CLARK BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES FROM THE PUBLIC MEETING

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2012

A public meeting of the Clark Board of Adjustment was called to order at 8:06 p.m. by Chairman Steve Kaminsky. He asked all present to participate in a flag salute and moment of silence. He stated that meeting was being held under and pursuant to the Rules and Regulations of the Sunshine Law of the State of New Jersey.

This meeting is in compliance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" as adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by mailing the Annual Schedule of meetings to the Union County Local Source, Clark Patriot and Star Ledger, by posting such Annual Meeting Schedule on the bulletin board in Town Hall reserved for such announcements and the filing of said Notice with the Township Clerk of Clark. Formal action may be taken at this meeting.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Douglas Krok, Thomas Meade, John Passuth, John Tierney, John Caliguire, Patrick Campione and Chairman Steve Kaminsky

Board Members Absent: None

Also Present: Alternate Board Member Edward Ruth. Board Attorney Howard D. Spialter and Board Secretary; Janet Gentry

OLD BUSINESS

Minutes from the January 9, 2012 reorganization meeting were reviewed. John Passuth brought a motion to accept the minutes. Motion was seconded by Patrick Campione and carried unanimously by voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Calendar#4-11, T-Mobile Northeast LLC, 1202 Lake Avenue. Attorney for the applicant was Mr. John Edwards with the Law Firm of Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio.

Mr. Spialter stated that Mr. Caliguire has submitted certifications stating that he obtained and read the transcripts of the proceedings from the November 14th, 2011 and December 14th, 2011 public meetings on this matter. Mr. Spialter also stated that there is a full complement of the board here tonight together with the alternate. It is my understanding that everyone is fully up-to-date with all transcripts and proceedings and there is no one with any deficiency. Secretary agreed. Mr. Spialter mentioned that there was some issue between the Township and the Applicant in regard to making up or

satisfying an escrow deficiency. Janet, she alerted me of that by telephone today and I said that this matter is proceeding tonight and I have reason to question the applicant and handling and satisfying any outstanding escrow. Mr. Edwards: My office notified me this afternoon that \$10,000.00 was being requested and I heard that the request was sent to a different attorney's office, not our office. And another letter was sent on December 28th, 2011 and was addressed to T-Mobile's office in Parsippany, To Whom It May Concern, so I don't know if T-Mobile received that but it never made it back to us. In the future these types of notices have to be sent to our office and we can take care of it. I can't get \$10,000.00 this afternoon.

Chairman Kaminsky: At this point of the hearing we have heard final statements from Mr. Edwards and we heard all the comments from the public. We are looking for a motion on this application.

John Passuth brought a motion to approve Calendar #4-11. No second.

John Tierney brought a motion to deny the application. Motion was seconded by

John Caliguire. Vote: Krok: yes, Meade: yes, Passuth: no, Tierney: yes, Caliguire: yes,

Campione: yes, Kaminsky: yes. Application Denied

Commentary from Board Members on this application is on the attached transcript.

ADJOURNMENT

March 26, 2012 Dated

Douglas Krok brought a motion to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Patrick Campione and carried unanimously by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Taken and Transcribed by:

ν .

Certified Transcript
Available at Town Hall

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT TOWNSHIP OF CLARK

In the matter of:

Transcript

of

T-MOBILE NORTHEAST, LLC

1202 LAKE AVENUE

Proceedings

CLARK, NEW JERSEY

Monday, January 23, 2012 315 Westfield Avenue Clark, New Jersey Commencing at 8:05 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

STEVE KAMINSKY, Chairman EDWARD RUTH DOUGLAS KROK JOHN PASSUTH THOMAS MEADE JOHN TIERNEY PATRICK CAMPIONE JOHN CALIGUIRE

JANET GENTRY, Board Secretary

A P. P E A R A N C E S:

HOWARD D. SPIALTER, ESQUIRE Attorney for the Board

PRICE, MEESE, SHULMAN & D'ARMINIO BY: JOHN R. EDWARDS, ESQ. Attorneys for the Applicant

Precision Reporting Service Certified Shorthand Reporters 1178 Fairfield Road Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807 (908) 685-2227

