |
| 23 | location? | 23 | Mr. Chairman. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I believe it was | 24 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: If I can get my |
| 25 | presented in -- I think it's a little bit unclear. You | 25 | screen to work I can pull it up. |
|  | Page 59 |  | Page 60 |
| 1 | MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll find it. | 1 | Lori, if you want to call the roll attendance. |
| 2 | MR. MLENAK: Just minimize Peter in the | 2 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Ms. Sovolos? |
| 3 | corner there so we can still see him. | 3 | BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: Here. |
| 4 | MR. SIMON: I just want to keep track of | 4 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Maselli? |
| 5 | the fact that, not in terms of timing, but just the | 5 | BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Here. |
| 6 | fact that Mr. Steck is still entertaining questions | 6 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Symonds? |
| 7 | from the Board. We haven't opened it up to the public | 7 | BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Yes, here. |
| 8 | yet in terms of questions for Mr. Steck, so he's still | 8 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Newlin? |
| 9 | on the stand, so to speak. | 9 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Here. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay? | 10 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Rosenbaum? |
| 11 | MR. SIMON: Yes. I'm just trying to keep | 11 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Here. |
| 12 | track. | 12 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio? |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How about this, Mr. | 13 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Here. |
| 14 | Schneider. Why don't we take a five-minute break. | 14 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Flanagan? |
| 15 | It's been an hour and a half. Why don't we take a | 15 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Here. |
| 16 | five-minute break while you look for that in the | 16 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Boyan? |
| 17 | transcript? | 17 | BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Here. |
| 18 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. | 18 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Mr. |
| 19 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: It's Exhibit A-12 | 19 | Schneider, would you like us while you're looking just |
| 20 | just so you know. | 20 | to move on to see if the public has any questions? We |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We'll be back at 8:35. | 21 | can come back to this. |
| 22 | (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken at | 22 | MR. SCHNEIDER: No, but if I can, the |
| 23 | 8:30 p.m.) | 23 | specific -- if you want me I can in the interest of |
| 24 | (Back on the record at 8:35 p.m.) | 24 | efficiency to deal with the issue of where on the |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. We're back. | 25 | property the question was. And the reason I'm familiar |

1 with it, although I can't locate it exactly in the
2 transcript, is you asked the question back in November
3 when I did my summation. So it's fresh in my mind.
of Ed.
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Obviously, there was a concern about the height and footprint as proposed back in May of 2019.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: But to be clear, when you say "safety" we're not quite sure what they mean by safety. Safety fall distance or anything like that?

MR. SIMON: Aric, I absolutely don't know.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Unless you have any question, I'll defer -- I hope I answered your --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You did.
MR. SCHNEIDER: And I will defer further
discussion to the extent applicable on the alternate sites in my resubmission.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you clarify the height that we do or do not know? Was that discussion back with the school was it 140 or is it --

MR. SCHNEIDER: The 140 at the time, but obviously the Applicant -- well, I'll address it in my summation.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Any other members of the Board have any questions for Mr. Steck? (No response.) Okay. Do any members of the public have any questions for the testimony that Mr. Steck provided today? There's one. Come on down.

If that microphone -- or maybe if you can

MR. SIMON: And just to circle back --
MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me just finish, if I can.
"CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So as discussed is the possibility that it will be placed in the field behind the school?
"THE WITNESS: Yes, he was talking about that area. We did discuss that area as well."
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's exactly what I
was looking for. Thank you.
MR. SIMON: So our position is, first of all, that that is nebulous in terms of specifically what area they're talking about, number one. Number two, A-12 specifically states, and we've talked about this a number of times, this is from the Board Superintendent, I think Mr. Spelker, "Our Board has decided not to pursue this proposal any further." This is from May 28, 2019. So this is approximately three years ago. "We appreciate you presenting to our Facilities and Finance Committee, but the Board was concerned with possible safety issues and the height and footprint that the site would require."

I'll save it for later, but putting it in
the -- way back in the woods where there's no kids I don't know what safety issues there would be.
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use this microphone next to Mr. Simon.
MR. SIMON: Wait, wait, wait. I'm sorry.
Ms. Conine, you can you cannot ask questions.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm sorry. I should have said that. Any clients --

MR. SIMON: I apologize.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: She can fire you right now.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman, I like that you're always in my corner.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does that work? I just want to make sure everyone knows their options.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: It works. It just has to be turned on.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So this is needs to be questions not statement. Questions of Mr. Steck's testimony today. So I everyone knows, we're going to have another public comment session on --

MS. ENGEL: This is Christel Engel, E-n-g-e-1. We live at 32 Millbrook Road. Sir, may I please ask the following question? You stated that since there was no revision made to the initial application that the 86 -foot tower by loopholes or otherwise could immediately be changed to 104 feet, if I understood you correctly, because it would mean 20
plus four.
And further that because of the collocation, that the reduction in the footprint would never be the real reduction of the footprint but it would be the original size; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: I'll rephrase that. In general, yes. The Applicant has reduced the size of the compound and said that we can accommodate one 10-by-20-foot pad for a second carrier, but the bid specifications of the municipality say, number one, they like collocation and it can have up to four carriers. And so if any more than one additional carrier appears the lease area, in my opinion, essentially guarantees that the compound would be larger to accommodate four carriers.

As I understand it, the Municipal Land Use Law was amended to say, and there are certain conditions to it, but it was basically to accommodate collocators a site plan to the municipality does not have to be submitted in general if a collocator comes up and the height can be increased by 10 feet.

There is also Federal legislation that I believe allows an accommodation up to 20 feet taller. And again it was in a sense a theme of once the tower's there the carriers or the industry has certain rights
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to encourage collocation and taller towers without the hassle of going back to the municipality.

MS. ENGEL: So then to just clarify again, we're looking at probably a much taller tower again?

THE WITNESS: In my opinion, a fair evaluation of this has to look at the possibility of four carriers and a taller tower.

MS. ENGEL: Thank you. No more questions.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I'm sorry. I want to question what you said.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ms. Engel? Do you have a question for her?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: No.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Never mind.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: To what Mr. Steck
said, I don't think is entirely accurate that the town in this municipality would have to agree to a lease.
So in fact any tower that wanted to come in and be
added to this facility the town would have to do that.
The Board of Adjustment may not, but I don't think it's true that the municipality wouldn't have a say. If they're a lease holder they can decide --

MR. MLENAK: Yes. In terms of the proprietary interest of the property, the municipality is the owner of the property and would have to enter Page 68
into a lease with any collocator.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But the municipality could say no?

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Why couldn't the lessor sublease to a second carrier without the interest of the municipality?

MR. MLENAK: Well, it would still be subject to the lease agreement provision on the ability to sublease.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Does that possibility exist or no?

MR. MLENAK: I haven't even looked at that, but what has been proposed by the Applicant's attorney is another condition of approval if this Board is so willing to require good-faith efforts for that lease to be amended to restrict the height to 80 feet plus 6 feet for branching in the future. So not withstanding the Federal and state law, what they provide in terms of zoning approvals, there would be a contractual limitation.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But the question of whether or not the governing body has say in terms of its collocators is nebulous subject to the terms of some lessor terms of the agreement?

MR. MLENAK: My point is that it is subject
to the lease being negotiated by the town and not this Board.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But it may have
already been negotiated by the town, period. So the
collocator may not have to go to a governing body?
MR. MLENAK: That's correct.
MS. ENGEL: My point exactly.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Simon, is Ms.
Engel no longer represented by you?
MR. SIMON: No.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I just wanted
to be clear for the record.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. Mr. O'Donnell?
MR. O'DONNELL: Just a quick question.
Doesn't Basking Ridge have a cell tower back on their fields?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Your name? MR. O'DONNELL: Neil O'Donnell.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And your address?
MR. O'DONNELL: 28 Millbrook Road. Doesn't
Basking Ridge have a cell tower? I mean I was at their ball field a long time ago and there is a cell tower back over that way.

THE WITNESS: It has one behind the municipal building, if I recall.

MR. O'DONNELL: Not back by the fields?
THE WITNESS: I don't recall. I've seen it
at one time, but I don't recall exactly where its position is. And I don't know if it's on Board of Ed property or on municipal owned property.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone else? Mr. Fox, you have a question?

MR. FOX: Mr. Steck, with respect to the
Federal or state law allowing the Applicant to extend the tower does that also give the Applicant the right to increase the size of the equipment enclosures?

THE WITNESS: I think the maximum permitted by at least the state legislation is 2,500 -square feet for an equipment area. So they put a limit on it, which would be the, you know, this full area is 30-by-60. So that would -- it could be expanded and still fit within the state regulations where you don't have to come back for site plan approval.

MR. FOX: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Come on down. Give your name and address. Just your street.

MR. SPENCER: Jeff Spencer, White Dear
Lane. My question is we talked a lot about public property and then residential property came up for the first time. Do these same lease agreements and
regulations how do they impact the Applicant applying for installation on a residential property?

THE WITNESS: Well, an Applicant is required to do a site search in its area, and that doesn't necessarily -- that site search doesn't automatically exclude residential properties. And again, there's a search area that is established by the provider, and then there is an obligation of the provider to look at sites, because one of the proofs is that the site they select has to be judged to be particularly suited. And again, there's kind of a sliding scale. Some sites are better than others and it depends upon the height of the tower.

In this instance the Applicant made some effort to look at other properties. There were self imposed restrictions such as no residential property. But they ignored the fact that there was a Historic District in certain boundaries. Again, part of this process is it's the burden of the Applicant to do a fair search of alternate sites, and in my opinion to consider alternate technologies.

MR. SPENCER: And just as a follow up, how would subleasing on that Applicant's -- on basically the site change if it were to be a residential property? Would there be less oversight, or would it

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Mr. Chairman, before we move on in the agenda now that Mr. Steck is done I'd like to ask Mr. Mlenak a question, a legal question related to the testimony that we heard.

In your opinion, does the Applicant need to fill out a revised application or is the method that's being proposed by the Applicant legal in your opinion?

MR. MLENAK: In my opinion, what the Applicant is proposing is fine. I respectfully disagree with Mr. Simon. It's not a crystal clear requirement to the application. You are operating on an application under a standard that requires you to consider conditions. You're all seasoned members of the Board. You've seen many applications where I'm sure you've seen applicants recommend or in advance tell you that they're consenting to such a condition.

There is case law which talks about the impact on a change to an amendment -- to an application in terms of whether new notice needs to be provided. One case in particular that comes to mind is a case out in Denville which goes to the core of the application where the change is being made. That was a three lot subdivision. There were changes and there was still a three-lot subdivision.

Here you have an application for a cell

1 tower and it didn't increase in height with the 2 intensity in terms of creating new variances. The

Applicant simply proposed a condition not unlike their proposal that it be a stealth tree or any other condition that they propose more landscaping requirements or anything like that.

Obviously, you have before you an application for 126 feet. If this Board determined that it had not met its obligation and that the conditions, whether proposed by the Applicant or of your own thought process were not sufficient to mitigate the negative criteria and that balance lies in favor of a denial you'd be denying a 126-foot application, not an 86-foot application. The short of it is, I don't believe if the Applicant chooses not to amend their application --

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So from a procedural perspective your advice is that it's okay?

MR. MLENAK: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But I imagine that from a practical perspective this Board now has to weigh whether or not the Applicant has met the Sica balancing test in light of the proposed reduction?

MR. MLENAK: Yes. You're analyzing --
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: -- or suggested

You have to do that deliberation, but then if that is the case then, yes, you can consider other conditions including lowering the height.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And in the interest of going through this as efficiently as possible, we pretty thoroughly walked through that memo the last time and I think it was unanimous in the conclusion that the answer was no. So I think the only modification here, I think the only thing we need to consider tonight is does that 80 -foot height change your answer? Everything else is equal.

I hear what you're saying. You need to consider, if they had gone with an 80 -foot tower to the school would they have said yes? Right. That's one of the questions. I have a view on that. I'll share it with you later.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Not legally. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll share it with you anyway. What's next? We're going to have public comment?

MR. MLENAK: Yes. Just to close the loop, I have the lease in front of me and it does allow for a sublease to collocate.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Without any further approval from the governing body?

## Page 75

condition of a reduction.
MR. MLENAK: You're analyzing the
application as it was applied for an determining
whether reducing the height to 86 is a condition that can mitigate the negative criteria. In doing so,
however, you're implicating obviously other aspects of the application.

You heard testimony from Mr. Steck tonight, I agree, because I asked the question of Mr. Masters last time, whether or not there's an impact to the first part of the Sica balancing test, which is how is the public interest affected by reducing the height down to 86 feet? So yes, you would have to evaluate all of these. You don't operate in a vacuum.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But the balancing test we should be thinking about is at 86 ?

MR. MLENAK: Well, I would say you first have to do it at what it's proposed at 126.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: We have kind of already straw polled that.

MR. MLENAK: Correct, and that's where I'm getting. You may have already done that.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Did we already do that?

