

necessary to accommodate the ground equipment for future collocators. A tree pole could also be accommodated within the smaller lease area. The equipment structures can be constructed to look like residential accessory structures. None of the priority one sites are proximate to the search area or the proposed location. None of the priority two zones are proximate with the exception of the D & R Canal which is not an option. With the exception of the existing shed that extends into the side yard setback and the height of the tower, the proposed installation complies with all the bulk standards of the R-2 zone. The facility does not interfere with the farmland preserved area. It is located proximate to the Wyckoff-Cornell burial site but given the passive nature of this use and the fact that it is located behind the house it does not cause any detriment to the burial ground.

Ms. Goldman questioned Mr. Masters. The lightning rod on the tree pole would be concealed by the branches. The average height of stealth silos varies from 108 feet to 130 feet. Farm silos are generally in the area of 60 to 80 feet (someone from the audience said they are 30 to 40 feet). An individual FCC license is not issued for each site.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the structure to house the equipment would look like if a tree pole was constructed. Mr. Schwartz testified Verizon equipment starts roughly 10 feet from the centerline of the tree so there is room for the foundation. The equipment compound is generally 10 feet by 20 feet and can be 9 feet to 10 feet high. Verizon does not typically house the equipment in a building but if a building is required they are roughly 12 feet by 30 feet including the generator room. Air conditioners are required for the building which in turn increases the size of the generator. If a tree pole design is approved, the applicant would come back to the Board for the site plan approval. The existing lease area would accommodate both Verizon equipment and collocator equipment. The necessity for lightning protection of the silo can be incorporated into the dome.

The meeting was opened to the public for questions.

Candy Willis, Knickerbocker Drive, was previously sworn in. Ms. Willis wondered why a crane test is not done while the leaves are off the trees. Mr. Stanzione said the applicant has already done more than required by the Ordinance with regard to the crane test and the applicant is freely admitting it is visible. They will not do another crane test.

Don Matthews, 28 Rutland Road, was previously sworn in. Mr. Matthews asked about the tree branching. Mr. Masters said the branching, whatever the distance down the tree it will go, is done during the original build. When collocators come, branches are taken out to accommodate the antenna array and then replaced.

Liz Palius was previously sworn in. Ms. Palius asked what could be done that would modify the effect of the silo that is 135 feet. Mr. Masters replied there is no landscaping that would mitigate the top of a 135 foot silo. The mitigation would be to attempt to mitigate the visibility of what is on the ground around the silo and to help diminish the visibility from adjoining properties.

Mr. Masters will provide high resolution pictures of the Delbarton tree to the Board.

Ewa Zak was sworn in. Ms. Zak asked about the noise from the generators and air conditioners. Mr. Stanzione said testimony was provided at a prior meeting regarding noise. The generator only operates once a week for approximately 45 minutes during daylight hours. There is no air conditioner required for the silo.

Barbara Ten Broeke was previously sworn in. She came to honor the Millstone Valley National Scenic Byway. In the Valley the only likely candidates for cell towers are church steeples, inside real silo, cemeteries, telephone poles and possibly a flagpole that could be inserted into a public or semi-public space. She asked if there was ever an instance where there were two lower silos or trees that are less offensive than the one proposed. Mr. Masters said he has never seen multiple lower towers proposed.

Jessie Havens, Ludlow Avenue, was previously sworn in. Her concern is the historic district. She asked if the tower will be removed when it becomes obsolete. Mr. Stanzione said they would accept any condition that upon it being abandoned it would be removed and the ground restored to its reasonable preexisting condition.

The Board took a five minute recess.

Dr. Eisenstein, who was previously sworn, presented his report. Mr. Villecco's RF Emissions Report has followed correctly the requirements of OET-65. Mr. Villecco had concluded that they are 300-something times below the FCC limit. When they satisfy the FCC limit they automatically satisfy the NJ limit since the NJ limit is five times more emissions than the FCC. They will only use FCC approved equipment. Therefore, the site will be safe from a radiofrequency point of view. The radiofrequency analysis dated April 5, 2016 included a picture of the existing coverage from the sites that surround the proposed site. The correct analysis for the LTE coverage was used and based on the propagation plot there is a gap in the area of the site. The proposed site is located towards the center of the gap. The gap is such that it would have to be filled in order for them to remain in compliance with the requirement to provide substantially better than mediocre service. The propagation map that shows what would happen with the proposed site installed shows the gap would be ameliorated. They are required to provide substantially better than mediocre service but that is not defined so the Board and applicant has to figure it out. The Board should look at it as a best effort. Verizon is getting a substantial improvement with this location. Looking ahead, all of the wireless communications will be data, so the data becomes increasingly more important. It will be for all voice calls as well as internet and maps. As data increases they are eventually going to get to a point where they will have to slow everyone down. You can slow down

data but you can't slow a voice call down. As they move to Voice over LTE they are going to find that they have to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the voice signals over the line. This is a near term problem and it is something the Boards need to be aware of. The Alternate Candidate Analysis dated February 11, 2015 discussed alternate sites and alternate technologies. There will not be a technology that is going to obviate the current technology. If anything, the new technologies will require more sites because they have to get closer to the user to keep the signal-to-noise ratio at a good level. However, they will be able to be constructed at a lower height. The new sites could be used only after you have an umbrella of a macro site that can handle the area. If the height of the proposed tower is too much lower, the effect of the site and the ability for any collocation is lost. The 90 foot height for other carriers may not be acceptable. It may only be acceptable if this was a fill-in site for them.

Chairman DeRochi opened the meeting to question Dr. Eisenstein.

Liz Palius asked how the hardwired telephone fits in the conflict between voice and data. Dr. Eisenstein said if you have new services like cable or fiber optics in your house the calls are really digitized and sent over a packet-switched information. If your house still has copper wire then your phone is likely an analog signal. The reason for cell towers is to give you mobile communication, not communication in your house.

Mr. Stanzone asked if a wireless carrier under license from the FCC needs to provide service even if there is landline service in the area. Dr. Eisenstein confirmed they did since they are two different things.

The application was carried to the November 29, 2016 special meeting.

III. CLOSED SESSION

Chairman DeRochi read the resolution to go into closed session to discuss pending litigation.

A motion to go into closed session was made by Mr. O'Brien and seconded by Mr. Fedun. The motion carried unanimously.

A motion to reopen the meeting was made by Mr. Kristjanson and seconded by Mr. Woitach. The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.