Page 2 Page 4 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: At this point we'll 1 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Okay. At this point in 2 continue with calendar page 4-11, T-Mobile Northeast, 2 the hearing, we had heard the final statements from 3 3 Mr. Edwards, we've heard all comments from the public LLC. already, and at this point we'll be looking for a 4 4 MR. SPIALTER: I just want to advise, we 5 5 motion on this application. have certifications from John Caliguire attesting to 6 6 MR. SPIALTER: By the way, in speaking with the fact that he has listened to -- that he obtained 7 7 Janet earlier, just to make sure, she had a concern and read the transcripts of proceedings from the 8 that anything that board members -- especially to the 8 November 14 to December 14, 2011 hearings on this 9 9 far end of the room, to my right, in your speaking, you matter. I pass them over to Janet for filing. 10 want to make sure that everything is picked up by our 10 It's also my -- we have a full complement 11 of the board here tonight together, with an alternate. 11 microphones, in addition to the fact that we have a 12 12 court reporter here. So, I don't know if there's any It's my understanding from Janet that everyone is fully 13 13 test that you can do as we're proceeding, Janet, or if up to date with all transcripts and the proceedings and 14 14 you want any members who are going to speak to come there is no one with any deficiency. Is that correct, THE SECRETARY: Just so - especially at 15 15 Janet? 16 that end. We can't get them up at that end. 16 THE SECRETARY: That's right. MR. SPIALTER: It's also -- just for the 17 MR. SPIALTER: And these are the mics that 17 18 they're utilizing? 18 record -- and this is not to catch Mr. Edwards or BOARD MEMBER MEADE: Do you hear us, Janet? 19 anyone by surprise -- I understand there's some issue 19 THE SECRETARY: They're on. That's good. 20 20 between the township and the applicant with regard to 21 MR, SPIALTER: I have no idea what 21 making up or satisfying an escrow deficiency. I don't 22 22 microphone -know the status of it. I advised Janet -- she alerted CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: This is the microphone 23 23 me to that by telephone today. I said this matter is 24 24 proceeding tonight and I have no reason to question the for recording? BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: These are the mics 25 25 applicant handling and satisfying any outstanding Page 3 Page 5 1 1 for -escrow. 2 2 MR, SPIALTER: This is the one for Is that your understanding, Mr. Edwards? 3 MR, EDWARDS: Good evening. 3 recording? 4 4 THE SECRETARY: Yes. This is the only one MR. SPIALTER: I'm not suggesting there's 5 5 anything outstanding. I just know the question was you want to --6 raised to me, and I said what do we do about it? б MR. SPIALTER: So, these two are for 7 7 MR, EDWARDS: That's fine, approaching a recording? 8 THE SECRETARY: Those are recording. 8 proceeding like that. I with just want to clarify a 9 MR, SPIALTER: And there's nothing towards 9 little bit for the record, my office learned of this 10 10 that end. Do we have anymore wire? issue this afternoon, that \$10,000 is being requested. 11 THE SECRETARY: It's not long enough. 11 I had heard that originally the request for additional 12 MR. SPIALTER: She wants the escrow, information was sent to a different attorney's office, 12 13 Mr. Edwards. 13 not our office, and then another letter was sent dated 14 THE SECRETARY: I'll speak up. 14 December 28, 2011. I have a copy of that. It was just 15 MR. SPIALTER: Just remember to keep your 15 addressed to T-Mobile's office in Parsippany, "To whom 16 voices up, enunciate, just so -- just so we don't have 16 it may concern." 17 17 garbled language in this. So, I don't know if T-Mobile received that, 18 18 And I see we have a picture taker, I but it never made it back to us. I spoke to Mr. Liasa 19 believe, for one of the newspapers. I just wanted to 19 (ph) this afternoon. I said, please, in the future, 20 send these notices to our office so we can take care of 20 place on the record -- and I thank you for all of your 21 understanding -- I am not in uniform tonight, just 21 it, I said I can't get \$10,000 this afternoon. I don't having been released from the hospital to make sure I 22 have this much cash with me, but that we would attend 22 23 was here for the hearing. So, don't take a picture of 23 to it. 24 24 me. Thank you.

25

25

MR. SPIALTER: Thank you.

Having said that, as the chairman said,

we're looking for a motion and whatever comments board members wish to make on this application. CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Do we have a motion? BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: I'd like to make a motion to accept calendar 4-11. MR. SPIALTER: When you use the word "accept" --BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: I use the word MR. SPIALTER: You want to use the word "approve"? BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: One hundred percent. MR. SPIALTER: I want to make sure there's no question on the record. CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Do we have a second? We have no second on the motion. Do we have an alternate motion to be heard? BOARD MEMBER TIERNEY: I make a motion we

that on the street should be 6 decibels higher than neg 84 -- than neg 78, and Mr. Shidfar corrected himself and agreed with that at that time. That was one contradiction.

During that same testimony, we even had a Clark resident on page 98 of transcripts, Mr. Doug Ritter from Clark, stating that he's a T-Mobile user and doesn't have any trouble with calls in that coverage area you were claiming you had a gap.

Testimony on October 24, 2011, neg 84 decibels outside cars. So, you can have a negative 90 inside vehicle for reliable coverage, when all he talked about, Mr. Shidfar, prior to that was neg 84 decibel design for in-vehicle reliable coverage. So, that was the other contradiction that I had there.

On November 14th, Dr. Eisenstein also talked about cell sites and how the towers do not talk to one another. Mr. Shidfar strongly disagreed and said the cell sites talk to one another. He disagreed with Dr. Eisenstein. Later on, the next page of the testimony, 78 and 79, he -- Shidfar did state the towers do not talk with one another. He agreed with Dr. Eisenstein.

So, I just had so many different glaring figures and numbers throughout his whole testimony

Page 7

BOARD MEMBER MEADE: No. I have no comment
 I want to make at this time.
 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: All right. Doug?

BOARD MEMBER CALIGUIRE: I second.

Comments from the board? You want to start

motion to deny, John Caliguire has seconded the motion.

CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: John Tierney has the

CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY; All right. Doug?
MR. SPIALTER: Hold on, We have a

5 competing interest out here.

deny the application.

with the far right, Tom?

Okay.

Okay. Obviously, this is not a court, we're not going to threaten anyone with taking cellphones, but certainly, with the concerns about getting a proper audio, we don't want any competition.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry.

BOARD MEMBER KROK: Well, I will also be voting no tonight on this application, and my main reason was basically that a gap in coverage was not proven to me. Mr. Shidfar's testimonial was all over the place. I saw nothing but contradictions between the power levels on the street and in the vehicle. I'll bring up some examples here.

The March 28, 2011 testimony, on page 48, 3 decibel's difference between in and out of car. He goes on again on page 49 and states 84 decibels in vehicle, and on street, 3 decibels less.

Later on in May, May 23, 2011 testimony, page 65, our expert witness, Dr. Eisenstein, brought up that T-Mobile Northeast utilizes a figure of 6 decibels for vehicle loss. So, Dr. Eisenstein stated on page 66 Page 9

that, to me, did not prove there was a coverage gap in
 this area. That's why I will be voting to deny this
 application.

4 Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: John?

BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: Do you need mine?

7 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Mm-hmm.

BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: I would have to say that, during my eight years on this board, this has probably been the most thought-provoking application that we've had, at least that I've been able to see in front of me.

I am supporting this application because I did feel, unlike my colleague, that, through the applicant's witnesses and testimony, that a deficiency in the coverage area was proven and that the location of this facility would help remediate that deficiency.

I also felt very confident, through testimony and through the witnesses of the applicant, that they would work in good faith with this community to do what they can to make the tower and location aesthetically pleasing.