MR. MLENAK: Well, we did a straw poll.

```
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MR. MLENAK: Correct. It starts without any approval or consent of any other party this agreement may be --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So as it comes to public comment, we've done this once before, we're going to do it again because we have new testimony. I think -- Steve correct me if I'm wrong -the public comment we have tonight is what, is it meant to be limited to the new testimony we've received since the last time we went through this?

MR. MLENAK: That's correct. The public comment has already occurred in this application, but because testimony and new exhibits have been introduced since that occurring we need to open up to the public again for any comment related to that new testimony, that new exhibit or any change to your prior comments you've given resulting from that new testimony. And it should be limited to that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So I would ask everyone just to -- we have that five-minute rule.
You know, please just keep that in mind and had try to be efficient with your thoughts.

So with that said who wants to be first.
Is Fran Frigerio here? No? (Laughter.)
Well, you had your hand up so come on down.

MR. SIMON: And these would include comments from my clients as well instead of me formally introducing them?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, I'm sorry.
MR. SIMON: No, no. You don't have to
apologize. I think it's fine and they can just be part of the public and they'll identify themselves as such.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This public comment session where your clients speak will be in lieu of them providing their supplemental testimony, is that what you're saying?

MR. SIMON: Well, it is essentially
supplemental testimony. And it doesn't have to be in any particular order, so this is fine.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. So we can expect that they'll identify themselves when they come up?

MR. SIMON: Absolutely.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: When you come you've just got to give us your name, your address. Street is fine. We don't need your street number.

MR. SCHADE: Steve Schade, Mount Kemble Avenue.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Can you spell your
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promise we're going to do this over here and by the time we're done five years later we have this over here. That what it looks like to ma.

And I'm going to quote something that Mr. Steck said that sticks in my mind. Significant negative visual impact. That's what we're talking about here. We're not talking about do we want better cell service if with could hide the antenna in the Presbyterian Church where nobody can see it.

The issue is nobody wants to look at this. I don't live in New Vernon any longer, as I mentioned the last time. I am here every day. As you can see I'm still here from this morning. I don't have to look at it from my house. I have to look at it when I get my mail. I have to look at it when I drive through the center of town. I don't -- I'm not proposing to speak for everybody else but I don't think anybody else is going to say anything different than what we're going it hear right now. None of us want to look at this and especially in a Historic District. (Applause.)

MR. KOENEKE: Mike Koeneke.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sir --
THE WITNESS: Copper Tree Lane.
MR. SIMON: Mr. Koeneke is one of my clients.
last name, please?
MR. SCHADE: S-c-h-a-d-e.
MR. MLENAK: And because this is considered
testimony you will have to be sworn in. Sir, do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. SCHADE: I do.
STEVE S C H A D E, is duly sworn.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And your street again, please?

MR. SCHADE: Mount Kemble Avenue.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you.
MR. SCHADE: Off the record, it's Fran's
63rd wedding anniversary today, so I don't know where she is, but let's hope she's having a better time than we are.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There is no off the record.

MR. SCHADE: So to not go over anything from before but to just go over new things that I heard tonight for the first time, it seems that the Applicant cannot only increase the size of the equipment, but they can increase the size of the pole from wherever it starts without coming back here again. So a lot of this sounds like snake oil to me. You know, they'll
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MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MICHAEL KOENEKE, is duly sworn.

MR. KOENEKE: So question what I'm about red to say all has what happens tonight, okay. Why do I feel like this is Ground Hog Day 3.0?

When we started this three years ago it was like it is tonight, a lot of confusion. And in my opinion we're no further along tonight than we were three years ago. You've heard thousands and thousands of pages of testimony. We have spent tens of thousands of dollars, all of us, and we're sort of back where we started from. Actually, I think we're worse.

Let me just recap very briefly, Counselor. In November you let us speak. That was the first time, right? And I think you heard a pretty clear message that no one wanted a cell tower in Historic Harding. Period. Okay. And you had a vote in December which happened to be nine nothing, straw vote. It was nine nothing. And then an unforced error was committed. You couldn't pull the trigger. You let Verizon back in and they came back in in February and you opened the meeting and you looked down here to your right and it
was like it was a done deal. Okay. It's 80 feet and there it went. You wouldn't even let our Counselor get involved until the end of the meeting. It was done.

So I'm sitting here, you know the old Vince
Lombardi clip where his Packers are doing terrible on the field and he yells out "What the hell is going on here?" I sort of ask myself what happened? Hum, what happened?

So how can nine nothing go 180 degrees?
What happened? Well, I ask you, Counselor, you know, we're not allowed to talk, but the question I have is how much did the Honorable Chris Yates insert himself onto this process? Wait, he was the Mayor, Deputy Mayor. This is his baby. He's gone around this town for three years telling everybody we got it all. It's a done deal. It's a done deal. Then all of a sudden you vote nine nothing. I think he woke up and he said, whoa, my peeps, what are they doing? And I think he went to work.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Koeneke, are you suggesting that this Board had conversations with the former Mayor?

MR. KOENEKE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You are. So you're accusing us --

MR. KOENEKE: I'm not accusing, I'm just -CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I just asked if you're suggesting that we had conversations with the former Mayor --

MR. KOENEKE: I'm connecting the dots. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: -- and you said "yes."
MR. KOENEKE: I'm connecting the dots. How do you go from nine to nothing --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Enough. Stop. You're
going to stand there after three years of this Board
sitting on this dais listening to this testimony and
then you're going to accuse us of having --
MR. KOENEKE: I'm not accusing.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You just admitted you
did, and I don't appreciate it. And I think everyone out in that audience, in the gallery heard you do the same thing. I expect a little bit of courtesy here. We're your neighbors, right. Do you think that we're doing this -- we get some sort of kick doing this?

MR. KOENEKE: No.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We're doing this for the Township.

MR. KOENEKE: I just don't see --
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I'm not going to sit here and be accused of doing something
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inappropriate, and I'm not going to let anyone on this Board --

MR. KOENEKE: I didn't say it was
inappropriate.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It absolutely would be.
Enough. Thank you. You can sit down.
MR. KOENEKE: Well, let me just finish.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. You are done. Sit down.

MR. KOENEKE: You built yourself a trap. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You're sitting down. Sit down.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Five minutes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone next?
MS. CONINE: I'll go next. I'm Sarah
Conine. Lees Hill Road.
MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. CONINE: I do.
SARAH CONINE, is duly sworn.
MS. CONINE: I am one of his clients. I just want to start by saying I know it's been a long three years for all of us, and especially as the public it gets hard because we can't say anything. So in
three years this is only the second time we've talked. So I know it's been hard on all of us not to be able to say something inappropriate or not appropriate sometimes, but anyway, thank you for letting us talk again.

I just want to say I am renovating -- so we have a home that we're renovating that I grew up in the Historic District in the least densely wooded area of most of Harding. And we have painstakingly gone to great lengths to preserve the history of that home. We had three builders come and tell us to knock it down. That it would be cheaper, and it would have been now that I'm almost done. But we really felt it was important to preserve the Historic Downtown area across the street from the Presbyterian Church, which is historic, where all the homes are close together because back in the 1800s they used to all be close together. We felt it really important for our town to preserve that so we've gone to great lengths to bring it up to today's living to but to preserve all that. We have saved the molding. We've saved the trim. We've saved the doors. We've added on the porch that was there again in the 1800 s.

So I beg of you, I beg, beg, beg with you
to not put this tower in my backyard where I've lived
for 35 years. I've watched a lot of this town change over the years in some wonderful ways, and some in really bad ways. And I've watched the DPW grow and grow and grow and my family has said nothing. They said nothing. They've let it happen. It's part of Town. It's part of what makes a town go. It's how it operates. But this is enough. We don't need this here. We all know, you guys are all smart people, we all know there's other options.

And the last thing I ask is down in your hearts would any of you want this in your backyards?

Now my daughter would like to say something.

MR. MLENAK: Say your name, please.
MS. NORA CARIFA: Nora Carifa.
MR. MLENAK: Same address?
MS. NORA CARIFA: Yes.
MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. NORA CARIFA: I do.
N O R A C A RIF A, is duly sworn.
MS. NORA CARIFA: I just wanted to ask, please -- I'm sorry -- not to put the cell phone tower in my backyard. We really don't want it. My parents have been working so hard to get you to say no and you
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The other thing you will also notice if they had done their due diligence and proposed it properly is that the back field in the school is actually 20 - to 30 -feet higher, there are portions, areas that are 20- to 30 -feet higher than the proposed site of the DPW, which means that if the Applicant is now okay with an 86 -foot tower potentially it could be something to $50-$ to 60 feet, maybe even 60 feet. That will allow far less visual impact than is being proposed now.

I can see that tower in my backyard. Many of you have been to my property. It is disgusting. We're not talking about putting up a tower, a cell tower at 120 versus 80 . All of a sudden making it 40 -feet lower makes it visually okay? No, it doesn't.

For generations to come this tower will be here and they will say our future generations will wonder, jeez, what were those people in 2022 thinking about. So please do not reverse your vote. Vote this application down.

My last point is, you all know, you've all heard enough testimony today, it is not going to be an 86 -foot tower. You asked the right question earlier about what application should we consider? You are not considering, in my humble opinion, my non-legal
guys three for years now --
MS. CONINE: Thank you. We've had a lot of cell phone talk in our house. It's been a long few years. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. BANSAL: Hi. I'm Harsh Bansal, Copper
Tree Lane. I'm one of Mr. Simon's clients so I can answer the question.

MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MR. BANSAL: I do.
H A R S H B A N S A L, is duly sworn.
MR. BANSAL: So there is a cell tower right next to Basking Ridge School that you asked the question about. It's very, very close to the playing fields. In fact, I have photos on my cell phone I can show you from I went there last time.

You will also find that if the Applicant had done and done their due diligence and gone to the school and said they wanted to put up an 86-foot tower in their back fields you would find that the distance from the center of the field, and you can ask them to investigate, is roughly the same as it is from the tower today to the building of the school. That may surprise you but that is the case, very, very close. We're talking about only a few feet of difference.
opinion, an 86-foot tower. You're considering the original 126-foot tower because the Applicant has very, may I say, cleverly decided they will not amend and not file a revised application because it comes with a lot of burden. So conveniently comes out and says, gee, accept this new one, and we'll do, you know, if you do this we'll amend our application. We don't know if they'll do it or not. So you are approving or denying today a 126-foot tower which I must humbly submit you already rejected even though in a straw poll.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Before you go, may I ask you one question?

MR. BANSAL: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So along the lines of what Alf asked Mr. Simon, and I don't know if you know but you just alluded to, why do you think the Applicant is not amending the application rather than just offering this as a condition? Do you have a view on that?

MR. BANSAL: Yes. My view is that they don't want to do the work that is associated with it. A new application potentially means they have to now go through all the Sica Balancing Test that they're supposed to do, provide the testimony that they have gone ahead and investigated alternative sites and all

1 of those things associated with it which takes money, time, and maybe even a new bidding process that they don't want to do. I don't know all the legal answers to it, but did they go to the firehouse and say, hey, how about an 86-foot tower? Did they go to the school and say how about putting it in the back field there for you, and we know it's 20- to 30 -feet higher and maybe therefore it should be only 60 feet. They can build a platform on which the tower can go. Build a 10-foot platform.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Thank you.
MS. RATLIFF: Hi, I'm Shauna Ratliff Road, Long Hill Road.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Can you spell your name, please?

MS. RATLIFF: S-h-a-u-n-a R-a-t-l-i-f-f.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And your street?
MS. RATLIFF: Long Hill.
MR. MLENAK: And you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. RATLIFF: I do.
SHAUNA RATLIFF, is duly sworn.
MS. RATLIFF: So 14 years ago we put in an addition on our house and we are on Long Hill and so this tower will be also in our backyard. And the Board
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NEIL O'D O NNELL, is duly sworn.
MR. O'DONNELL: So history of the DPW real fast. I've been their neighbor since 1994. Like Ms. Sarah Conine said, I've seen all the changes, expansion, everything, and really didn't say too much about it. Lost a Weeping Willow Tree right behind my putting green there. I think a lot of you have been in my backyard. Had a tree service come, contaminated, bah, bah, bah. First thing in my mind, let's go look at the well. Looked at the well water, guess what? Contaminated. Where was all that water coming from? We knew where it was coming from. The DPW.

Paul you were involved in a couple of those meetings long ago. So just telling you the whole history of the DPW living next to them. Tracy Toribio, a good friend of mine. Like Tracy, but he never does anything that I ask him to do. He tells me what I want to hear. Never cleaned up anything. I've been looking at abandoned police cars for over 25 years. Abandoned stolen cars for over a year. I have weeds taller than my fence. Every tree, Mr. Schneider, is dead back there. I look at it all the time.

So the neighbor I am, an attorney we all know lives on James Street said, I would sue the blank out of that town. I'm not that type of guy. I come
nearly did not approve our application at that time
because our roof line was going to be 2 inches under the town ordinance for height. So I don't see -- it took hours and hours and hours of arguing and it was under, and finally somebody on the Board said that height is under the town restrictions. I don't know what we're fighting over. So I don't know at this point why a cell tower, which is significantly over any height restriction in town is so seriously being considered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. Now, if you present material --

MR. O'DONNELL: I'm not presenting. I'm good.

MR. MLENAK: State your name, please.
MR. O'DONNELL: Neil O'Donnell, 28 Millbrook.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Wait. I made an assumption and wrote Copper Tree.

MR. O'DONNELL: Am I allowed to sit?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sure.
MR. MLENAK: Mr. O'Donnell, do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. O'DONNELL: I do.
here -- I moved here a long time ago because I like the people in this town and people look after each other. We have each other's back.

When Sandy hit here I was in Nashville Tennessee. Thirty people showered in my house because I had a generator. People at the post office were coming to me when Cathy was there saying, thank you, Mr. O'Donnell, for letting me shower in your house. I had no idea who they were. That's the type of town this is. We protect each other's back.

That being said, Green Village monopole compared to the one we want to put here, you know why Green Village monopole is not a big deal? Because you have a blind curb going both ways. No one is looking at a cell tower. No one is going to the recycling center at a standstill waiting to unloads their cardboard, aluminum, or plastic and saying, oh my gosh, can you believe the town let them put that cell tower there?

Also, post office, you walk out you're going to see every bit of that tower. You will see every bit of that tower. My backyard, wow. You want to talk about Rowing Dangler, Sotheby's sells million dollar homes. Depreciation value, I know we are not that stupid in this room. Let's be realistic about
this. People don't buy homes underneath cell towers and they don't buy homes underneath power lines. Look where they're located. They're located on highways and they're set apart because no one wants to live by them.

Number three, let's all talk about 5G. All
new, exciting, every commercial you see it 5G, 5G, 5 G . What are the health effects of 5 G . It's a new product. Mr. Schneider, thanks for moving it 8.2 feet closer to my master bedroom. You're unwelcome in my master bedroom because I won't show it to you but it's closer to my master bedroom. I will be sleeping underneath that tower. Okay. We have military waves coming off these cell towers at 5G, which is unknown. We have no history of 5G, and now my master bedroom, my bed that faces there is going to be closer to this 120 -- it's not going to be 80 feet, let's be realistic -120 feet, 140 -foot tower. Thank you, but no thank you.

My questions to the BOA, would you want this tower less than 70 feet from your property line, your backyard?

Number two, would the BOA let any owner, architect, builder in New Vernon or Harding get clearance on all these separate variances Verizon is asking for?

Number three, would you like your children
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is I don't think it's going to be right underneath the fields. It's going to be farther back in the distance. And as Mr. Bansal said it is a higher point there than any other location we have seen so it may not have to even be that high. So putting it way back in those fields I think is one location that should be relocated.

And also, let's be realistic. Modern technology changes every minute. So you guys don't want to be hopefully known as the one who put this eyesore in the center of town right behind my backyard. So I think patients is a wonderful thing. And with technology always changing and if we can't find a location that suits it let's all be patient. We've been living without cell phone service and dead spots everywhere, including everywhere I traveled. I traveled all the way from New England Patriots, all the way down to the Miami Dolphins. Do you think I had good cell service in all those towns? I do not.

Can we protect the children at the School of Boosters and find a better way? I guarantee Verizon can find a way to booster that up somehow.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you.
MR. O'DONNELL: Thank for your time.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thanks. All right.
and/or grandchildren playing underneath this cell tower?

We all can sit here and listen, but if you
listen closely to my questions all the answers would be, no.

I have heard in previous meetings already
nine Nos, so why after three years of meetings, Mr.
Chairman and the BOA, would you stop doing your job protecting the town and surrounding neighbors. This town puts trust in you and the BOA to maintain the rural beauty of our Village. If you cannot see how a cell tower located at the DPW would impact the heart of New Vernon then I truly believe that you do not respect and cherish what this community stands for.

Please vote no. Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Mr. O'Donnell, I
have a question. We talked this evening a lot about the school property in the backyard there with the field, right. So you talk about not having kids, grandkids play underneath that tower. What are your thoughts with the tower being within reason or some site close to fields with kids in this town, kids coming to play sports from other towns playing under a cell tower?

MR. O'DONNELL: Well, my personal opinion
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Who's next? Come on down.
MS. ENGEL: Christel Engel, 32 Millbrook
Road. And yes, I will tell the truth and nothing else but the truth.

MR. MLENAK: I'll ask you anyway. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

MS. ENGEL: Yes, I will.
CHRISTAL ENGEL, is duly sworn.
MS. ENGEL: All right. So rather than reading this entire thing, because we have heard from many people in the public already tonight, I really don't want to double things up but I do want to tell you that I absolutely love this town. I brought my mother tonight who came from Germany, and she's 90 -years old. She's sitting with me here in the audience to support our cause and the causes to try to convince you to say absolutely no.

I work in New York. I work very hard. I spend all of my time every single weekend, every night that I can in my garden. And for those who were able to come to my garden and to my husband's garden last year I believe you saw that we handstakingly (sic) planted all of those little plants and trees. I'm appalled to even hear, working in real estate, having
been in commercial real estate for the last 35 years in New York, that we are even considering this application without looking at new plans.

We had testimony weeks and weeks and weeks ago where we were looking at plans, we were looking at photographs from three, four, five, six, seven years ago. Honestly, it's an embarrassment to all of us. We should not and we cannot allow this tower to happen.

I want to say one more sentence or two more things which my husband I believe gave a very, very strong testimony already. I don't want to repeat it. I want to use my one word and I'm just going to say two more things okay.

Harding has made a very, very unfortunate mistake in expanding the DPW site. We have heard tonight that several other people have never mentioned anything because it is to the benefit of all of us that we can go recycle and do something to give back. This is too much. We cannot add anymore grievances to what we're already dealing with. And I may tell you I get up at five o'clock in the morning. There are trucks that come in at $4: 30$. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Who's next?
MR. CARIFA: James Carifa, Lees Hill Road.
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MS. BLANCO: First name A-j-a, last name B-1-a-n-c-o.

MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. BLANCO: I do.
A J A B L A N C O, is duly sworn.
MS. BLANCO: I was here in November. We were all here. Came back in it was after the New Year. Whatever the first meeting was after the New Year. It's all running together at this point. And I couldn't believe when Verizon said they were going to reduce the pole. Everybody agreed. I thought everyone was in agreement in November. I was absolutely shocked.

And it's in everyone's backyard. It's in my front yard. My daughter is asking me constantly, constantly are we going to move? If there's a cell phone tower are we going to move?

I've lived in the house nine and a half years, I was hoping to go to the nursing home or die in that damn house. I want to live there as long as I can. It needs so much repairs and so much work and we're trying to keep it original. And I don't know what to tell her. I don't know what to tell her. I don't want that damn thing in my front yard. I don't

MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the
truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
MR. CARIFA: I do, so help me God.
J A MES C ARIF A, is duly sworn.
MR. CARIFA: Three years, long time, very
tiring three years. Yeah, this tower is proposed to go right along our property line. Along the Bansal's property line, the O'Donnell's property line. It doesn't belong in Harding. It doesn't belong against a residential property line or in a History District.

If the roles were reversed would you guys
-- and I was in your shoes would you want me to vote yes if this is against your property line? I mean, Harding is a small town. We're all neighbors. I certainly would not vote for this against one of my neighbor's property. So please consider what we said tonight.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone else?
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Just for the record, he's one of your clients?

MR. SIMON: He is. Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Come on down.
MS. BLANCO: Aja Blanco, 14 Lees Hill Road.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Can you spell that, please?
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want it for my neighbors and you guys shouldn't want it either. I haven't heard one testimony from one person that has wanted this. Have you guys?

I read an opinion -- there was an opinion piece, that's the only thing I've ever seen for people that have wanted this. For all those people that want it, I tell them to get AT\&T. The service is much better. Don't get Verizon. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Would you like to speak? No, not you, Mr. Schneider. I'm sorry. Anyone else?

MS. RILEY: Hi. I'm Jane Riley from Youngs Road.

MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. RILEY: I do.
JANE RILEY, is duly sworn.
MS. RILEY: I'm just here tonight to support my neighbors. I have longed from the beginning, I think you all know, I think this is the wrong place for the tower. I don't think we need it. The whole idea of Harding has been in the Master Plan and every group that I've been involved I've been on the host committee and historical society, the Shade Tree Preservation Committee, and the whole idea of all

1 of these things that I've done over the years has been to preserve the rural character of this town and I think that's tantamount to why we all love living here. And I just see this tower as being an eyesore in the middle of our lovely little rural village, which is changing because of the trees that have been lost, because of ash borer and all these other things, and the commercial area's dried up. And we may be rethinking making that into a more residential area, which again I think would be a shame to have in the center of a residential area less of a commercial area a huge ugly tower like that. And just I can't even believe that we're entertaining this when we spend so much time at the Board of Adjustment talking about where windows should be on houses, what kind of trim you should use, the style and all of that kind of stuff.

I mean, I had the Historic Preservation Commission we've done three houses on Lees Hill Road. They came every time and made suggestions. And I can't believe that you all -- I know it's been a long three years, but you can't look at that tower and say that you want something like that in the middle of our town.

And that's all I have to say. I really
encourage you not to vote for it because who knows what
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to keep this place so special. And everyone who comes to visit me says, I can't believe this is like a little magical place in the middle of a very urban area. And we're only 30 minutes from the City.

And I just hope that you vote no for this proposal. It doesn't make any sense. And I think everyone knows that you've given a lot of time and thought about it and it's a very hard position you're in, but it really doesn't fit our beautiful town and I hope that you consider just saying no. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Last chance.

All right. What's up on the agenda next?
We have summations. Who goes first.
MR. MLENAK: Mr. Simon.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you like to give us your summation?

MR. SIMON: Sure. And I will be briefer than normal, because I think you've heard my summation probably maybe twice already, maybe two and a half times. But --

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm sorry. Can I interrupt? It's 9:30. Are we doing both summations this is evening or are we --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, I'm hoping we do
will come next after that.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone else? Last chance.

MS. LYON: I'm Meghan Lyon from Village Road.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Can you spell your
first and last name, please?
MS. LYON: M-e-g-h-a-n Lyon, L-y-o-n.
SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you. I'm
sorry, and what was your street again?
MS. LYON: Village Road.
MR. MLENAK: Do you swear to tell the
truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
MS. LYON: I do.
MEGHAN LYON, is duly sworn.
MR. LYON: I am just really thankful that everyone's taking the time to be so thorough tonight. I've learned a lot. And I just wanted to share with you I lived 20 years here. We love our town. We love our neighbors. The fact that 75 new families have moved here in the last year just shows that it's such a special place. And I think all of them are so new to the town they're just getting to know it and I've been here 20 years and gotten involved with my family with many organizations and hundreds of people try so hard
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both summations and take a vote. Mr. Schneider?
MR. SCHNEIDER: I will be brief.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you agree? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
MR. SIMON: I'd like to sincerely first thank the Board, the Board Professionals, members of the public, certainly Mr. Schneider, his professionals. It's hard when you have a three-year application over 22-plus hearings. It's a long slog and there's a lot of material, especially when you're dealing with a Use Variance, and especially when you're dealing with a cell tower application that's being proposed on public property.

However, the idea that you can decide after 20, maybe 21 hearings that I'm changing the application but I'm not changing the application. I'm going to agree as a condition of approval to go from 126 down to 86 feet as a condition of approval without identifying how that impacts the positive criteria in terms of providing good-faith effort to look at alternate location, alternate technologies at the desired signal strength for the area that is proposed to being covered which is now changed with an 86 -foot tower.

I ask Mr. Masters, have you ever in your hundreds, he said hundreds, and I know he has been
involved in hundreds of cell tower applications over his storied career, and I asked him, has there ever been a time where an application that you were working on agreed as a condition of approval and then relying on it as the third prong of the Sica Balancing Test to mitigate detrimental impacts to reduce the height of a tower? The answer was, he could not recall. Hundreds.

And there's a reason why he cannot recall, because it doesn't happen. Let alone for a use variance, let alone where you're subject to the Sica Balancing Test and for a use variance need to meet that four-prong criteria, including balancing the positives, the public interest that's at stake which is the first prong, versus the second prong, versus the third prong, and then you do the balancing for the forth prong. It doesn't happen because it legally cannot happen without the Applicant demonstrating what the impact is of reducing the height to 86 feet in terms of the coverage, in terms of its impact on the ability to use ODAS technology.

Remember, you have an ordinance here in the Township of Harding that promotes small cell technology. I asked Ms. Boschulte, Ms. Boschulte, at 80 feet can you combine that such a tower -- and this is well before they amended their application -- could
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the approval for the Use Variance that requires five affirmative votes. Has that ever happened? I don't think so. I know it's never happened on my watch, and there's a reason for that. The reason is that it's not legally possible for a Board to have as a condition of approval that the Applicant will just agree to lower that principal building for which a use variance and as a principal structure, having let alone for more than one principal structure on the lot that's required -they're also required a use variance, if you lower it we're fine, we're going to approve it without demonstrating.

Well, what the heck is it going to look like? How Mr. Simon, if I'm presenting the application, are you possibly meeting the positive criteria for the Use Variance that you seek without demonstrating the impact of that 86-foot tower in this case in terms of looking -- making a reasonable effort to look at alternate sites, look at alternate technologies, looking not just at the 86 feet but also looking at the reduced size of the compound as was stated by Mr. Steck. Even with the Applicant agreeing not just to reduce it to 86 feet but making it 8 feet further away from the O'Donnell property, 26 feet further away from the Conine property. It doesn't