It was for these reasons why I feel comfortable leaving here tonight knowing that my decision of supporting this application would be made Page 10

21.

Page 12

without any regret or compromise. That is why I still will be supporting this applicant.

CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: John Tierney?

BOARD MEMBER TIERNEY: This application has been a long, detailed one with a lot of technical data.

As I looked at the application and the voluminous

amount of data involved, I decided that the most logical approach was to list the pros and cons of the application and decide which outweighed the other.

There was one benefit outlined that I heard, and that was an improved level of cellphone service to two-thirds of a T-Mobile perceived gap area.

The cons were several, vary in weight. The first one I had was conflicts with the existing zoning code. This use is not permitted. It's a commercial use in a residential area. Besides this code conflict, the town master plan promotes preservation of the residential nature of the town and prevention of commercial use intrusions into residential areas.

Then we had the proposed lot site. It's a small, triangular-shaped lot that does not meet the zoning size requirement and is not able to provide the required proper setbacks.

Also, structures in this residential zone are regulated to 35 feet maximum structure height

If the antenna fell to the north, it could impede or cause danger to traffic on Lake Avenue. That also posed a danger to the community, in my mind. The lack of proper setbacks due to the undersized nature of the lot becomes unacceptable to this board member.

Applications like this must also be analyzed relevant to their value impact on adjoining properties. The board was presented with conflicting testimony on this factor. I did not feel the applicant's testimony was credible, that there would be no value effect on an adjoining property where a 120-foot antenna was placed practically on its border. The appraiser hired to provide counsel to the board clearly disagreed with the applicant's testimony.

Then we have the questions, is there an actual gap? If so, what is the size of the gap? And then, what is the importance of any gap? Technical testimony by the applicant was confusing at times and progressed to disagreements and unresolved points with the expert hired to counsel the board. It became unresolved whether a true gap actually existed, and whether the measurement that was used by the applicant was accurate.

Other than driving around making mechanical signal measurements to quantify a gap, there was no

Page 11

versus 120 feet of antenna proposed. I thought two consideration points became relevant, and the visual

impact of the structure height was the main one.

A balloon test was reportedly done, but no member of the board was notified and therefore able to report any impressions back to the rest of the board. Pictures were presented, but by no means a substitute for actual on-site viewing of the test.

The absence of the balloon test actual viewing also inhibits analysis of whether the antenna structure would be unsightly or acceptable. The balloon line would have facilitated visual analysis of the height effect among the trees that would have been left or removed.

Then, there is a fall-zone requirement in the code for antenna structures such as these. Here, the small lot size and the lack of required setbacks become crucial. If this antenna should fall -- however improbable as indicated in the applicant's testimony -- it could fall onto Goodman's crossing to the south, and impede or eliminate access and egress from a sizable apartment complex. That access and egress from that apartment complex could also be emergency access and egress. That poses a danger to the community, in my mind,

Page 13

actual field survey data of perhaps clients in the area

or non-client data in the area. Some small amount and
 totally unscientific -- totally unscientific -- I

totally unscientific -- totally unscientific -- I
 received from people in the suggested gap area

5 indicated everyone uses a cellphone and considers it

6 essential. All but one reported having no reception

7 difficulties in the area. The one who did have
 8 difficulties was a former T-Mobile customer from the

9 area the application does not resolve. Those

difficulties were resolved by switching to another vendor.

It was a statement from the technical witness for the applicant that he believed other vendors were having the difficulties in the gap area. The people I spoke to represented several other vendors and had no signal problems in the area.

In summary, I am not in favor of this application because I cannot approve erecting an antenna that has serious conflicts with existing code and the master plan, some of which could be dangerous; an antenna which could be unsightly and could be detrimental to adjoining property values, all to partially cover -- partially cover an unclear gap area. The possible benefit, partially improved service by T-Mobile to the gap area they outlined by them, does

Page 14 Page 16 not outweigh the detriments to the code, the 1 zoning, there appears to be complete disregard for 2 2 neighborhood and the town in my mind. zoning laws. 3 3 I also do not accept the value of the I also feel that the applicant failed to 4 4 proposed benefit. The indicated areas and the town prove the benefit for the community. 5 5 already have full cellphone services throughout the There was also a point brought up that 6 town. I didn't have anybody tell me their phone didn't 6 failure to approve this application would make the 7 7 work and didn't have full services in the gap area, property totally unusable. To deny the application is 8 except they might not be getting that from T-Mobile. 8 not going to make this property any less usable than it 9 9 The antenna in the end appears to be unnecessary to was prior to this application. This piece of property 10 have good cellphone service in the outlined area. So, 10 is an orphan piece of property due to a roadway that 11 perhaps there's no real benefit to the people of Clark 11 went in many years ago, and unfortunately that's the 12 involving this application. I, therefore, am voting 12 way it is. But I will not be in favor of this 13 against it. 13 application. 14 Thank you. 14 Madame secretary, can we have a roll call? 15 15 THE SECRETARY: Thomas Meade? CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: John Caliguire? 16 BOARD MEMBER CALIGUIRE: I myself will not 16 BOARD MEMBER MEADE: I vote for the --17 be supporting this application for some of the same 17 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Let's clarify. 18 reasons as my peers. I believe it doesn't cover the 18 THE SECRETARY: This is a motion to deny. 19 gap 100 percent. It leaves a big, big gap. 19 MR. SPIALTER: There is a motion to deny. 20 I also believe it's a safety issue, the 20 A yea vote, or a positive vote, is a vote against the 21 21 height of the tower, with a lot of residential areas application. 22 22 very close. I also believe, coming in from Scotch A negative vote, a vote no, is a vote in --23 23 Plains, it would be an eyesore as you come up over the is a vote against the motion, arguably in favor of the 24 24 hill to be staring at that -- that structure. For application. Everyone clear on that? 25 25 those reasons, that's why I will be voting against this CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Madame secretary? Page 17 Page 15 1 THE SECRETARY: It's a motion to deny. 1 application. 2 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Pat, got anything else? 2 BOARD MEMBER MEADE: I vote for the 3 3 BOARD MEMBER CAMPIONE: I, too, must existing proposed --4 reiterate and agree with my colleagues on their 4 MR. SPIALTER: So, you're voting against 5 reservations about this application. I'm not going to 5 the motion? 6 6 beat a dead horse and duplicate their words, but my BOARD MEMBER MEADE: That's correct. 7 7 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Are you voting -biggest reservation is the benefit to the community of 8 Clark which we represent. I see absolutely no inherent 8 BOARD MEMBER MEADE: Before --9 9 benefit to this community as a whole for allowing the MR, SPIALTER: Let me say it one more time. cell tower to go in. 10 10 There is a motion to deny the application. So, there's 11 11 the motion to deny, which has been set because it And I go back to Mr. O'Brien's report, the 12 basically says the application is not to be approved. 12 planning report and the burden of proof, where he 13 clearly states and gives us many reasons why this 13 If you believe that the motion is to be passed, so that 14 application has not met the burden of proof using the 14 the application is not to be approved, you would want 15 Sica balancing test or any other witness testimony that 15 to vote yes. 16 16 they've given us. If you believe that the motion should not 17 be approved -- that doesn't mean that you believe the 17 So, with that said, I will be voting 18 application should be granted, there are a variety of 18 against this application. 19 CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: I also will not be 19 other things that could occur -- but if you just voting in favor of this application for the following 20 believe that the motion as presented should not be 20 21 passed, which is a tacit affirmation -- not a complete 21 reasons: 22 I don't feel that the applicant proved any 22 affirmation, but a tacit affirmation of the