you -- which they really didn't do, can you combine the 80 -foot tower with the ODAS technology that is permitted as of right in the Township of Harding within the locations that are being proposed, including within the Historic District? And the answer was, it won't work at that height.

And that's where you have an ordinance that
says that you can't have a pole that's greater than 35
feet. And now we're in a Historic District at more than double that. The idea that 86 feet is doing something better than nothing is not what the law allows a Board to consider.

The law also doesn't allow the Board to consider for a use variance. And you all as experienced Board of Adjustment members think about one time, whether it's a use variance, and dealing with the mitigating factors and factor three of the Sica Balancing Test, or when you memorialize a Resolution and you have conditions of approval, have you ever let alone for a use variance at 126 feet or higher or lower said, oh, yeah, we'll approve this application with the condition that the Applicant is going to lower the building, the principal building, lower the principal structure by a third.

If you lower it by a third we'll grant you
matter, Mr. Steck stated it. It doesn't make a reasonable difference.

And it's frustrating, because you as Board of Adjustment members will normally say, well, that doesn't work. Now move it over here. Maybe if you move it over here way in the back or you maybe do this and you find another site maybe it's okay, but because this is a publicly bid process the Applicant they knew what they were getting into. In fact, some knew what they were get into. They were the ones that suggested to the Township in the first place to submit this out for public bid at this particular property.

They came in with eyes well open that if -that this is what we're going to be stuck with within the public bidding process, but they believed right or wrong that they could go before the Board of Adjustment and get five affirmative votes considering the fact that this is adjacent to residential properties, distinguished residential properties, and next to and within a Historic District.

Think about Chief Heller in talking about the need to cover the school, let alone whether there's alternate ways to do that. And now all of a sudden the Applicant is saying, okay, we'll accept an approval at 86 feet, and by the way we're not going to be able to

1 cover the school. And we haven't demonstrated under 2 the first prong, second prong, third prong, fourth 3 prong of the Sica Balancing Test how we're meeting the 4 negative criteria. We have demonstrated site 5 suitability at 86 feet and we have made a good-faith
effort in terms of the positive criteria.
There's been no propagation or drive test
at 70 feet, at 60 feet. We heard testimony -- I'm
sorry, public comment, I apologize -- the last go around that AT\&T is fine at 45 feet at the firehouse. What we do know is that all the trees except two are going to be removed. And maybe we might be stuck with just one tree left and the biggest tree being removed, especially given what Mr. Mlenak just read to you, which is that the Applicant has the right to collocate without any approvals contractually with the Township, legally via the Municipal Land Use Law, legally via the Federal law, whether it's ten percent, whether it's 20 feet, whether it's the fact that even if the Township -- because Ive been part of this. If the Township says, oh, sure, we'll agree that we're not going to allow someone to collocate there is changes in governing body membership, political party majorities. And I will tell you that five years, 10 years from now, and there's a completely different makeup of the
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rezone the property to permit the use. They did an amendment Conditional Use section. They didn't make it part of the redevelopment plan. And you never -- Mr. Masters testified that he's never testified for a carrier, ever in his hundreds of cases in a case where a monopole even at 86 feet was proposed to be located within a Historic District in a redevelopment area and adjacent to residential homes on properties exceeding an acre of land.

Bottom line here is that, and I'm not going to repeat myself because I stated it a number of times during my summation and a half that's brought us to this date, that there is a plethora of language in your ordinance, in the Wireless Telecommunications Ordinance, in the Master Plan, in the Historic Preservation elements of the Master Plan. In the Redevelopment Plan that talks about no wireless telecommunication towers at historic properties. No wireless telecommunication towers adjacent to residential properties. Collocation is encouraged. Right. Three things. You are "0" for three. You're not even batting 333, you're batting zero on this particular application.

And based on the overwhelming amount of information that is in your ordinance, in your Master

Township Committee, and a carrier wants to come and they want to collocate, and even if there's a condition of approval they of course have the right to say, oh, well, no back in 2022 the Township Committee said that there's no collocation so that's it till the end of time. That's wrong. That's not correct as a matter certainly of law.

With regard to a couple of people they mentioned about schools, Mr. Bansal talked about at Ridge High School, Governor Livingston High School. I know Montclair State University. I mean, there's plenty of schools that have cell towers on them. The difference is that in my experience they're not right on top of the school. And schools as you know they have bigger campuses, they have sporting fields and the like.

So we believe that the Applicant has not made a good-faith effort under the positive criteria whether it was at 120 feet, and certainly not at 86 feet. I'm glad I re-read the e-mail from the Superintendent that talked about that based on the height and based on the size of the compound we're not interested. Okay. But they haven't seen anything about 86 feet. Okay.

We also know that the Township didn't
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Plan and those other documents certainly the Applicant, I talked about the positive criteria, cannot meet the four-prong Sica Balancing Test from -- for this application, in balancing the positive and negative the Applicant continues, even at 86 feet, even moving it 8 feet further, even moving it 25 feet 9 inches further, right, but closer of course to the post office, closer to other activities at the DPW yard, that Verizon continues to fail to demonstrate that even at 86 feet and the reduction in compound that it will not result in substantial detriment to the surrounding neighborhood and the public good.

You heard a lot of impassioned pleas, very eloquent intelligent pleas from members of the public. I'm not repeating them. I'm not trying to replicate them because I can't, because I don't live in Harding. I live nearby. I don't live here. But what I can tell you is that it's not just emotion that's at play here, these are intelligent comments that are based in fact, based in the law that requires respectfully that this application be denied. Thank you.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Mr. Chairman, fellow members of the Board, before I get into the substance of my summation let me likewise thank you personally from the way you have professionally treated me and my

DPW, where? And with all due respect, to suggest that there's a suitable residential piece of property that should be the appropriate siting of this facility I think is ridiculous.

What does all that say as it relates to what the case law says? Some have suggested or appear to want to quote from the case law. The leading case, and I often don't quote cases in summations because I don't want to bore anybody, but here's what the leading case says as to the Applicant's responsibility relative to alternate sites.
"What concerns us, however, is the prospect of arbitrary action based on the prior Court suggestion that a telecommunications provider must negate the possible existence of other sites that might, might, and they emphasize might, have served better and been less intrusive but were not discussed.
"This observation might be wrongly interpreted as giving Zoning Boards carte blanche power to reject an application based on conjecture that a possible alternate site is both suitable and available, suitable and available. To require an applicant to disprove the possible existence of these sites may be daunting, if not impossible, because of the uncertainty as to the availability of such sites as well as the

1 team during often dire or difficult circumstances.
2 While we may ultimately have a disagreement as to
3 whether the application is or should be approved, you 4 have at least professionally treated me I think fairly.
me briefly, key word being "briefly" address at least
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was quoted as saying, be sincere, be brief, be seated. I will try to adhere to those guidelines for the following reason:

UNIDENTIFIED PUBIC VOICE: Mr. Chairman, we can't hear.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry. Back in
November of last year I delivered to you a summation which I respectfully submitted both factually and legally articulating the basis upon which I believe the application should be approved at the 126 -foot height. I will be constrained not to repeat the sum and substance of what I indicated and maybe appeal to you back in November.

Mr. Mlenak has made clear to me that the summation should be limited to the proffered condition of 86 feet, and I will adhere to those constraints because they're appropriate.

Before I get into the substance of why the application should be approved at the lower height let
two of the comments or subject areas that have been brought up this evening.

When I provided the summation back in November I covered a lot of areas. I covered what I thought was the significance of the public bidding process. I covered what I thought was important relative to the lack of bulk requirements in the PL Zone. I covered in detail alternate technologies and referenced testimony of the Board's expert. I also covered in large measure the issue of alternate sites.

And let me address two of those issues that have been raised this evening in part by Mr. Simon. With respect to alternate sites, when I was last up here I quoted to you, Mr. Chairman, verbatim from the transcript, the series of events which took place relative to the school. There should be no amnesia or misunderstanding of how that process unfolded and we should dispel the notion that the Applicant said we only want it in the front. We're not going to be willing to consider any other aspect of that property. That wasn't the facts and no one should suggest to the contrary.

Oftentimes during the whole entirety of this proceeding certain members of the Board have asked the Objectors or the interested parties, if not at the
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physical variables that may render them unsuitable.
"The grant of any variance on these sites is by no means predictable considering the fact-sensitive issues are implicated in proving special reasons."

I think that citation, which in part by the way is referenced in Mr. Mlenak's memorandum, provide some parameters as to the Applicant's good-faith alternative to find alternate sites. I would make two further observations, both -- one relative to the school, one relative to this property, and this property I'm referring to the Harding Township Municipal building property. It is beyond silly to suggest that since the Applicant has or would agree to a condition of approval to locate it at a height of 86 feet that the Township is not -- that the Township Committee is not aware of that. And if they were so interested would have reversed their previous confirmed in writing position that this site is not available.

Second, relative to the school, let's for the moment put aside "A" the perception, albeit wrongly, of potential health effects that are often implicated when pursuing a school property. Let's deal with a practical reality of how that process unfolds, and let's put aside the fact that the school building
itself where the tower would be located under your own Master Plan is deemed to be one of historical significance, built in 1925, and remodeled in 1931. Let's put that aside. If the Harding Township Elementary School was truly interested in making available its property back in 2019 , or at any time subsequent to November, they have the unfettered right whether they cared about Verizon Wireless, cared about T-Mobile or anybody else, they could have made available the site under the local lands, under the public bidding laws to make available the site at a height not to exceed "X." They did not. The fact is that that site is not available. The fact is that that site would require a " D " Variance. The fact is that Mr. Steck went on for about an hour talking about multiple principal uses at the Harding Township DPW property.

It would be a second or not third principal use at the Harding Township Elementary School with hundreds of school children every day. So I'm confused. What's the more intensive existing principal use: The school or Mr. Flanagan delivering his recyclables Saturday morning? I'll let you make that judgment other than to note it goes right to what the Courts were saying. Go find an alternate site. In
this case every alternate site would have required a D-1 Use Variance or a use not permitted in the zone, and would have represented a second if not third principal use.

Relative to the church, we're talking about, well, maybe the church would have been interested at a height of 86 feet. The church rejected the inquiry of the Applicant as to the use of the cupola. So what's the likelihood that the church practically is going to allow an 86-foot tower when they won't allow the use of their existing structure?

With all that being said, Mr. Chairman, let's try to focus as to why we returned to the Board. I indicated what my summation argued in November. I trust you all recall that. You made clear in the course of your deliberations that you were not -- that you were not amenable -- more clearly than that -willing to approve a tower at that height. But, I respectfully asked you whether a majority of the Board felt it to be worth it to pursue it at a lower height. And the majority of the Board, with some hesitancy and making clear that they weren't committing to approving anything thought it was an alternative worth pursuing. That's why we returned.

So, frankly, and respectfully I resent the
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1 implication that there's some bait and switch and 2 something nefarious about what we've done here. We 3 asked you and you could have said no. You didn't. You 4 didn't commit certainly to approving it, but you didn't 5 tell the Applicant go home, take your approval and use 6 whatever other available remedies you may choose to do. $7 \quad$ You left the door open and we in an attempt to address
your concerns reduced the height.
To suggest as Mr. Simon suggests that we haven't addressed the RF issues associated with 80 feet is not supported by the record. Exhibit A-21 details at your request what the respective coverage was at 120,100 and 80 feet. So to suggest that we didn't address it is just not correct. Did we bring back Ms. Boschulte? No. After 22, 23, 24 hearings I don't need to bring back Ms. Boschulte when she testified probably no less than ten times, including submitting an expert report, and subject to Mr. Simon's cross-examination at what the coverage would be at 80 feet.

Let me conclude with the following. The Sica Balancing Test is very clear. Everyone agrees that the Sica Balancing Test governs this application. The third prong of the Sica Balancing Test specifically talks about conditions to ameliorate the impacts, if any, that the Board identifies. That's what the third
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prong says. It talks about conditions to ameliorate impact. I suggested in November that while there was clearly some visual impact, I didn't come here and tell you no one is going to see it from anywhere. I acknowledged that there was some visual impact, but I suggested based on the entirety of the record that it did not rise to the level of a substantial impact at 126 feet. You obviously disagreed with that ultimate conclusion. But what I would suggest to you is that to the extent that you had concerns relative to visual impact they have been ameliorated in large measure and certainly now don't rise to the level of substantial impact at the 80- or 86 -foot height that the Applicant proposes, depending on the type of stealth structure that is proposed.

And once you identify what the public interest that's advanced, albeit not as significant at 80 versus 126 , and you weigh that against the far more limited visual impact, the forth prong of the Sica Balancing Test asks you to balance that and in my opinion supports a vote in favor of the application at 86 or 80 feet. I thank you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Thank you
both. Steve, I think next up is deliberation and a vote. Any instructions before we start?

|  | Page 121 |  | Page 122 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. MLENAK: I don't intend to belabor | 1 | We'll start from the beginning. Positive criteria: |