23

24

25

23

24

25.

need for the tower or proved the deficiency in the

Due to setbacks of the tower required by

coverage of the area.

application -- then you would want to vote no. I'm not

So, you're voting on the -- thank you.

sure I can say it any other way.

| | Page 18 | T | Page 20 |
|-----|--|----------|--|
| 1 | You're voting on the motion. You're not voting on the | 1 | CERTIFICATE |
| 2 | application. Okay? | 2 | |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: The motion is to deny | 3 | |
| 4 | the application. | 4 | I, Michael Lombardozzi, a Notary Public and |
| 5 | Madame secretary? | 5 | Registered Professional Reporter of the State of New |
| 6 | THE SECRETARY: Okay, Tom Meade? | 6 | Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true |
| 7 | BOARD MEMBER MEADE: I vote for the motion | 7 | and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken |
| 8 | to deny the application. | 8 | stenographically by and before me at the time, place, |
| 9 | THE SECRETARY: Douglas Krok? | 9 | and on the date hereinbefore set forth. |
| 10 | BOARD MEMBER KROK: Yes. | 10 | I do further certify that I am neither a |
| 11 | THE SECRETARY: John Passuth? | 11 | relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any |
| 12 | BOARD MEMBER PASSUTH: No. | 12 | of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a |
| 13 | THE SECRETARY: John Tierney? | 13 | relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel and |
| 14 | BOARD MEMBER TIERNEY: Yes, | 14 | that I am not financially interested in this action. |
| 15 | THE SECRETARY: John Caliguire? | 15 | |
| 16 | BOARD MEMBER CALIGUIRE: Yes. | 16 | |
| 17 | THE SECRETARY: Pat Campione? | 17 | Michael Lombardozzi, RPR |
| 18 | BOARD MEMBER CAMPIONE: Yes. | | Notary Public, State of New Jersey |
| 19 | THE SECRETARY: And Steve Kaminsky? | 18 | Date: 2012-02-06 |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN KAMINSKY: Yes. | 19 | · |
| 21 | THE SECRETARY: Denied. | 20 | |
| 22 | MR. SPIALTER: Mr. Edwards, thank you. | 21 22 | · |
| .23 | MR, EDWARDS: I thank you all very much. | 23 | |
| 24 | MR. SPIALTER: Thank you for your | 23 | |
| 1 | courtesies during the application. It's a been a long, | 25 | |
| | | 23 | |
|] | Page 19 | | |
| 1 | arduous road. | | |
| 2 | MR. EDWARDS: Thank you. | | |
| 3 | (Whereupon, the deposition concluded at | | ļ |
| | 8:30 p.m.) | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | · | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | P. S. |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | ļ | | |