| 2 | this. You all have reviewed my memo from August 26th, | 2 | Promotes the general welfare. They have a license, so |
| 3 | 2021. Lori was kind enough to leave another physical | 3 | the answer is yes. |
| 4 | copy in front of you. It sets forth the deliberations | 4 | Is there a gap in coverage? No one |
| 5 | and each of the steps in the Sica Balancing Test you | 5 | disputes it. What is the signal strength necessary to |
| 6 | have to consider. I don't want to belabor it any | 6 | fill that gap? I think that's been the topic of a lot |
| 7 | further. I'm here for questions. | 7 | of discussion. So I think that's one question. And |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So let me say, we went | 8 | I'll tell you, the specific question I asked Mr. |
| 9 | through this in December. The difference here is the | 9 | Schneider, I said does this 80-foot tower cover your |
| 10 | 86 feet. You know -- and I think it's probably worth | 10 | need? He said, and I know it's not testimony, but the |
| 11 | we go very briefly. Step one, identify the public | 11 | Applicant's response to that was yes. It's not as good |
| 12 | interest. Right. We discussed this ad nauseam. It's | 12 | as 120 , but it fits the bill, it fits the need. So -- |
| 13 | coverage -- it's presumed to be beneficial. | 13 | and everybody stop me here if you disagree with this |
| 14 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: And they have an | 14 | analysis. |
| 15 | FCC license. | 15 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: In step four it |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And they have a | 16 | says, will improve mobile wireless communications. It |
| 17 | license. Right. I said regarding Step One identify | 17 | doesn't say it will make it perfect, but it will |
| 18 | the public interest. | 18 | certainly improve it. |
| 19 | MR. MLENAK: Let's just not confuse things, | 19 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It will certainly |
| 20 | just for the record. The FCC license that goes to the | 20 | improve it. I think that's indisputable, right? If |
| 21 | positive criteria and whether or not there's a | 21 | anybody disagrees let me know. |
| 22 | promotion of the general welfare. If you're starting, | 22 | Can the same result be achieved by placing |
| 23 | Mr. Chairman, with the negative criteria that's | 23 | an antenna on some other existing structure using some |
| 24 | something different. | 24 | different technologies or by putting the tower in a |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So fine. | 25 | more suitable alternative site. |
|  | Page 123 |  | Page 124 |
| 1 | It's going backwards. We've discussed this | 1 | technology is the least intrusive. So the burden is on |
| 2 | over and over again, and I hear Mr. Steck. It would be | 2 | the Applicant. |
| 3 | great if there's some heavily wooded residential | 3 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, one point of |
| 4 | property. Where is it? Right. It doesn't exist. | 4 | reference is I know we had -- Dr. Eisenstein can tell |
| 5 | First of all, my personal view, this is | 5 | us. You can't just go fill this whole area with ODAS. |
| 6 | worse on a residential piece of property than it is at | 6 | Dr. Eisenstein, as you sit there did I recall that |
| 7 | the DPW. If anybody disagrees please speak up. | 7 | correctly? |
| 8 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We don't have a | 8 | DR. EISENSTEIN: It would require an |
| 9 | property to consider. So -- | 9 | entirely new application, a whole new study and |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You're right. Show me | 10 | application. You can't just sit here and say it would |
| 11 | that property. Where are you going to put it, you're | 11 | or would not work. |
| 12 | going to put it on Millbrook Road, at 62 Millbrook? | 12 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: But don't you need |
| 13 | I mean, so the alternative using different | 13 | a pole just to base the ODAS off to? |
| 14 | technologies, well, this comes at the discussion of | 14 | DR. EISENSTEIN: By a pole are you talking |
| 15 | ODAS. So could they just go put ODAS -- I think Mr. | 15 | about a monopole of some type? |
| 16 | Simon has talked about this. Can they just go put ODAS | 16 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: A cell structure. |
| 17 | antennas throughout the town and cover it? I think we | 17 | DR. EISENSTEIN: You can put an ODAS in |
| 18 | have had testimony -- well, what do you guys think, can | 18 | just along the right-of-way. But you're talking about |
| 19 | we do that? There's been a lot of testimony on this. | 19 | $35-$ to 50 -foot poles. And as I testified before, when |
| 20 | MR. MLENAK: Just to be clear on the | 20 | I drive through the Township the existing utility poles |
| 21 | standard here. Your job is not to determine | 21 | are unsuitable for ODAS, because the power lines are at |
| 22 | necessarily whether they can. Your job is to determine | 22 | the very top of the pole. So the poles are not |
| 23 | whether the Applicant has undertaken a reasonable and | 23 | suitable. |
| 24 | good-faith effort to find that alternative. And of the | 24 | Secondly, the areas along your streets, |
| 25 | alternatives proposed that this site and this | 25 | particularly in the vicinity of the DPW site are |

1 heavily wooded up to the right-of-way, up to the 2 street. So your ODAS antennas would have to go above 3 them. So you'd be talking about a set of new possibly

50 -foot poles that would have to be put in. That's a major new application. That's a whole different thing. That's not something I can just say do that instead of this. It would require an extensive study, and I'm not certain it can be done as I sit here today. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I guess we don't need to answer this, but this needs to go into the pot here as we come to our final answer. So there's, you know, ODAS is the other technology.

Negative criteria: Identify the public interest.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm sorry, Mike. The last sentence of Step Five is "or by erecting the tower in a more suitable alternative site." And for the life of me as I think about this, we keep talking about what if, what if, what if the school. The fact is all of this could have been ameliorated by an e-mail from the Applicant to Dr. Spelker saying, hey, what do you think about 86 feet?

And I can't for the life of me understand why that didn't happen, but the fact is it didn't

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Why do we keep
talking about ODAS along poles throughout the town when this application is specific for this area? Why do we keep talking about the whole town?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Why are we talking -- I
brought it up in the context of Step Five.
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I know, but it wasn't you, but even --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's a question if it was ODAS only -- and Dr. Eisenstein correct me -- if it was ODAS only you would have to propagate these units all over the town. If it was a mixture, which they're intending to do, then you wouldn't necessarily need to propagate.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: That's still not clear to me. We're talking about one specific location in this town.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: One location in town --

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: So you're saying that you need to erect an ODAS on every pole for every public street to achieve that just in this specific location?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Something like that.
DR. EISENSTEIN: So if you're going to put
happen. And that -- I was okay to say, you know, the question to the school district was placed at 140 and I was willing to say, okay, it was a good-faith effort even though the application was 126, okay, fine. But now that the application we're talking about an 86-foot tower that is a third of the height. And Dr. Spelker in his email said specifically that because of the height of the structure proposed, among other things, we're going to pass. And when you cut the height of it by a third I think a good-faith effort will be to have sent that follow-up email. The Applicant failed to send that follow-up e-mail. And I think that Step Five failed as a result of that oversight.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I agree.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's a problem.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I guess the question
is, had the School Board known it would be at 80 -- you guys keep presuming 86. I hate that fake tree.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Actually, I don't
agree with 86 . They said 80 . We should stick with 80 .
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, 80 is if it is not a fake tree.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I don't care. Eighty.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I agree with you.
in an ODAS system you have to put in poles, not every single pole that could be used, but you have to put them in at a distance where you get the correct propagation from the pole.

Let's say for example that the poles had a radius range of coverage of let's say 700 feet, a
thousand feet. Then you'd locate your poles every thousand feet along the right-of-way. What I'm saying is around here, this area around here which is the area we're talking about, the existing poles are unsuitable because they have the power lines at the top. You can't mount an antenna where there's power lines. So you'd have to erect all new poles. So just think about all your streets, the residential streets and the main streets putting poles in every let's say thousand feet. These would be new poles and they'd have to be above the tree line. So it looks to me, again I'm just estimating as I'm driving along, the trees are at least 40 feet and as I'm looking at them. We'd have to look at 50-foot poles with antenna on the top of them and a base station that sits under that on the ODAS system to control the radios, and that would be in front of residential properties all up and down just this area, just this area. So it's a --

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Thank you. You

1 answered my question.
DR. EISENSTEIN: If you did it for the
whole town you would just be need correspondingly more.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You're talking about
an ODAS only solution?
DR. EISENSTEIN: ODAS only. That's what I
thought I was asked.
BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: And they would be in addition to the existing poles, not replacing the existing poles?

DR. EISENSTEIN: They would have to be in addition to -- well, replacing I would think -- look, I'm not representing -- was it PSE\&G out here? I don't know who your power company is, but they would have to decide whether or not they want their poles replaced. My guess would be no, they would not because that would be rewiring the poles. I think you have to put in new poles. And probably if you put it in you put in a steel structure so you can get them up a little higher. Not a wood structure.

If I could just add one other thing. It is being done. I mean, this is not something which is off of science fiction somewhere some remote thing. There are areas all around, including in the vicinity of my office in Philadelphia where they're putting in brand
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essentially a repeater. It would receive signals from
the -- we would call it an umbrella tower which would
be the 80 -foot one, and then the supplemental tower,
the small cell would receive a signal from there and
rebroadcast it in the area of the school. And that's
done frequently.
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: It's like a
repeater?
DR. EISENSTEIN: It's like a repeater. It
would actually not be a separate cell site. So it
would be a repeater off of that. So in that sense say
a distributed antenna system, but you don't need a
whole set of poles. You would need one pole let's say
in the vicinity of the school to do the repeating.
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: And that's outside the building?

DR. EISENSTEIN: That would -- it would either be, again, I can't just design the network off the top of my head.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I thought you were good.

DR. EISENSTEIN: Not bad; not that good.
23 You might be able to do it on the roof of a building.
24 You might be able to do it on the existing building
25 without a separate structure by having a receiving
new poles and putting in essentially ODAS and 5G and other things in. It's going in all over. And it's not to say that at some future time there won't be exactly that in Harding.

I don't see it coming and the current proposal has nothing to do with 5G. I heard someone mention that. They're not putting anything -- this is strictly a 4G system, the existing cell phone system.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Going back to the school thing, though.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I just want to clarify one thing. So we were talking about an all ODAS system. One of the propagation maps said 80 feet we saw that the coverage at it was 2100 megahertz it was nonexistent or substandard at the school. An 80 -foot tower could there be a scenario where you do ODAS at the school or across the street from the school or something like that to supplement the coverage there. So you get what the Chief wanted, but the 80 -foot tower is what you need rather than a hundred-foot tower a hundred --

DR. EISENSTEIN: So the answer is -- yes, what you would do is, what I would recommend would be to put in what would be called a small cell site, not an ODAS. It would just be a small cell, which would be
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antenna up there that would then rebroadcast within the building.

But another way of doing it would be to put it on the right-of-way in the street not too far from the school. And you can cover other areas. Those would be called fill-in sites. They often put small cell sites along shopping centers or other places where you don't necessarily get the best cell phone coverage but you have a lot of density of traffic. So they'll put in a small cell site just to cover that limited area in there. And it works. It's commonly done.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: To be clear, it wouldn't be something inside the building, it would be external to the building. So if it was something that happened to the building, fire or something like that, you would still get cell phone coverage at the school?

DR. EISENSTEIN: That would be my view of it. It would be a small cell site. It would be external to the building and not dependent on the building.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Going back to this, the notification of the school that the application of the antenna had potentially changed to 80 feet. This seems to be the key point.

Tom and Alf, you both said yes, that's an

1 issue, I think? to let it fester. stop me. That's fine. weakness. Spelker."

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: You were about to say something before. Mr. Simon said --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It is, but I may want

MR. SIMON: My neurologist thanks you.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I mean, if I misheard

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I think it's a

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I was going to say
I wouldn't mind hearing back again one more time that e-mail from the Superintendent. Is that possible?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could we hear Dr. Spelker's e-mail back? Who had that, was that you, Mr. Simon? Can you read that again?

MR. SIMON: Yes. This is an e-mail from Dr. Spelker to Diane Enright dated Tuesday, May 28, 2019. "Our Board has decided not to pursue this proposal any further. We appreciate you presenting to our Facilities and Finance Committee, but the Board was concerned with possible safety issues and the height and footprint that the site would require. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. Matthew

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: It said safety and?

MR. SIMON: "Was concerned with possible safety issues and the height and footprint that the site would require."

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Thank you. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: So you have the
school, right. The school backs up to, abuts to, next to other residential homes that are within the national state and limits of the New Vernon Historical District.

So do I think that in the wooded area would it look a little bit better? Probably. But again you'd have -- my feeling is when you read, you know, these Land Use books that we pay people to put together for us and give us guidance specifically to this, it says a lot of -- it's very much against it.

So we're going through obviously the positive and negative criteria, but it's definitely going to, in my opinion, going to have to be very convincing.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What is against what? What are you saying?

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: I feel that there are points along the Redevelopment Plan, as well as some of the Land Use Telecommunications sections, that
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CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Agreed.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's why I say it's a weakness.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. What else?