| A | - apartment | 12:2 | Campione 1:13 | commercial |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| able 9:11 10:22 | 11:22,23 | | 15:3 18:17,18 | 10:15,19 |
| 11:5 | appears 14:9 | <u>B</u> | - car 7:19 | community 9:20 |
| absence 11:9 | 16:1 | B 1:9,9 | care 3:20 | 11:24 12:3 |
| absolutely 15:8 | applicant 1:19 | back 3:18 11:6 | cars 8:11 | 15:7,9 16:4 |
| accept 6:5,7 | 2:20,25 9:19 | 15:11 | cash 3:22 | competing 7:5 |
| 14:3 | 10:2 12:18,22 | balancing 15:15 | catch 2:18 | competition 7:9 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 13:13 15:22 | balloon 11:4,9 | cause 12:2 | complement |
| acceptable | 16:3 | 11:12 | cell 8:17,19 | 2:10 |
| | applicant's 9:15 | basically 7:13 | 15:10 | complete 16:1 |
| access 11:21,22 | 11:19 12:10,14 | 1 | cellphone 10:11 | 17:21 |
| 11:23 | application 4:5 | beat 15:6 | 13:5 14:5,10 | complex 11:22 |
| accurate 12:23 | 6:2,19 7:12 9:3 | believe 5:19 | cellphones 7:8 | 11:23 |
| 20:7 | 9:10,13,25 | 14:18,20,22 | certainly 7:8 | compromise |
| action 20:12,14 | 10:4,6,9 13:9 | 17:13,16,17,20 | certifications | 10:1 |
| actual 11:8,9 | 13:18 14:12,17 | believed 13:13 | 2:5 | concern 3:16 4:7 |
| 12:16 13:1 | 15:1,5,14,18 | benefit 10:10 | Certified 1:23 | concerns 7:8 |
| addition 4:11 | 15:20 16:6,7,9 | 13:24 14:4,11 | certify 20:6,10 | concluded 19:3 |
| additional 3:11 | 16:13,21,24 | 15:7,9 16:4 | chairman 1:10 | |
| addressed 3:15 | 17:10,12,14,18 | big 14:19,19 | | confident 9:18 conflict 10:16 |
| adjoining 12:7 | 1 ''' | biggest 15:7 | 2:1 4:1,23 5:25 | 1 * |
| 12:11 13:22 | 17:23 18:2,4,8 18:25 | bit 3:9 | 6:3,15,21 7:3 | conflicting 12:8 |
| ADJUSTMENT | i | board 1:1,14,17 | 9:5,7 10:3 | conflicts 10:14 |
| 1:1 | Applications 12:6 | 2:11 4:8,19,25 | 14:15 15:2,19 | 13:19 |
| advise 2:4 | | 6:1,4,8,12,18 | 16:17,25 17:7 | confusing 12:18 |
| advised 2:22 | appraiser 12:13 | 6:20,24 7:1,11 | 18:3,20 | cons 10:8,13 |
| aesthetically | approach 10:8 | 9:6,8,9 10:4 | claiming 8:9 | consideration |
| 9:22 | approaching 3:7 | 11:5,6 12:5,8 | clarify 3:8 16:17 | 11:2 |
| affirmation | approval 6:9 | 12:13,20 14:16 | Clark 1:1,4,7 | considers 13:5 |
| 17:21,22,22 | approve 6:11 | 15:3 16:16 | 8:6,7 14:11 | continue 2:2 |
| afternoon 3:10 | 13:18 16:6 | 17:2,6,8 18:7 | 15:8 | contradiction |
| 3:19,21 | approved 17:12 | 18:10,12,14,16 | clear 16:24 | 8:4,15 |
| ago 16;11 | 17:14,17 | 18:18 | clearly 12:14 | contradictions |
| agree 15:4 | arduous 19:1 | border 12:12 | 15:13 | 7:15 |
| agreed 8:3,22 | area 8:9 9:2,16 | Bridgewater | clients 13:1 | copy 3:14 |
| alerted 2:22 | 10:12,16 13:1 | 1:24 | close 14:22 | correct 2:14 |
| allowing 15:9 | 13:2,4,7,9,14 | bring 7:17 | code 10:15,16 | 17:6 |
| alternate 2:11 | 13:16,23,25 | brought 7:23 | 11:16 13:19 | corrected 8:2 |
| 6:17 | 14:7,10 15:24 | 16:5 | 14:1 | counsel 12:13,20 |
| amount 10:7 | areas 10:19 14:4 | burden 15:12,14 | colleague 9:14 | 20:11,13 |
| 13:2 | 14:21 | buluen 15.12,14 | colleagues 15:4 | court 4:12 7:6 |
| analysis 11:10 | arguably 16:23 | C | come 4:14 14:23 | courtesies 18:25 |
| 11:12 | attend 3:22 | C 1:16 20:1,1 | comfortable | cover 13:23,23 |
| analyzed 12:7 | attesting 2:5 | calendar 2:2 6:5 | 9:24 | 14:18 |
| antenna 11:1,10 | attorney 1:17 | Caliguire 1:13 | coming 14:22 | coverage 7:13 |
| 11:16,18 12:1 | 20:11,13 | 2:5 6:20,22 | Commencing | 8:9,12,14 9:1 |
| 12:12 13:19,21 | Attorneys 1:19 | 14:15,16 18:15 | 1:8 | 9:16 15:24 |
| 14:9 | attorney's 3:12 | 18:16 | comment 7:1 | credible 12:10 |
| anybody 14:6 | audio 7:9 | call 16:14 | comments 4:3 | crossing 11:20 |
| anymore 5:10 | Avenue 1:4,7 | calls 8:8 | 6:1,24 | crucial 11:18 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| customer 13:8 | Dr 7:23,25 8:16 | facilitated 11:12 | go 15:10,11 | inhibits 11:10 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 8:20,23 | facility 9:17 | goes 7:20 | inside 8:12 |
| <u>D</u> | driving 12:24 | fact 2:6 4:11 | going 4:14 7:7 | interest 7:5 |
| D 1:9,17 | due 12:4 15:25 | factor 12:9 | 15:5 16:8 | interested 20:14 |
| danger 11:24 | 16:10 | failed 16:3 | good 3:3 4:20 | intrusions 10:19 |
| 12:2,3 | duplicate 15:6 | failure 16:6 | 9:20 14:10 | involved 10:7 |
| dangerous 13:20 | D'ARMINIO | Fairfield 1:24 | Goodman's | involving 14:12 |
| data 10:5,7 13:1 | 1:18 | faith 9:20 | 11:20 | in-vehicle 8:14 |
| 13:2 | <u> </u> | fall 11:18,20 | granted 17:18 | issue 2:19 3:10 |
| date 2:13 20:9 | E | fall-zone 11:15 | | 14:20 |
| 20:18 | E 1:9,9,9,9,16,16 | far 4:9 6:25 | <u>H</u> | T |
| dated 3:13 | 20:1,1 | favor 13:17 | handling 2:25 | <u> </u> |
| dead 15:6 | earlier 4:7 | 15:20 16:12,23 | hear 4:19 | Janet 1:14 2:9 |
| December 2:8 | EDWARD 1:10 | feel 9:14,23 12:9 | heard 3:11 4:2,3 | 2:12,15,22 4:7 |
| 3:14 | Edwards 1:19 | 15:22 16:3 | 6:17 10:11 | 4:13,19 |
| decibel 8:14 | 2:18 3:2,3,7 | feet 10:25 11:1 | hearing 4:2 5:23 | January 1:6 |
| decibels 7:20,21 | 4:3 5:13 18:22 | fell 12:1 | hearings 2:8 | Jersey 1:4,7,24 |
| 7:24 8:1,11 | 18:23 19:2 | felt 9:18 | height 10:25 | 20:6,17 |
| decibel's 7:19 | effect 11:13 | field 13:1 | 11:3,13 14:21 | John 1:11,12,13 |
| decide 10:9 | 12:11 | figure 7:24 | help 9:17 | 1:19 2:5 6:21 |
| decided 10:7 | egress 11:21,22 | figures 8:25 | hereinbefore | 6:22 9:5 10:3 |
| decision 9:25 | 11:24 | filing 2:9 | 20:9 | 14:15 18:11,13 |
| deficiency 2:14 | eight 9:9 | final 4:2 | higher 8:1 | 18:15 |
| 2:21 9:15,17 | Eisenstein 7:23 | financially | hill 14:24 | K |
| 15:23 | 7:25 8:16,20 | 20:14 | hired 12:13,20 | Kaminsky 1:10 |
| Denied 18:21 | 8:23 | fine 3:7 | Hold 7:4 | 2:1 4:1,23 6:3 |
| deny 6:19,22 9:2 | eliminate 11:21 | first 10:14 | horse 15:6 | 6:15,21 7:3 9:5 |
| 16:7,18,19 | emergency | following 15:20 | hospital 5:22 | 9:7 10:3 14:15 |
| 17:1,10,11 | 11:23 | foregoing 20:6 | HOWARD 1:17 | 15:2,19 16:17 |
| 18:3,8 | employee 20:11 | former 13:8 | hundred 6:12 | 16:25 17:7 |
| deposition 19:3 | 20:13 | forth 20:9 | I | 18:3,19,20 |
| design 8:14 | enunciate 5:16 | front 9:12 | idea 4:21 | keep 5:15 |
| detailed 10:5 | erecting 13:18 | full 2:10 14:5,7 | impact 11:3 | know 2:22 3:5 |
| detrimental | escrow 2:21 3:1 | fully 2:12 | 12:7 | 3:17 4:12 |
| 13:22 | 5:12 | further 20:10 | impede 11:21 | knowing 9:24 |
| detriments 14:1 | especially 4:8,15 | future 3:19 | 12:2 | Krok 1:11 7:11 |
| difference 7:19 | ESQ 1:19 ESQUIRE 1:17 | G | importance | 18:9,10 |
| different 3:12 8:24 | essential 13:6 | gap 7:13 8:9 9:1 | 12:17 | |
| difficulties 13:7 | | 10:12 12:16,16 | impressions | L |
| | evening 3:3 | 12:17,21,25 | 11:6 | lack 11:17 12:4 |
| 13:8,10,14 | examples 7:17 existed 12:21 | 13:4,14,23,25 | improbable | Lake 1:4 12:2 |
| disagreed 8:18 8:19 12:14 | existing 10:14 | 14:7,19,19 | 11:19 | language 5:17 |
| disagreements | 13:19 17:3 | garbled 5:17 | improved 10:11 | laws 16:2 |
| 12:19 | expert 7:23 | GENTRY 1:14 | 13:24 | learned 3:9 |
| disregard 16:1 | 12:20 | getting 7:9 14:8 | indicated 11:19 | leaves 14:19 |
| Doug 7:3 8:6 | eyesore 14:23 | given 15:16 | 13:5 14:4 | leaving 9:24 |
| Douglas 1:11 | | gives 15:13 | information | left 11:14 |
| 18:9 | F | glaring 8:24 | 3:12 | letter 3:13 |
| 10.7 | F 20:1 | BINITING VIAT | inherent 15:8 | Let's 16:17 |
| | | | | |

| level 10:11 | 7:1,11 9:6,8 | notices 3:20 | ph 3:19 | property 12:11 |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| levels 7:16 | 10:4 11:5 12:5 | notified 11:5 | phone 14:6 | 13:22 16:7,8,9 |
| Liasa 3:18 | 14:16 15:3 | November 2:8 | picked 4:10 | 16:10 |
| line 11:12 | 16:16 17:2,6,8 | 8:16 | picture 5:18,23 | proposed 10:20 |
| list 10:8 | . 18:7,10,12,14 | numbers 8:25 | Pictures 11:7 | 11:1 14:4 17:3 |
| listened 2:6 | 18:16,18 | | piece 16:9,10 | pros 10:8 |
| little 3:9 | members 4:8,14 | 0 | place 5:20 7:15 | prove 9:1 16:4 |
| LLC 1:3 2:3 | 6:2 | O 1:9 | 20:8 | proved 15:22,23 |
| location 9:16,21 | met 15:14 | obtained 2:6 | placed 12:12 | proven 7:14 |
| logical 10:8 | Michael 20:4,17 | Obviously 7:6 | Plains 14:23 | 9:16 |
| Lombardozzi | microphone | occur 17:19 | plan 10:17 13:20 | provide 10:22 |
| 20:4,17 | 4:22,23 | October 8:10 | planning 15:12 | 12:13 |
| long 5:11 10:5 | microphones | office 3:9,12,13 | please 3:19 | public 4:3 20:4 |
| 18:25 | 4:11 | 3:15,20 | pleasing 9:22 | 20:17 |
| looked 10:6 | mics 4:17,25 | Okay 4:1 6:23 | point 2:1 4:1,4 | p.m 1:8 19:4 |
| looking 4:4 6:1 | mind 11:25 12:3 | 7:6 18:2,6 | 16:5 | |
| loss 7:25 | 14:2 | on-site 11:8 | points 11:2 | Q |
| lot 10:5,20,21 | mine 9:6 | originally 3:11 | 12:19 | quantify 12:25 |
| 11:17 12:5 | Mm-hmm 9:7 | orphan 16:10 | posed 12:3 | question 2:24 |
| 14:21 | Monday 1:6 | outlined 10:10 | poses 11:24 | 3:5 6:14 |
| | motion 4:5 6:1,3 | 13:25 14:10 | positive 16:20 | questions 12:15 |
| M | 6:5,16,17,18 | outside 8:11 | possible 13:24 | R |
| M 1:9,9 | 6:22,22 16:18 | outstanding | power 7:16 | |
| Madame 16:14 | 16:19,23 17:1 | 2:25 3:5 | practically | R1:9,9,9,16,19 |
| 16:25 18:5 | 17:5,10,11,13 | outweigh 14:1 | 12:12 | 20:1 |
| main 7:12 11:3 | 17:16,20 18:1 | outweighed 10:9 | Precision 1:23 | raised 3:6 |
| making 2:21 | 18:3,7 | O'Brien's 15:11 | presented 11:7 | read 2:7 |
| 12:24 | | P | 12:8 17:20 | real 14:11 |
| March 7:18 | N | | preservation | reason 2:24 7:13 |
| master 10:17 | N 1:9,16 | P 1:9,16,16 | 10:17 | reasons 9:23 |
| 13:20 | nature 10:18 | page 2:2 7:18,20 | prevention | 14:18,25 15:13 |
| matter 1:2 2:9 | 12:4 | 7:23,25 8:6,20 | 10:18 | 15:21 |
| 2:23 | need 9:6 15:23 | Parsippany 3:15 | PRICE 1:18 | received 3:17 |
| maximum 10:25 | neg 8:1,2,10,13 | partially 13:23 | prior 8:13 16:9 | 13:4 |
| Meade 1:12 4:19 | negative 8:11 | 13:23,24 | probably 9:10 | reception 13:6 |
| 7:1 16:15,16 | 16:22 | parties 20:12 | problems 13:16 | record 2:18 3:9 |
| 17:2,6,8 18:6,7 | neighborhood | pass 2:9 | proceeding 2:24 | 5:20 6:14 |
| mean 17:17 | 14:2 | passed 17:13,21 | 3:8 4:13 | recording 4:24 5:3,7,8 |
| means 11:7 | neither 20:10,12 | Passuth 1:11 | proceedings 1:3 | · |
| measurement | never 3:18 | 4:25 6:4,8,12 | 2:7,13 | regard 2:20 |
| 12:22 | New 1:4,7,24 | 9:6,8 18:11,12 | Professional | Registered 20:5 |
| measurements | 20:5,17 | Pat 15:2 18:17 | 20:5 | regret 10:1 regulated 10:25 |
| 12:25 | newspapers | PATRICK 1:13 peers 14:18 | progressed | reiterate 15:4 |
| mechanical | 5:19 | ^ | 12:19 | relative 20:11 |
| 12:24 | non-client 13:2 | people 13:4,15 | promotes 10:17 | 20:13 |
| MEESE 1:18 | north 12:1 | 14:11 | proof 15:12,14 | released 5:22 |
| meet 10:21 | Northeast 1:3 | perceived 10:12 | proper 7:9 | relevant 11:2 |
| member 4:19,25 | 2:2 7:24 | percent 6:12 14:19 | 10:23 12:4 | 12:7 |
| 6:4,8,12,18,20 | Notary 20:4,17 | | properties 12:8 | |
| | • | permitted 10:15 | | reliable 8:12,14 |