We're on the negative criteria. Identify the public interest. I think everyone here wants to see this tower go up so wouldn't that be the public interest? (Laughter.)

Steve, what is the public interest?
MR. MLENAK: You've seen the gap, and you've seen the exhibit that shows what various frequencies the tower at 80 feet would fill in that gap. Not all gaps are equal, though. You have to look to see what's in there and what the tower's going to fill. One acre of gap of wooded land is different than the highway and a heavily residential area and commercial areas.

Clearly, you're also going to have to consider what the public interest was when it was proposed at 120 feet, and how that is diminished at 80 feet. And the key difference there obviously is less height to be at the school. So you have to identify what exactly would this tower do to certain public interest in terms of identify the public interest. And then later we use that same interest in balancing

1 against the negative.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That gets back to the
fascinating point that George made last time, for all this discussion about how critical it is that we have cell phone service up at the school, where is the School Board putting their hand up saying please put a tower in my backyard so I can have cell service. Right.

You just have to question -- I believe Chief Heller, and it's logical that you would want to have cell phone service there, but with that said where was the school saying please put it there? Right. I mean, their answer was the opposite. It was nope, don't want it at 120 because it's too high. Their answer was not, hey --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: But they're also not here saying we need it.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They're not saying either.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: We need it -- we
don't want it on our property but we need it. They haven't said this.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Detrimental
effects. We talked about this ad nauseam. The visual
we talked about last time and I think that's where got
hung up on. I think that's what led us to this 80 -foot proposal.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: It's out of character. Its unexpected.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Reasonable conditions.
Can they reduce the detrimental effects which led us to 80 feet?

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I have one thing that has come up in today's -- especially in today's testimony. Yes, they have -- the Applicant has reduced said we'll build at 80 feet. The piece that we have also talked about a lot but that has not been presented is that the Township has not, you know, we have heard -- Steve read from the lease that said, you know, that as far as the lease is concerned they want collocation, and they have, you know, a much higher height than we're actually going with. We have not heard from the township to say that, yes, we agree with the Board -we agree with the Applicant and we will limit what we are leasing to 80 feet. And so that leaves us open, and just some of the concerns that we have heard is that, oh, well, they can, you know, Verizon can come in, they can build their tower. It will be 80 feet tall, and then the next thing we see is another Applicant comes in and immediately the tower and the
pad are larger. I won't get into whether it's 10 feet, 20 feet, but its larger. And we have said, well, the answer -- the only thing you can do to protect against that is have the Township say, okay, we agree 80 feet is the end of the line. So that's my concern is we sort of got, we got 80 feet but we haven't sort of locked it in. We have both impacted parties haven't said, yes, we with agreed to that.

MR. MLENAK: That's correct. If the Board was so inclined to grant this with an approval with a condition that they make best efforts or commercially reasonable effort to get the lease amended to cap the height. What was discussed by Mr. Simon tonight and what we talked about before is correct, that that is an agreement between two parties. And they were to fulfill their obligation by making the effort to get an amendment but five years from now --

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I understand that, yeah, we can't make it forever, but the lease isn't forever either. But you say that Verizon can make the best effort to get the Township to agree to it. Can we make it a condition that this variance requires that they get that agreement? That the lease be revised to 80 feet?

MR. MLENAK: I don't believe that would be
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considered a reasonable condition to require an amendment to a private contract.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Okay. Thank you.
So Steve, I'll just weigh on this. I have a list of points which are a must for me. That's one of them. It's got to ironclad 80 feet. I understand all those points, but there has to be a way.

And this is not the only thing, but this is one of the top ones. There's got to be huge odds in favor of not extending past 80 feet. It's a must, otherwise no.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there a way to assure that then?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It can't -- you know, commercially reasonable not even close. It means hardly nothing anymore. It's got to be with real teeth one way or another.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let's just talk that out then. What would have real teeth? How could --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Why couldn't we -what you were saying I understand is --

MR. MLENAK: Let's say we could require that. There's nothing we can require that they don't change it back.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There's nothing to require that they come back to the Board, a different Board and the Board approves it. What's the difference? They're elected.

MR. MLENAK: That would be contractually between those two parties not with us, and then they can amend that.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What I'm saying is, yes, you're saying that the future Township Committee or same Township can change their mind or change the lease, there's no question about that. My point is if they come back to this Board this Board could also change its mind, it's a different Board, and approve an extension. Yes, there's no public hearing and it would be much better to come back to the Board and they'll still have a risk to change in the future.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could we ask the Applicants if you would be willing to agree?

MR. MLENAK: If that's what he proposes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I don't know how many Boards Members feel this way, but would you be amenable to place a condition on the approval that the tower height does not exceed 80 feet? I feel like we talked about this before.

Why not? Mr. Simon, I would love to know
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would be -- and what is it, it's 20 percent? This gets back to the same question. It's a 20 percent increase.

MR. MLENAK: You're talking 20 feet.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So you would need the
Applicant to go back and revise it to 60 feet knowing that they by right can go up to 80 and that's how -- is that right? Is that the only way to do it?

MR. MLENAK: That's not available here.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If the Applicant said he wanted a 60 -foot tower it could be done.

MR. MLENAK: That's a whole new application 60 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Why is 80 feet?
MR. MLENAK: No, they did go back. We had summations since November. It's now May.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You didn't mean a new application, you meant a new condition for approval.

MR. SCHNEIDER: If there were five affirmative votes to approve the application -- sorry. If there were five affirmative votes to approve the application the Applicant would be willing as a condition of that approval to go to the governing body and ask them whether they would amend it to limit the height to 80 feet. I can't do anything more than that.

MR. MLENAK: Isn't that what we already had
what's going on inside your mind. Is that a crazy question?

MR. MLENAK: I think that would be a condition that runs afoul of the Federal law.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. It runs afoul of
the Federal law. So I'm not going to ask you. All right. So there you go, we can't do it without running afoul of the Federal law.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I look at this as this is not our problem to solve. It's somebody else's problem to solve, but it's a very clear point. This is clearly a very tough situation. There's reasons to have the coverage. This is not a great location. It can't be more than 80 feet.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: It is $10: 30$. We have to at least say on the record that you're agreeing to go past 10:30.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We all agree to go past 10:30.

UNIDENTIFIED PUBLIC VOICE: Can you repeat that?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We're going to continue on to past 10:30, unless you guys want to come back next month?

So how practically can one do that? It
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on the table?
MR. SCHNEIDER: Well --
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: We already had that on the table.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. But you just asked me whether I'd be willing to do that.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. We were going down -- I think Alf said he would like to be ironclad the height never exceeds 80 feet. That was his ask. Then we sort of walked through how one could accomplish that. The first thing was your consent to using commercially reasonable terms to go get the lease amended. It was not satisfactory in Alf's view. So then I just started down the path of, well, what would make it ironclad? And just knowing that you could by right extend the tower 20 feet --

MR. SCHNEIDER: I could only agree to that condition if the governing body imposed that condition.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What condition?
MR. SCHNEIDER: That it would not be extended past 80 feet, which I'm willing to do.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Understood. So there you have it, I think.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I don't have it.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, you have your

1 answer. the future. know what -collocate. that. that? wants it.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It depends what the text says, I'll tell you right now.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I disagree with Mr. Simon and the Board. I don't think that -- the Township can impose an appropriate restriction binding in perpetuity not to extend the height of the tower.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think the discussion was, yes, we agree the Township Committee could do that, but then the Township Committee could change in

MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't agree with that.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You think you can put an agreement in place that could never be changed?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They are elected. We do vote, so it could --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Why couldn't a future
Township Committee have an another vote and say, you

MR. MLENAK: They can always amend.
MR. SIMON: I've been part of any number of those. Not to mention whether another carrier comes in and says, hey, you know, Federal law, state law, I'm entitled -- it's public property, I'm entitled to
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make the application to the appropriate Township
Committee or Board. I can't do anything more than

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Then why is it we can't see an amendment to the lease to that effect as part of this application?

MR. MLENAK: The Applicant hasn't submitted it as part of the record to date.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's not exactly the answer to my question.

MR. MLENAK: Then I don't understand.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So why can't we see -- why can't they go off and get this agreement done so we see it in writing, we see the lease modification? How hard is that?

MR. MLENAK: So reserve vote until you see

UNIDENTIFIED PUBLIC VOICE: No. Nobody

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Guys, please.
BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I don't understand why it can't be a condition of approval that the lease is revised, not best efforts or anything like that, that the lease is revised and both parties to the lease agree that it will never go past 80 feet, granted

MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't see it any different than a deed restriction or anything of the like. But I'm suggesting that it can be binding. I'm also suggesting that I would do that. So if you're asking me to then to guarantee you something that I can't guarantee you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know you can't. I was just recognizing the fact that there's no way that any Board or even this body could put something in place in perpetuity.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: But could the condition be that the Applicant makes a best effort to limit the tower height to 80 feet?

MR. MLENAK: Well, that's what's on the table.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: But you still have the FCC. The FCC still has the ability to go another 20 feet.

MR. MLENAK: No. If the lease --
MR. SCHNEIDER: How about this. The
Applicant will agree as a condition of approval to approach the governing body to obtain their consent if the tower shall not exceed a height of 80 or 86 feet, whatever height you want to use as the base mark. And in the event anybody requires relief from that they
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some -- I don't see why we can't --
MR. MLENAK: What I'm hearing part of the issue is not that, but the other end which is it can always be changed.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I didn't hear you, Steve.
MR. MLENAK: It could always be amended
back. I don't know how a private agreement, and you can tell -- I'm open. I don't know how a private agreement between Verizon and the town can instill this Board as some third-party beneficiary that gets rights to detail a future amendment.

MR. BOYAN: Steven, though, it's a
condition of approval that it's amended. And then if at some subsequent date it's amended back then the conditions of approval haven't been satisfied, therefore they don't have the " D " Variance, right?

MR. MLENAK: Well, I would view it more as when the town ultimately says no they didn't.

BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You're right. I totally agree with that. But in that scenario, though, I just laid out if it's in there as a condition of approval and that condition is no longer met then the condition is no longer enforced.

MR. MLENAK: I don't know --
BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Alf, does that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Yes. It sounds like we get what we want.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So what would that condition read?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I don't know. We
would have to work on it.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, in attorney
language, but you're saying you would want the Applicant -- put it in your words. What would you want the Applicant to do?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So I might as well tell you all of my things. I'm not a hundred percent no, but this is one that's a must. This has to be -this risk might have to control.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The right risk?
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The right risk.
Change right risk. Eighty, whatever type of tower it is.

Secondly the setback. I'm a no at 66 , period. It's got to be -- I do not believe that whether it's the town or Verizon or whoever has worked hard enough to get that additional setback. And I think we should -- if the Board were to go ahead with
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BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Do you have a number in mind, Alf?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Yes, 78. Minimum.
Because that's close to their property line. They said
they could do it. They said maybe 13 feet they could do if they could figure out how to mount the pole. And it's close to 80 feet. It's like a minimum.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. What else have you got on your list?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The landscaping is
just pathetic. So if you look at the pictures of this property, even the cost of this, look at the picture from the O'Donnell property particularly, it's horrible. Yes, of course, this is fully aware of the composition of the cell tower itself. There's no question about that. But that's one of the neighbor views. Landscaping is relatively cheap. They can do a lot more to try to shield this DPW site.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So you want the -- I think they proposed 5 and 6 foot.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I don't know. The problem with this, I'm not even close to a professional landscaping and I would have to fall back on Paul to be aggressive with the landscaping issue to work very hard to shield as much as possible.
this, and this is my opinion, is that we should require a rear setback. Particularly the worst one, which is to the O'Donnell property 66.3 . The good faith this, good faith that --

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that an up or down issue for you the setback?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Yes. Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So let's figure out right now. Mr. Schneider, will you talk about this?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well, let me just say one more thing. If you look at that shed, I mean, this is a shed for recycling, for dumpsters. It is not high quality. It doesn't look expensive. Yes, I'm not an engineer. Yes, I don't know. But they have to go spend some money to extend that pad in there so they can get that tower further away. They should absolutely do it. And I do not believe that they've tried hard enough.

MR. MLENAK: Was this the issue that we heard testimony with respect to the geotech soil issues?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Yes. But there's another way to do that. It's a little more traditional, but they'd have to eat into that recycling facility.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Didn't we discuss that or is that another Applicant, Paul's review?

MR. MLENAK: Mr. Schneider, I believe, correct me if I misplace your words, had agreed to a condition to work on a landscaping plan subject to Paul's review and approval.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But this has to be --
MR. MLENAK: And I think what you said was to shield all the ground equipment; is that correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: That is correct. And I also offered to make a reasonable contribution to the Shade Tree Commission, for the purpose of if it was appropriate the Shade Tree Commission could do additional plantings off-site.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That bar is too low.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, I said I would agree to --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: No. I'm talking about the language. This always go in. This is like standard stuff. And this site, because of this tower, it is outrageous in many ways. What we do with setbacks with core residential properties and we tortured hat othere yy hic othere night for f feet. A
 than we typically do. What that is, Id have to say
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | would have to be up to Paul, but it wouldn't be the | 1 | at the 66.3 is the O'Donnell property. |
| 2 | standard plants and a few evergreens and things like | 2 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is it possible for you |
| 3 | that. | 3 | to move the tower further from the O'Donnell property? |
| 4 | BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Can I ask a question | 4 | You've told us before, but I'll ask you again. |
| 5 | that's related to this? One of the things that is | 5 | MR. SCHNEIDER: No. But I could put the |
| 6 | looked at instead of landscaping, because you end up | 6 | equipment -- if the Township made the shed available I |
| 7 | with a problem when the landscaping is done. What | 7 | can put the equipment in the shed. |
| 8 | about actually extending the DPW shed in a manner such | 8 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You guys should just |
| 9 | that the equipment was actually inside the shed as | 9 | talk directly. |
| 10 | opposed to outside screened by landscaping. So in | 10 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's the tower, it |
| 11 | other words, put an addition -- put a shed addition on | 11 | isn't me. |
| 12 | the shed. Would that be -- how would that be as a | 12 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Not at this point. |
| 13 | screen as opposed to saying we're putting the | 13 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So what I'm hearing |
| 14 | landscaping up, basically putting inside, you know, | 14 | from Alf, because he's a no with that answer. Just |
| 15 | instead of landscaping, sorry, the recycling bin but | 15 | keeping track. |
| 16 | far enough so the stuff could go inside. | 16 | And ladies and gentlemen we're going to |
| 17 | MR. MLENAK: That's certainly going to be a | 17 | vote tonight. I should have said earlier, whatever the |
| 18 | new application because that's a new improvement. | 18 | answer is, if you're really sad or really happy or |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We have spoken about | 19 | somewhere in between don't do it here. Go home, okay? |
| 20 | it. I'll ask again. So one of Alf's concerns, and | 20 | We're going to clear the room out. Don't hang out in |
| 21 | perhaps other people's concerns is the side-yard | 21 | the parking lot. Go home. You can celebrate or cry at |
| 22 | setback. Is it possible for you to move the tower any | 22 | home, okay? |
| 23 | further away from the O'Donnell property, the Conine | 23 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: So we're voting |
| 24 | property or both? | 24 | tonight? |
| 25 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well, the I'm looking | 25 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I would like to get a |
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| 1 | vote. | 1 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The stealth tree looks |
| 2 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I want to be done | 2 | like a fake tree. It looks worse than -- it you're |
| 3 | with this. | 3 | going to do this the tree looks worse. It sticks out |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. What else? | 4 | bigger. It doesn't look like a tree. And I agree with |
| 5 | MR. MLENAK: We were going to go back to | 5 | you, there's some pretty ones but at the end they don't |
| 6 | voting in order. You were in the middle of detrimental | 6 | look like trees. |
| 7 | effect. | 7 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I think they're |
| 8 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Alf, those are | 8 | both hideous. And I think the tree is less hideous. |
| 9 | your thoughts? | 9 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone have a strong |
| 10 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Yes. | 10 | view one way other another, the tree versus the pole? |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Detrimental effects, I | 11 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Why do you think |
| 12 | think is the height is what we identified. We | 12 | the tree is less hideous? |
| 13 | identified noise. They offered up conditions. Like | 13 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Because otherwise |
| 14 | noise-related generator. Right. They're going to do | 14 | it looks like this tall monolith with no purpose. I |
| 15 | it on Tuesdays at noon or something to that effect; | 15 | mean, you know what it is. It's aesthetics, so it is |
| 16 | right? | 16 | what it is. |
| 17 | MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. | 17 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If we were to go this |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And to that point, do | 18 | path, pole or a tree? |
| 19 | you have a list of all these conditions we spoke about | 19 | BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Eighty feet is what |
| 20 | over the course of these three years, Steve? | 20 | I like. |
| 21 | MR. MLENAK: I may just have that. So we | 21 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Elizabeth? |
| 22 | have -- subject to language that we may have to | 22 | BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: This is not my vote, |
| 23 | discuss. The very first thing on my list to discuss is | 23 | but I would say a flagpole. |
| 24 | because I've heard this agreement before, is stealth | 24 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So let me ask you by |
| 25 | tree versus flagpole. | 25 | the way, what I was going to say earlier by the way, |

1 you guys know how this works, voting tonight are Tom,
2 Alf, me, Aric, you, Elizabeth, Donato. Sorry, George.
MR. BOYAN: That's quite all right.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They need five votes to get an approval here. So three or more Nos is a no. Donato, what do you say about pole versus tree? If you were to say yes, say you had to say yes to one of them.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Definitely not a tree. But I don't even know why we're discussing that if we haven't even voted.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, fine. So detrimental effects, we talked about it. Can we impose reasonable conditions, that's what we're talking about the 80 feet. Final step, let's get there right now.

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It's not just the 80 feet. I mean, Alf identified other items. And I don't disagree with Alf. I actually agree and emphasize. The setback is a huge issue.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Are you a no if you don't get the setback?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you asking me to vote right now?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, don't answer, whatever, but Alf said if the setback does not increase --
right, and there's one method which gets involved with the type of soil and the slate and all that kind of stuff, shale, whatever. The other method is extending the pad. The reason I can't extend the pad is because that nasty old shed is there.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, what I was going to say, if I can finish, I think it's the Township that's saying no, put it here and that's it. I think if you ask -- if Mr. Schneider had his right he'd put it wherever you wanted to.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That may be, but extending the pad is not moving the pole.

MR. MLENAK: That shed is not in the lease area, right?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No.
MR. MLENAK: I don't know why we're even -CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't believe that Mr. Schneider has any ability whatsoever to move it from what's being proposed.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I think if they will put in just for the base to extend the base and leave the shed because of the money.

MR. MLENAK: I don't know if it's a question of money. I think it's a question of bidding too. When the Applicant was asked he said no, so

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I just think that there hasn't been a big enough effort to increase the setback. Whether it's just the pole next to the shed, or whether the Town gets involved to actually use the shed's footprint to increase that setback. We're going around and around here in circles.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I'm trying to get to the end here and I think I know where this going.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You know what, I feel
like the Board is -- somehow we're given to make this work in this small section part of the property. We have this big other section of industrial property and that's in a way why I think we should push back on the setback and say you make it work.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's not our problem.
Why is it our problem? Seventy-eight is like the bare minimum. It should be a hundred.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm with you, and we have discussed this many times. We have asked the Applicant many times. And I believe the Applicant, I believe, and I don't see why the Applicant would care where on the property it goes.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Because Mike, I remember from his testimony that there's two methods,
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rather than a condition --
BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: At some point
there's so many conditions that this thing looks entirely different than what we have been seeing for the past three years. So it leaves me very uncomfortable to vote on something this big and this important with all these floating conditions and what ifs and maybes in the air.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Tell you what.
I think we got our answer. Someone want to make a motion?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: One last question.
So the aspect of suitable site could also potentially mean, did they look at alternate sites that could be within the site as well, right? It doesn't necessarily need to be a different block and lot?

MR. MLENAK: Alternate sites.
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Alternate sites.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Alf, can I ask you to make a motion?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What I would do probably is change these -- I would make it a condition to get that setback.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Schneider, are you willing to concede -- what am I asking -- would you --

1 what's he going to do, is he going say he'll go back
2 and ask the DPW to move it?
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I don't know what they're going to do. They can figure it out. They can go back to their engineer. They cannot go back to their engineer.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I hear you. Mr. Schneider --

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: 66.3 is a no for me. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Schneider, have you asked the Township if you can move the pole to a different location?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We're not willing to do that after four years. I can't tell you what's going to happen in the future.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. I would
like to vote tonight.
MR. SCHNEIDER: I agree. So I think
someone should make a motion.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Do you want to make a motion?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: No.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anyone want to make a
motion? The motion could be that we deny this.
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I make a motion
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MR. MLENAK: There was a condition that the cable bridge --

MR. SCHNEIDER: Flagpole, Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Flagless flagpole.
MR. MLENAK: That the height of the cable bridge would be reduced to 8 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. That's part of my motion.

MR. MLENAK: That the lease -- that the
applicant make good-faith and commercially reasonable efforts to have the lease amended to 80 feet.

That there are new landscaping plans that is reviewed by and approved by the Township Engineer and Planner.

That a geotechnical analysis of the property be conducted and provided to the Township Engineer for review and if such conditions permit that the Applicant relocate the facility as close as possible to the existing recycling shed to increase the setback from adjacent residential lots.

And I believe there's also the condition that was menioned, whicic 1 dont hare on this list earlier, about the generator maintenance.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Generator would be run Tuesdays at Noon?
that we vote on it. (Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Let's go
this way. Does anyone want to make a motion? You want me to make a motion? Vote whichever way you want.

I vote we approve this with the conditions stipulated.

MR. ROSENBAUM: Do you want a read out of those conditions?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does the person who seconded have to vote yes for the motion.

SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Does anybody second it?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I will second it.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We need a list of conditions, no?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I do want to get the conditions.

MR. MLENAK: Well, I can read out what I've been writing throughout out the process, but of course the person making the motion you're making a motion on your condition. What I've written down is stealth tree, but I hear monopole.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So my motion is a pole at 80 feet.
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MR. SCHNEIDER: Tuesday afternoons.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The pole would be painted a color as to be -- we talked about this -gray?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Sky gray.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Somebody testified to
some color during the course of the hearings.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Mr. Masters.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Masters. How about
Mr. Fox gets to pick the color. So as to reduce the -so as to make it as unnoticeable as possible. I don't think all this matters, but -- so anyway, these are all conditions, okay?

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What about the -- how
are you going to deal that 80 -foot?
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Steve had in there that
they're going to do best-faith commercially
reasonable -- can you re-read that condition, please?
MR. MLENAK: Applicant should make good-faith and commercially reasonable efforts to have the lease amended to limit the total height of the tower to 80 feet.

And then I can include that the amended
lease or those efforts undertaken be provided to me for review prior to permit.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: How can you make it stronger?

MR. MLENAK: I'm open to suggestions.
BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I don't know what's legal.

MR. MLENAK: I asked Mr. Schneider if he had suggestions. I don't see how you can put the Board into that two-party disagreement as a third-party beneficiary, which is what would be required to prevent future amendments.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Even if they didn't require future amendment can we require to see the amendment -- actually see the amendment as part of the condition of approval. Yes, we don't have protection against the change in the future, but at least you see that as it gets done as part of the agreement.

Mr. MLENAK: Mr. Schneider do you have a position as to whether or not --

MR. SCHNEIDER: I was having trouble hearing. Im sorry.

MR. MLENAK: Mr. Newlin asked if the condition instead of being in good faith and commercially reasonable efforts be an add on, an objective requirement that the lease be amended as a condition.

MR. MLENAK: I don't think that's the only issue, though, on the table.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think there's a lot of other issues, which is why I don't think it matters what these conditions are, to be completely honest.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I had three. That's one of them. Setback was the other. And then I think enhanced language on the landscaping, which doesn't seem what the setback is.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Guys, let's move it along. Let's do a show of hands, all right. This is not the official vote. All right. But you've got to give your answer here.

Based on what we've seen, would you vote no to this application? One No. Two Nos. Three Nos. Four Nos.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: On the setbacks.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So that's enough. So that's why I'm going through this quickly, because those conditions are irrelevant. What can we change, Donato -- Tom, what can we change or what can the Applicant change to get you to a yes?

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: The reason for my -- the reasons for me, there's a major loose end, we talked about it all night, is the fact that there's

MR. SCHNEIDER: What happens if the governing body doesn't agree?

MR. MLENAK: That's what Mr. Newlin's asking.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, commercially
reasonable efforts to me is not strong enough. It
should be best efforts. No. I think we ought to have this. I think it's crucial.

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I agree that the
very -- that as a minimum that the approval is conditional that the lease be amended to limit it to 80 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Isn't it a violation of
Federal law to put conditions on towers be only
80 feet? So again, in fact, are we not violating
Federal law by requiring that there's a lease term?
MR. MLENAK: I don't believe that's the
case.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How is that possible?
MR. MLENAK: If you have a condition that
you're waiving your rights under that Federal law that would be a violation.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So this is your condition, guys. So you tell me what you want it to read.
communication out there between Mr. Spelker, the Board
of Education, that lays out specifically height
and size. So that's -- that is an open ended --
BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: So Tom, you think
the Applicant didn't evaluate other sites? That's your point and that's why --

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: I think that the site is still on the table until it's closed.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: It's a whole new height and size.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Just going based
on this document. I just want to be clear. Based on
this document you feel the Applicant hasn't satisfied
its obligations to look at alternate sites and that's
why you would be a no?
BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: I think that the applicant has -- I think that based on the new testimony that we have heard since November that the Applicant has not tied up any loose ends with the alternate sites. I think the only alternate site that we would all consider based on prior testimony would have been the back of the school. So that' - - that's a major point.

Also, too, the language in the Land Use

1 Law, but again, I think that if the Board of Ed was
2 approached in an email, meeting you can't -- I can't
3 keep -- I can't vote on something that I don't think is 4 complete.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: So regardless of all the other conditions that Alf brought up, in your mind -- and I'm not trying to push anything, I'm just trying to understand.

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: No. I appreciate that. I think that landscaping, you know, you're not going to put in 120 -foot trees, 20 of them in whatever.

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Stack them on top.
BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Right. There you go.

In regards to, you know, the Applicant and the setback, that's something that sounds to me based on the conservation it would be very difficult. If we were to do something about it then it could easily be changed again. So it's just something that if we were to make a requirement of the change it could be changed back. So I'm not really --

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: So for you the line in the sand is --

BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: For me it's just a lose end on the school.
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concerned about.
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Yeah. It just
encroaches -- the side-yard setback is a big no for me.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: The height, of course, but just dropping it down 20, 30 feet that can go back up 20 feet is not enough, because I think when you are able to put it into the interior of the site it mitigates it at an exponential rate for me, as evidenced by the pole that's in the middle of the site.

I've said this before, and I don't think
there has been a big enough effort by the town to actually work with us -- work with us on this. It's getting late, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes, it is.
BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: And then we're entrusting them to change the lease according to the issue that --

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Also there's other factors here too. There is these what ifs. There's the Spelker issue. Why wouldn't we write an e-mail or make a phone call? It's a different application to make, even if it's just an amended one.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's fair. I think that's one of the points.

MR. MLENAK: I just don't recall, because people -- you made a motion, Mr. Chairman. I don't recall if there was a second.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There was. Aric seconded.

MR. MLENAK: There should be a vote.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I agree. I want to see -- how many motions have I made where people start pointing to me discussing after I make the motion? Every time, right?

Alf -- I know why, and there's nothing we can do as we sit here tonight to fix what Alf wants to fix.

Who else said no down there? Elizabeth, is there something that the Applicant can fix as we sit here tonight?

BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: No.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Donato, is there something the Applicant can do as we sit here tonight?

BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I don't want to repeat myself from the last time we had the straw poll, but it's not like I'm objecting to the site. I'm not objecting to the DPW as the site, I just don't like where it is on the DPW.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The setback you're
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BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: That's a huge point.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This guy needed to be
reached out to when this thing changed to 80 feet
because this was -- I shouldn't say this guy -- the
Board of Ed should have been reached out to.
Let's just keep moving. Hugh, is there anything that's going to change?

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Again, the height.
If we have to get the Mayor to come in and testify the Township will limit the height to 80 feet that's what we have to do.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So your thing is you want to lock it to 80 feet so it can never be changed?

BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough. All right. So listen, I'm going to make a motion. We have to make a motion.

Does anybody want to make a motion along the lines of what you all want to do, or do you want me to make a motion and you can vote no to? All right. I'm going to make a motion. If you don't want this tower you're going to vote no to this motion.

I move we approve it with the conditions listed by Steve. Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'll second that.

|  | Page 173 |  | Page 174 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Lori, would you call | 1 | Eisenstein, thank you. |
| 2 | the roll? | 2 | DR. EISENSTEIN: Thank you very much. |
| 3 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. Ms. Sovolos? | 3 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And Paul, McKinley and |
| 4 | BOARD MEMBER SOVOLOS: No. | 4 | everyone. We appreciate it. |
| 5 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Maselli? | 5 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: And the public at |
| 6 | BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. | 6 | large. |
| 7 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Symonds? | 7 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Is there |
| 8 | BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: No. | 8 | any other business? All right. We're adjourned. |
| 9 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Newlin? | 9 | (Whereupon, the hearing on this application |
| 10 | BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: No. | 10 | concludes at 11:10 p.m.) |
| 11 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio? | 11 |  |
| 12 | BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: No as well. | 12 |  |
| 13 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Rosenbaum? | 13 |  |
| 14 | BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. | 14 |  |
| 15 | SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Chairman Flanagan? | 15 |  |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. All right. So | 16 |  |
| 17 | the application is denied. Mr. Schneider, I appreciate | 17 |  |
| 18 | all the time you've spent. I appreciate your | 18 |  |
| 19 | professionalism with us. Mr. Simon, likewise. And I | 19 |  |
| 20 | do like you. I tease you, but thank you. | 20 |  |
| 21 | Next steps I don't know, but Ill leave | 21 |  |
| 22 | that for you Steve, and Steve thank you. | 22 |  |
| 23 | MR. MLENAK: Ill prepare a Resolution. | 23 |  |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You'll get the | 24 |  |
| 25 | Resolution written up, and that's all we have. And Dr. | 25 |  |
|  | Page 175 |  |  |
| 1 | CERTIFICATE |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |
| 4 | I, IRIS LA ROSA, a Notary Public and |  |  |
| 5 | Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of New |  |  |
| 6 | Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true |  |  |
| 7 | and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken |  |  |
| 8 | stenographically by and before me at the time, place, |  |  |
| 9 | and on the date hereinbefore set forth. |  |  |
| 10 | I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a |  |  |
| 11 | relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any |  |  |
| 12 | of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a |  |  |
| 13 | relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and |  |  |
| 14 | That I am not financially interested in the action. |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |
| 19 | IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR |  |  |
| 20 | Certificate No. 30XI 00162800 |  |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |
| 23 | Dated: |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |
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| Wintertime | 149:8 151:24 | 171:2 | 10-by-20-foot | 180-foot 41:9 |
| 23:16 36:20 wireless 1:5 5:12 | $152: 5158: 11$ 158.14171 .13 | $171: 2$ year 17:21 91:20 | $65: 9$ | 1800s 84:17,23 |
| wireless 1:5 5:12 | 158:14 171:13 | year 17:21 91:20 96:23 99:8,9 | 10-foot 89:10 | 186-foot 32:8 |
| 12:14 37:10 | 171:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 23 \text { 99:8,9 } \\ & \text { 102:21 113:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 : 3 0} 142: 15,17$ | 190-foot 41:9 |
| 111:14,17,19 | worked 149:23 | 102:21 113:12 years 5:4 22:4 | $142: 19,23$ | 1925 117:3 |
| 117:8 122:16 | workers 13:18 | years 5:4 22:4 28:24 29:6,20 | 100 3:22 119:13 | 1931 117:3 |
| withstanding | working 85:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 24 \text { 29:6,20 } \\ & 36: 837: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $102 \text { 3:23 }$ | 1994 91:3 |
| 54:15 67:17 | 96:25 105:3 | $44: 1462: 19$ | 104 64:24 |  |
| witness 3:2 | works 41:12 | $79: 2 \text { 80:9,12 }$ | 10th 4:2 22:12 | $\frac{2}{290 \cdot 2}$ |
| 15:16 17:12 | 64:13 132:11 | 79:2 80:9,12 | 11:10 174:10 | 290:2 |
| 41:25 42:15,18 | 157:1 | 81:15 82:10 | $\mathbf{1 1 0} 21: 22$ | 2,500-square |
| 43:5,24 44:7 | worse 41:20 | $83: 2484: 1$ $85 \cdot 1,286 \cdot 1,4$ | $119.5 \text { 10:7 }$ | 69:13 |
| 44:17 45:10 | 80:15 123:6 | $85: 1,2$ 86:1,4 $89 \cdot 23$ 91:19 | $12 \text { 20:17 }$ | $2032: 17$ 64:25 |
| 46:4,12 47:3 | 156:2,3 | 89:23 91:19 |  | 65:23 102:19 |
| 47:13,21 48:3 | worst 150:2 | 94:7 97:1,6 |  | 102:24 104:15 |
| 48:9,15,21 | worth 118:20,23 | 98:5,6 99:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 2587: 14 \\ & 93: 15,17 \end{aligned}$ | 109:19 139:2 |
| 49:3,21 50:1,8 | 121:10 | 101:1,22 |  | 143:1,2,3 |
| 50:16 51:4,13 | wouldn't 66:21 | 102:19,24 |  | 144:16 146:18 |
| 62:7 65:6 66:5 | 81:2 127:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 109: 24,24 \\ & \text { 135:23 139:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 122:12 136:20 $137: 14$ | 169:11 171:6,7 |


| 20-87:4,5 89:7 | 333 111:22 | 7:00 1:9 | 18:15 22:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 62:18 63:2 | 35 85:1 97:1 | 7:05 6:4 | 34:21 35:3 |
| 117:6 133:19 | 106:8 | 70 93:19 109:8 | 38:15 39:2,11 |
| 2020 23:14 | 35-124:19 | 700 128:6 | 41:6 53:19,23 |
| 25:23 |  | 75 102:20 | 54:18 74:4,13 |
| 2021 22:12 | 4 | 750-square | 74:16 104:18 |
| 121:3 | 4:30 97:22 | 26:18 | 105:18 106:10 |
| 2022 1:7 3:12 | 40 27:19 31:4 | 78 3:18 151:3 | 107:20,23 |
| 16:4 24:16 | 34:22 128:19 |  | 108:25 109:5 |
| 87:18 110:4 | 40-feet 87:15 | 8 | 110:19,24 |
| 20th-some-odd | 400 22:16 | 8 107:23 112:5 | 111:6 112:5,9 |
| 4:24 | 45 109:10 | 163:6 | 113:21 116:16 |
| $211: 8$ 104:15 | 4G 130:8 | 8-foot 39:3 | 118:7 120:22 |
| 2100 130:14 | 5 | 8.2 12:11 93:8 | 121:10 125:23 |
| 22 119:15 | $\frac{5}{521.16151 .20}$ | 8:30 59:23 | 126:18,20 |
| 22-plus 104:9 | $521: 16151: 20$ | 8:35 59:21,24 | 146:23 |
| 23 119:15 | 5-22:3 | 80 3:19 18:13 | 86-foot 22:25 |
| 24 119:15 | 5:30 8:13 | 39:10 67:16 | 27:9 29:21 |
| 24-inch 20:19 | 50-87:8 | 81:1 87:14 | 41:2 64:23 |
| 22:25 23:19 | 50-foot 124:19 | 93:16 105:24 | 73:14 86:19 |
| $2512: 518: 21$ | 125:4 128:20 | 119:10,13,19 | 87:7,23 88:1 |
| 91:19 112:6 | $5510: 1,5$ | 120:18,22 | 89:5 104:23 |
| 25.9 9:25 10:2,4 | 5821:21 | 126:17,20,20 | 107:17 118:10 |
| 10:7,12,18,19 | 58.1 12:12 | 126:21 130:13 | 120:13 126:5 |
| 12:2,6 | 5G 93:5,6,6,6,7 | 132:23 136:12 | 893:21 |
| 26 107:24 | 93:13,14 130:1 $130: 6$ | 136:20 138:7 |  |
| 26-foot 39:4 | 130:6 | 138:11,20,23 | 9 |
| 26th 121:2 | 6 | 139:4,6,24 | $912: 5112: 6$ |
| 28 62:18 68:20 |  | 140:6,10 $141: 23142 \cdot 14$ | 9:30 103:23 |
| 90:16 133:18 | $152: 23$ | 141:23 142:14 | 90-years 96:16 |
| 28th 3:12 16:4 | 6-foot 18:4 22:3 | 143:6,13,24 | $9081: 24$ $93.610 \cdot 5$ |
| 17:21 29.512 .1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { b-toot } 18: 422: 3 \\ & 37: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $144: 9,21$ $146: 13,23$ | $93.610: 5$ $973: 21$ |
| $29.512: 1$ $29.911: 24$ | 60 87:8,8 89:8 | 146:13,23 $147: 25151: 7$ | $973: 21$ $\mathbf{9 8 3} 32$ |
| 29.9 11:24 | 109:8 143:5,12 | 157:14,16 |  |
| 3 | 60-foot 143:10 | 162:25 163:11 |  |
| 3.0 80:8 | 62 123:12 | 164:22 166:12 |  |
| 30 19:21 103:4 | 63rd 78:14 | 166:15 172:3 |  |
| 171:6 | 64/95 3:17 | 172:10,13 |  |
| 30-by-60 26:24 | 642-4299 1:24 66149.21 | 80-120:13 |  |
| 37:11 69:16 | $66149: 21$ $\mathbf{6 6 . 3} 12.12150 .3$ | 80-foot 27:8 |  |
| 30-feet 87:4,5 | $66.312: 12150: 3$ | 75:10,13 106:2 |  |
| 89:7 | $154: 1161: 9$ $\mathbf{6 8 / 9 0 3}$ | 122:9 130:16 |  |
| 300 23:5,13 | 68/90 3:17 | 130:20 131:3 |  |
| 30th 23:13 24:16 | $693: 18$ | 138:1 164:15 |  |
| 30XI 175:20 | 69-feet 22:25 | 83 3:19 |  |
| 31st 15:6 26:13 | 24:6,10 | 85 3:20 |  |
| 39:25 | 7 | 863:20 13:1,25 |  |
| 32 64:20 96:2 | 73:3 | 14:8 16:22 |  |