| remediate 9:17 | 6:20 | 18:22,24 | 11:9 15:15 | two 5:6 11:1 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| remember 5:15 | seconded 6:22 | spoke 3:18 | testimonial 7:14 | two-thirds 10:12 |
| removed 11:14 | secretary 1:14 | 13:15 | testimony 7:18 | T-Mobile 1:3 |
| report 11:6 | 2:16 4:15,20 | staring 14:24 | 7:22 8:5,10,21 | 2:2 3:17 7:24 |
| 15:11,12 | 5:4,8,11,14 | start 6:24 | 8:25 9:15,19 | 8:7 10:12 13:8 |
| reported 13:6 | 16:14,15,18,25 | state 8:21 20:5 | 11:19 12:9,10 | 13:25 14:8 |
| reportedly 11:4 | 17:1 18:5,6,9 | 20:17 | 12:14,18 15:15 | T-Mobile's 3:15 |
| reporter 4:12 | 18:11,13,15,17 | stated 7:25 | 20:7 | T IIIODIIO 55115 |
| 20:5 | 18:19,21 | statement 13:12 | thank 3:24,25 | U |
| Reporters 1:23 | see 5:18 9:11 | statements 4:2 | 5:20 9:4 14:14 | unacceptable |
| Reporting 1:23 | 15:8 | states 7:20 15:13 | 17:25 18:22,23 | 12:5 |
| represent 15:8 | send 3:20 | stating 8:7 | 18:24 19:2 | unclear 13:23 |
| represented | sent 3:12,13 | status 2:22 | things 17:19 | undersized 12:4 |
| 13:15 | serious 13:19 | status 2,22 | Thomas 1:12 | understand 2:19 |
| request 3:11 | service 1:23 | 20:8 | 16:15 | understanding |
| requested 3:10 | 10:12 13:24 | Steve 1:10 18:19 | thought 11:1 | 2:12 3:2 5:21 |
| required 10:23 | 14:10 | street 7:16,21 | thought-prov | unfortunately |
| 11:17 15:25 | services 14:5,7 | 8:1 | 9:10 | 16:11 |
| requirement | set 17:11 20:9 | strongly 8:18 | threaten 7:7 | UNIDENTIFI |
| 10:22 11:15 | set 17.11 20.3 setbacks 10:23 | structure 10:25 | Tierney 1:12 | 7:10 |
| reservation 15:7 | 11:17 12:4 | 11:3,11 14:24 | 6:18,21 10:3,4 | uniform 5:21 |
| reservations | 15:25 | structures 10:24 | 18:13,14 | unnecessary |
| 15:5 | Shidfar 8:2,13 | 11:16 | time 7:2 8:3 17:9 | 14:9 |
| resident 8:6 | 8:18,21 | substitute 11:7 | 20:8 | unresolved |
| residential | Shidfar's 7:14 | suggested 13:4 | times 12:18 | 12:19,21 |
| | Shorthand 1:23 | suggesting 3:4 | today 2:23 | unscientific 13:3 |
| 10:16,18,19,24 14:21 | SHULMAN | suggesting 3.4 summary 13:17 | Tom 6:25 18:6 | 13:3 |
| resolve 13:9 | 1:18 | summary 13.17 supporting 9:13 | tonight 2:11,24 | unsightly 11:11 |
| resolved 13:10 | Sica 15:15 | 9:25 10:2 | 5:21 7:12 9:24 | 13:21 |
| rest 11:6 | | 14:17 | totally 13:3,3 | unusable 16:7 |
| | signal 12:25 | sure 4:7,10 5:22 | 16:7 | usable 16:8 |
| right 2:16 4:9 6:25 7:3 | 13:16 site 10:20 | 6:13 17:24 | tower 9:21 | use 6:6,8,10 |
| | | | | 10:15,16,19 |
| Ritter 8:7 | sites 8:17,19 | surprise 2:19 | 14:21 15:10,23 15:25 | user 8:7 |
| road 1:24 19:1 | sizable 11:21 size 10:22 11:17 | survey 13:1 | | uses 13:5 |
| roadway 16:10 roll 16:14 | | switching 13:10 | towers 8:17,22 town 10:17,18 | utilizes 7:24 |
| | 12:16 small 10:21 | T | • | utilizing 4:18 |
| room 4:9 | | T 1:9 20:1,1 | 14:2,4,6 | |
| RPR 20:17 | 11:17 13:2 | tacit 17:21,22 | township 1:1 2:20 | V |
| RUTH 1:10 | Sorry 7:10 | take 3:20 5:23 | traffic 12:2 | value 12:7,11 |
| S | south 11:20 | taken 20:7 | 1 | 14:3 |
| S 1:9,9,16 | speak 4:14 5:14 | taker 5:18 | transcript 1:2 20:7 | values 13:22 |
| safety 14:20 | SPEAKER 7:10 | talk 8:17,19,22 | | variety 17:18 |
| satisfying 2:21 | speaking 4:6,9 | talked 8:13,17 | transcripts 2:7 | vary 10:13 |
| 2:25 | SPIALTER | technical 10:5 | 2:13 8:6. | vehicle 7:16,21 |
| saw 7:15 | 1:17 2:4,17 3:4 | 12:17 13:12 | trees 11:13 | 7:25 8:12 |
| | 3:25 4:6,17,21 | telephone 2:23 | triangular-sh | vendor 13:11 |
| says 17:12 Scotch 14:22 | 5:2,6,9,12,15 | tell 14:6 | 10:21 | vendors 13:14 |
| | 6:6,10,13 7:4 | test 4:13 11:4,8 | trouble 8:8 | 13:15 |
| second 6:15,16 | 16:19 17:4,9 | 10317.13 11.7,0 | true 12:21 20:6 | versus 11:1 |
| | | | | |

| | | <u> </u> | | rage z |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|--------|
| viewing 11:8,10 | | 908 1:25 | | |
| visual 11:2,12 | 0 | 98 8:6 | | |
| voices 5:16 | 08807 1:24 | 20 0.0 | Ì | |
| voluminous 10:6 | . 1 | | | |
| vote 16:16,20,20 | ***** | • | | |
| 16:20,22,22,22 | 1178 1:24 | | | |
| 16:23 17:2,15 | 120 11:1 | | | |
| 17:23 18:7 | 120-foot 12:12 | | | |
| voting 7:12 9:2 | 120-1001 12.12 | | | |
| 14:12,25 15:17 | | · | | |
| 15:20 17:4,7 | 14th 8:16 | | | |
| 17:25 18:1,1 | | | - | |
| | 2 | | | |
| W | 2011 2:8 3:14 | | | } |
| want 2:4 3:8 | 7:18,22 8:10 | | · | |
| 4:10,14 5:5 | 2012 1:6 | | | ļ |
| 6:10,13,24 7:2 | 2012-02-06 | | | |
| 7:9 17:14,23 | 20:18 | | | |
| wanted 5:19 | 23 1:6 7:22 | | | |
| wants 5:12 | 24 8:10 | | | |
| way 4:6 16:12 | 28 3:14 7:18 | | | |
| 17:24 | | | | |
| weight 10:13 | 3 | | | |
| went 16:11 | 37:18,21 | | | · · |
| Westfield 1:7 | 315 1:7 | | | |
| we'll 2:1 4:4 | 35 10:25 | | | } |
| we're 4:13 6:1 | 4 | | | |
| 7:7 | 4-11 2:2 6:5 | | | |
| we've 4:3 9:11 | 48 7:18 | | | |
| wire 5:10 | 49 7:20 | | | |
| wish 6:2 | | | | |
| witness 7:23 | 6 | | | |
| 13:13 15:15 | 67:248:1 | : | | · |
| witnesses 9:15 9:19 | 65 7:23 | | | _ |
| | 66 7:25 | | | , |
| word 6:6,8,10 words 15:6 | 685-2227 1:25 | | | |
| work 9:20 14:7 | | | | |
| | 7 | | | |
| i r | 78 8:2,21 | | 1 | , |
| yea 16:20 | 79 8:21 | | <u> </u> | |
| years 9:9 16:11 | 8 | | | |
| | 8:05 1:8 | | | |
| L | 8:30 19:4 | | *** | |
| zone 10:24 | 84 7:20 8:2,10 | | | |
| zoning 10:14,22 | 8:13 | | | |
| 16:1,2 | | | | |
| <u> </u> | 9 | | | |
| 010 000 2 10 01 | 90 8:11 | | | |
| \$10,000 3:10,21 | | • | | |
| | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | |