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    MAYOR DeVITA: We will now turn to the public hearing.

This is a Federal Court ordered hearing on Crown Castle's application for a special use permit for the installation of 25 distributed antenna systems, DAS nodes, with attendant equipment with six to be installed on preexisting utility poles and 19 on new poles, some of them wood, some of the stealth.

Tonight is the third of four hearings that concern nodes within the numbers N693, across from 1 Glen Lane; N695, 139 Laurel Lane; N696, 40 Picardy Lane; N657, 78 Cherry lane; N669, 40 White Oak Tree Road; N670, 40 Woodvale Drive.

The manner in which we will proceed is as follows:

After my opening remarks, Howard Avrutine, our Village Attorney, will run through preliminaries such as notices and exhibits. Then the applicant, Crown Castle, will make its presentation to
the Board. The Board will then question the applicant, make comments and have discussion. The applicant will have a chance to speak again. Then the residents and guests, and we welcome you, I know there are a number of Syosset residents, you're certainly welcome, then the residents and guests will have the opportunity to ask questions or make comments.

If you have not already, please fill out your name and address and give it to either Liz or Nancy. When your name is called you will have the opportunity to either question or make a comment.

What we would like to do is, so everybody gets a chance to speak, is try and keep comments to three minutes, which is actually a long time to speak. If you need more time that's fine, if someone ahead just said what you were going to say, you can say that person just said what $I$ wanted to say, that's fine, too. The idea is to give everyone
a chance to speak tonight.

At the close of the hearing, the record will be kept open for 30 days for anyone who wants to submit materials or something in writing.

15 years ago in 2004, the Board of Trustees, under the Mayorship of Denise DeVita, my better half, passed a Wireless Telecommunications Facilities Ordinance for Laurel Hollow. It was in response to a changing area of law, one in which the rights of municipalities had been repeatedly curtailed.

Going back, in the $1970 s$ and early 1980s, cell towers went up in localities because municipalities had no
legislation prohibiting them. Then the municipalities passed laws which simply prohibited cell towers, period. Because of those denials and the courts upholding them the industry petitioned Congress, to which, in response, passed the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. U.S. Congress decided that a nationwide cellular grid was something
that the country needed for cell service and other digital types of communication, such as the Internet.

A couple of important points of that federal law that concern us: First, a municipality cannot pass legislation that has the outright effect of prohibiting the construction and placement of wireless facilities.

Second, one more difficult provision is that the municipality may not deny an application based on the fear of the health effects of radio frequency emissions. In sum, the law does not prohibit a municipality from regulating, just unreasonably regulating.

So, Laurel Hollow's ordinance was drafted to require an applicant to provide as much information as possible as to allow the Board to have as complete a record as possible about the proposed installations in order to properly grant or deny an application. Our ordinance is found in Chapter

145 of our Zoning Laws. I just wanted to highlight a few points of the purposes of our ordinance which requires the applicant to meet a number of requirements.

Section $36.1(d)$ encourages the use of stealth and other innovative technology to minimize the adverse aesthetic and visual impact on land, property and buildings.

Section 36.1 promotes and encourages the priority of siting of wireless telecommunications facilities to minimize the adverse visual and physical effects of wireless telecommunications facilities and to protect the natural features, aesthetics and open space character of the Village. Section $36.1(g)$ to minimize the impact of such facilities on residential properties.

We will see how these sections come into play.

While the application process set out in our ordinance is very detailed,
one overarching philosophy found in our law is for our Board to ensure that, quote, "The placement, construction and modification of wireless
telecommunications equipment do not threaten or endanger the health, safety and welfare of the Village's residents and visitors, and to protect the public's welfare, environmental features, aesthetic values, nature and character of the community," and that we will do.

Howard?

MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you, Mayor.

As the Mayor indicated, this is the public hearing on the application of Crown Castle, $N G$ East LLC to install six new wireless telecommunications nodes as part of a new distributed antennae system, known as $D-A-S$, DAS, to be installed on utility poles within public rights-of-way located within the Village of Laurel Hollow.

The exhibits in connection with tonight's hearing are as follows:

First, a copy of the legal notice as prepared by the Clerk/Treasurer.

Next is an Affidavit of Posting from Elizabeth Kaye that the legal notice was posted on the bulletin board in front of Village Hall on March 29, 2019.

The next exhibit is an Affidavit of Publication that the legal notice was published in the North Shore Leader on April 3, 2019.

The next exhibit is a document that confirms that the legal notice was published to the Village's website on March 26, 2019.

The next exhibit is a document that confirms that the legal notice was sent to the Village website NEWS subscribers on May 17, 2019.

The next exhibit is an Affidavit of Mailing from the applicant indicating that the Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to all required property owners on May 10, 2019 .

The final exhibit is notification
from the Nassau County Planning
Commission dated September 25, 2018 that the subject matter of this hearing is referred to the Village of Laurel Hollow Board of Trustees to take action as it deems appropriate.

As the Mayor indicated, this is the third hearing out of four and concerns six particular antennae node locations. The way this matter is going to be handled is that the record is going to be cumulative. What that means is that all evidence and testimony given during these hearings will be considered as part of the record upon which the Board will render its determination with respect to each particular application. So if something is said at tonight's hearing, it will be utilized in connection with any of the other hearings, and of course, that would apply in the reverse as well.

At this time, the applicant will present their case to the Board, Mr. Robert Gaudioso.

MAYOR DeVITA: Mr. Gaudioso, I apologize, I don't mean to interfere, I forgot to introduce some of the other people that are here.

First here on my right is Dick Comi from the Center for Municipal Solutions. Dick has been our consultant on this application from the outset and has prepared multiple reports.

Seated next to him are our two Federal Court attorneys, Todd Steckler from the Steckler Law Firm and next to him, Joe Macy from Berkman Henoch.

So thank you, and I apologize, Mr. Gaudioso.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor and Members of the Board. My name is Robert Gaudioso of the law firm of Snyder \& Snyder on behalf of the applicant Crown Castle.

This is the third public hearing, but I'll just briefly run through some of the materials that were originally submitted with the application, including Crown Castle's Certificate of

Public Convenience and Necessity from the New York State PSC.

MR. AVRUTINE: Hold on one second, if you could. I know you sort of do this quite often, but if you could please try and slow down your tempo because the reporter is taking it and sometimes you are hard to keep up with. MR. GAUDIOSO: My apologizes. I am aware $I$ am standing between us and the Memorial Day weekend, I'll try to strike that balance.

MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you.
MR. GAUDIOSO: Crown Castle has also provided a Right-of-Way Use Agreement. We submitted a map which is up on a projector screen of the 25 node locations. We submitted structural certification reports for each of the nodes. We included Crown Castle's Certificate of Insurance. We also included a long environmental assessment form for all 25 nodes, a set of drawings, plans for each of those, submitted visual renderings for what
each proposed node locations would look like. We submitted alternative sites as part of the original locations that were previously submitted. We submitted a new pole justification report, included tax maps and the surrounding property owners. We submitted a noise certification letter, an environmental clearance letter, a radio frequency justification report and also submitted reports from our consultant confirming that the facilities would comply with FCC regulations regarding radio frequency exposure.

Since the last public hearing and based on the comments at that hearing and the prior hearings we submitted additional information. We submitted a letter from Crown Castle detailing that the meter pan is owned and installed by PSG Long Island, the small size of that meter pan being 19 inches long by 13 inches wide. We updated the visual renderings to show the location of each of the meter pans on the facilities and
that they could be painted to match the pole and the equipment shroud. We submitted a letter also from Crown Castle confirming, again, that the noise would comply with the Town Code, nevertheless -- I'm sorry, the Village Code, nevertheless, Crown Castle did also offer as a condition of approval to throttle the fan which is essentially the only noise inducing component below 101 degrees Farenheit. Rarely does it exceed that, but at a temperature below that, we would throttle it down to 75 percent which would lower the overall noise to 45 decibels at approximately 5 meters from the node which, again, would be well below the ambient noise levels, the amount of a quiet conversation. We also submitted some documentation responding to some under grounding questions, including a response. I believe there was a photograph shown of a Crown Castle manhole. That is not an ion containing manhole which is the equipment in this
case. That was fiber spliced in New York State, a completely different type of installation.

We also included in the additional drawing and schematic of a type of stealth base for the base of the stealth poles. We're also working on some other designs. We recently received some photographs of some light poles in and around Village Hall so we will provide some additional details, some other stealthing options that we can come up with.

We also came up with an alternative site analysis showing that we can relocate all of the nodes that were requested to be relocated, other than one. We proposed an alternative to the alternative that was discussed out in the site visit. We also updated and showed the stealth poles requested at all different locations, based on our site visit.

We also submitted a letter confirming that Crown Castle's
facilities are small wireless
facilities. We submitted a lane
appraisal report which looked at
potential diminution in property values, based on existing Crown Castle nodes, not only in this area, but in the City of Rye in Westchester.

With that, Mr. Mayor, I'd be happy
to answer any questions the Board may have this evening.

Thank you.
MAYOR DeVITA: Mr. Comi, would you
like to comment first?

MR. COMI: Thank you, Mayor.
As the Mayor mentioned, our
organization is the Village's wireless municipal consultant. We happen to be the largest one in the country. We work only for the municipalities. We have no relationship to Crown Castle or any of the wireless carriers whatsoever or anybody that works in our organization.

I'm going to split what I say into two things this evening. I will be very brief, yes, I understand the weekend is
coming.

The first one will be to make some general comments overall that are related to a number of the sites or a number of the issues as we see them and then $I$ will take the six sites that they talked to and go down through them very briefly. And when $I$ do that, if they will put it up on the screen to make life easier for everyone.

First of all, the one thing that we still haven't seen that we asked for and we require is the proof of need for each and every one of these nodes individually. We have not seen the data we asked for. By the way, it was asked for at the last two meetings and you didn't hear Mr. Gaudioso say that he provided any information in his updated report because he didn't. So we still believe that it is needed because the system doesn't have to have all 25
offering. So there may be the
possibility that by some moving or some
other issue that some of them are not
required; that's number one.

One of the issues that has been looked out throughout and that the applicant has said that they cannot do is putting facilities on what is known as a LIPA pole and the community and others that we work in have asked why.

To this date, to the best of my knowledge, no agreement has been shown that says that they could not go on an existing LIPA pole. In a number of cases in the community they are saying, well, we can't use that pole, we have to put a new pole in, which, in some cases if it's a stealth pole it may be the right thing, but in other cases if that existing LIPA wood pole is in a most obtrusive -- least obtrusive place, you may want to use it. That is a second item.

One item they did address is we brought up the issue that anything in terms of attachments, electric or whatever that's got to cross a road will go underground and they must bore it and
not cut up the road and they have agreed to do that.

You heard Mr. Gaudioso say that the size of the antennas was in the
documentation to establish the fact that it meets the small cell arrangement. We disagree. The letter that was provided was provided by one of their individuals, a senior planner, an $R F$ person, and $I$ only add this for clarity, he is not a licensed PE. But, at the same time in their application about a year ago, their licensed PE did state in their document that the antenna was 15 and-a-half inches by 84 inches which exceeds the government definition of a small cell which is 3 cubic feet. Also, in an $F C C$ document back in 2014, FCC 14-153, it states in here that Crown Castle currently deploys antennas and small cell networks that are significantly larger than the 3 cubic feet.

So, my interpretation of what their licensed PE -- by the way, it was there
structural firm, and yes, they did sign violations PE at every site to say that's the antenna. Now you have another letter by an individual who is not a PE that says, oh, it's really got 18 antennas inside. So one was right and one was wrong and I tend to go with the licensed PE who puts his license on the line saying what he's provided and stamped is accurate.

They have addressed, as you've heard this evening, the noise levels. And, in fact, what they said to us this evening, which is something else that we have not heard, is that they will turn down the volume, up to 101 degrees to 75 percent and yes, that will reduce the noise level, folks. Like any fan, house fan or whatever, you put it on high it makes more noise than if you put it on low or medium. That is true about their fans also.

One of the issues that is extremely important is the health issue. As the Mayor said, the federal government, in
their ultimate wisdom, has come up with regulations that does not allow this Board to change those regulations, to challenge those regulations, et cetera. All they have is the ability to verify that the regulations, if and when something is permitted and constructed, that the emissions are met. And in that light, we would recommend -- by the way, I'm not recommending the site, I'm simply saying that if a site goes in, we would recommend post-construction testing, actual testing to verify the emissions levels at various distances to absolutely ensure that what has been provided in terms of calculations, and I'm not saying that they are not going to meet the levels, I'm simply saying the community has the right to verify it and $I$ would strongly suggest that that be one of the areas in which they may want to put a condition, should something be granted.

Let me go now to the six locations we are talking about.

MAYOR DeVITA: I have it.

MR. COMI: Thank you, sir.

I have number one here -- let me get out here so $I$ can also see -- is across from Glen Lane.

In the information that was recently provided it states that no location requested, keep as originally proposed. However, our comments that we started and then adjusted stated that the location is still near homes, and as you can see the fence there is a sump area. Why not put it inside the sump. And their proposed picture of where they are going to do it right here is not. Again, looking to become less obtrusive. I'm not saying it's not a ways away from the home, but it could be put inside the gate, it could be screened quite well by some of those trees there and become less visible as to what is presently proposed, okay.

Item number two, or location number two I guess I should say, 695 139 Laurel.

In this particular place they are saying that, yes, they can move the location where the stake is located and put in a new stealth pole. Now, in terms of the stealth facilities, you heard them say that they come up with a new design whereby the equipment goes in the base, in terms of a little triangular area around the outside of the pole.

One of the things that they had previously stated in their letters was that Town's ordinance says ground equipment can be placed underground and they said whatever is on the pole is not ground equipment.

Now, I would argue that's ground equipment, the whole thing. But now that they're putting it on the ground, it certainly is ground equipment and there is nothing that $I$ am aware of that says that equipment could not be put in a vault underground. In fact, it is underground in places, other places in the country, not the ion they were
talking about but this kind of DAS equipment can be put there. So, yes, that is what they said they can relocate to that location for number two.

For item number three, which is 40 Picardy Lane, they again in this case say they can relocate it to where the Village went out and looked and that would make it less obtrusive, folks, in that location by relocating.

Item number 4 is 78 Cherry Lane.
In terms of 78 Cherry Lane, they are stating that they can install a new stealth pole at the location identified, see picture and type. It's in a different location.

Our comment was at first they were just going to move it to the other side of the driveway. Now they're talking about a stealth, a concealment pole. But, again, we believe that the pole could be moved further away from the entrance to the driveway which is on the other side of the road. Again, it may not be a significant item, but it could be relocated to be a little less obtrusive.

For location number five, which is 40 White Oak Drive, they're saying they can install a new wooden pole in a position identified. Here came up the question of why you need a new wooden pole when there's a LIPA pole there. That's the issue in this particular case, why put in a second pole. The industry is saying they can't use the LIPA pole. But they have not documented that to the best of my knowledge.

The sixth location, which is 40 Woodvale, it says they can move it to a new location; however, it is interesting. Their notes -- and this is N670, their notes and what they provided in their binder say a new wood pole. That certainly is not a new wood pole they've shown.

Again, this part of the
documentation of what they have provided says they can move it, but it doesn't agree with the other part of
documentation in terms of what they are showing.

Those are my comments, thank you very much.

Any questions from the Board at this time?

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you, Mr.
Comi.

MR. AVRUTINE: I have a couple of things to supplement from what Mr. Comi offered and $I$ do have a question, as well, regarding the LIPA pole issue.

The position of the applicant had been throughout this process that LIPA poles were not available for their use.

As part of the federal lawsuit, it was revealed that the reason for that is that it is cost prohibitive from their perspective. We are in the process of gaining more information from them on this point, including their pole attachment agreement with LIPA which we are negotiating to receive a copy of. So, at least, at this point in time, it appears that the issue is not one where
the technology precludes it or some other actual functionality precludes it; but, rather, it appears to be an issue of cost.

I would like also, you mentioned the issue about whether the particular antennas qualify as small cells and that in your estimation, Mr. Comi, these installations do exceed that definition.

Can you explain, for the benefit of those in attendance, what the significance of that is.

MR. COMI: Well, first of all, the significance is that the New Report and Order that just came out --

MR. AVRUTINE: When you say report?
MR. COMI: I'm sorry, let me back up a step.

The federal government came out with what they call a New Report and Order 18-133 which went into effect in January. That report and order specifies certain pricing and a lot of the things, but it defines, under the report and order, a small cell as a
facility that has an antenna of 3 cubic feet or less.

Obviously, if I'm correct because the 14 and-a-half by 48 is about 4.6 cubic feet, 50 percent larger, which means it does not comply with the small cell report and order. So that is one of the impacts of it, as well as the fact that over the years a lot of the legislation, not only in this report and order but other things to do with right-of-way had to do with talking about small cells or DAS nodes. Again, the way it's defined and the way it's sized does not comply.

Let me also say that right here on Long Island there is another infrastructure provider that is putting these up, or attempting to put them up, whose antenna is less than 3 cubic feet. MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you, Mr. Comi. I just would like to add one other item with respect to site number 670 at 40 Woodvale.

There was a submission by the
applicant whereby they did propose to change from a wood pole to a new concealment pole. That was part of the previous resubmission depicting that location.

MR. COMI: Yes, I realize that.
I am talking about what they submitted three days ago. What they submitted three days ago says wood pole.

MR. AVRUTINE: Maybe Mr. Gaudioso can clarify.

MR. COMI: It's probably just a typo.

MR. AVRUTINE: I just wanted to make sure that we're clear.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I would like to clarify a few points.

On 40 Woodvale, we agreed to move it. We can do either the stealth or wood pole, those are both alternatives.

On the issue of a small wireless facility, I think I mentioned it the last time but I'll mention it again, the FCC order defines a small wireless facility based on a number of factors:

Less than 50 feet in height, not on tribal land, not FAA -- less than 28 cubic feet of equipment, less than 3 cubic feet for each antenna.

So what we have documented is that within our antennae shroud would be used as a stealth method. We have three sectors of antennas with a total of 18 antennas. So we need the small wireless facility definition.

What the professional engineer submitted with respect to the structural certifications from $I$ believe about a year ago was relating to antennae shroud encloser, so there is no confusion between that.

The small wireless facility definition doesn't limit the carrier or applicant. What it does is it grants a benefit to the carrier or the applicant in two ways:

Number 1, it limits the timeframe for the shock clock, but we're already beyond that even under the old shock clock. So it limited it, a new pole
from 150 days down to a 90 -day shock clock.

MR. AVRUTINE: I'm sorry to
interrupt. The folks here don't even know what a shock clock is, what that reference is.

MR. GAUDIOSO: A shock clock is a reasonable period of time for the Board to act after the application is filed. So the old shock clock for non-small wireless facilities was 150 days for a new pole, now it's been reduced to 90 days. For an existing pole, it's reduced from 90 days to 60 days. That is besides the point.

The other key factor is what it does. It affects what a municipality, in essence, the consultant can charge down to $\$ 100$ per node for an existing pole or $\$ 1,000$ per node to review for a new pole. So that is how it affects Mr. Comi with respect to his fees. So I wanted to make that clear.

Secondly, regarding the comment we didn't submit the RF data, the Code does
not require any specific RF data. We submitted tons of RF data over a year ago, including drive-test data and propagation maps and different affidavits from our RF engineer.

Regarding the issue of the LIPA data, Mr. Avrutine is correct but with one exception.

From day one, our submission noted that the use of the LIPA poles was economically not feasible, that was in our original memo. We've stood by that. I've given you some of the ballpark figures. We provided a form, protective order to your counsel as part of the litigation. We provided that back on May 3rd. Once we have that order implemented we will provide that data to support the difference between the cost to go on a regular pole and the cost to go on a LIPA pole. As indicated before, the difference is staggering, it makes it financially unfeasible.

I think I've responded to all of the items, other than one which is the
vaulting issue. Again, the Code doesn't require pole-mounted equipment, whether on the base or in the middle of the pole. The underground, more
importantly, the new $F C C$ order makes it very clear that any aesthetic, including specifically vaulting or underground requirements have to meet a very specific test.

We cited to the FCC order, that's threefold: It has to be reasonable, it has to be no more burdensome than the other constructed deployments in the area, and has to be objective and published in advance and we believe that does not meet any of those three requirements as laid out in that documentation submitted.

Thank you.
MAYOR DeVITA: So now we will proceed with the Board's questions.

With respect to the LIPA
financials, our attorneys are now negotiating under the auspices of the federal case a protective order to
obtain information. We have, almost at every hearing, basically a new audience, Mr. Gaudioso. We're going to go back and lay a foundation just about what the application is about.

Number one: The question that comes up, one of the most basic, is what is this service that Crown Castle is installing the infrastructure for to be provided by Verizon and possibly other providers in a colocated manner, how is that going to benefit us? Cell phone service, data acquisition.

We understand that this is 4G LTE. How is this service -- what is Crown Castle's basic statement about how this would benefit us?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Crown Castle has a certificate from the state to be able to provide telecommunications within the right-of-way. They provide telecommunications service by building DAS networks. As part of a DAS network they build four colocations specifically as required by your Code.

The initial carrier in this case
would be Verizon Wireless. Verizon Wireless would provide personal wireless services, including, exactly as you mentioned 4G, LTE service with both phone calls and broadband data commingled in one facility. So it would improve all phone call service, it would improve your wireless usage on your laptop or smart phone or any other mobile device you may have.

MAYOR DeVITA: Because questions come up a number of different times, different ways. Mr. Comi was asking for information about certain bands of broadcast that were not provided. And I think Crown Castle is providing information on certain bands, but not others. Can you explain that?

MR. GAUDIOSO: We have shown the need for Verizon service at both the 700 megahertz band and the 2100 megahertz band. The FCC order is very clear that carriers are permitted to densify their networks, that a prohibition of service
would be a material inhibition of service. We believe we've provided all the data that establishes that the criteria -- we believe that we've provided even more data than what is required by your Code.

MAYOR DeVITA: So the question has come up before, Crown Castle's application for this service is that it will provide $4 G$ service. This is not for 5G, correct?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

MAYOR DeVITA: My question is -everyone is being bombarded by everything on TV, every newspaper about 5G is coming.

Are you, in essence, asking for a system that by the time this is completed and installed this would be outdated?

MR. GAUDIOSO: No.

MAYOR DeVITA: 5G, you're finished installing it and all of a sudden you or another carrier-installer is now looking for a 5G system.

MR. GAUDIOSO: That is not correct.

So, as we have seen, since original cellular service, now we call 1G, there's always been a revolution of technology. The technology is basically overlaid on the existing infrastructure, and we would expect the same thing with whatever technology is coming in the future.

The reality is that LTE technology will remain in place for a long period of time. We would expect that 5 G and 4 G LTE would overlap for a significant period of time, if not for the entire duration of both.

MAYOR DeVITA: Actually, the last time one of our audience members asked that in the infrastructure you are proposing, is it capable of handling 5G?

MR. GAUDIOSO: You would have to define for me what $5 G$ means, that is really -- each market --

MAYOR DeVITA: Doesn't the industry define it yet?

MR. GAUDIOSO: No. Part of the
process we know is that it would be a much faster service and we know that there would be much lower latency periods. We suspect we would probably use different frequency bands, different technologies. But until that comes to fruition and an application made for 5 G service, $I$ can't tell you for sure that these facilities would be used for 5 G service. The expectation is they would be capable of handling 5G service. That is not what the application is for. The application is for remedying a need for Verizon's 4G service.

MAYOR DeVITA: So, one of the issues that comes up is, and Mr. Comi mentioned it, is the emission issue. So the federal government has set certain standards for radio frequency emissions, which is what we're talking about here.

You submitted reports, basically the three different heights of poles, the wood pole with the antennae on top, the side-mounted pole -- side-mounted
antennae and stealth pole antennae and reports for each of those in terms of compliance.

Do you want to summarize what that is so we can ask questions about that?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Sure. What the FCC has put out is Bulletin OET 65, it's laid out technology in determining whether a wireless facility complies with the $F C C$ radio frequency exposure guidelines.

We basically have three different height poles. The height is 43 feet for the center line of the antennae and that maximum power under the $F C C$ formula, the RF exposure would be approximately 1.5 percent of the allowable 100 percent limit. So actually, a wooden pole top is actually the amount that is the lowest in comparison to the applicable standard. The stealth pole, by way of comparison because it's lower in height would amount to approximately 2.8 percent of the allowable FCC standard.

In any case, the facility would be
in compliance with the $F C C$ radio frequency exposure guidelines.

MAYOR DeVITA: You talked before, assuming these things were put in place our Code allows us to have some type of enforcement mechanism for compliance and I assume, in terms of compliance and measuring, actual testing of compliance of these facilities. I assume that Crown Castle would not oppose that type of testing to ensure compliance.

I assume there would have to be some type of compliance if and when they would be installed.

MR. GAUDIOSO: That is not correct. I'm not going to opine on a potential condition until I actually saw the condition of approval. We don't believe the actual testing is required, permitted under the federal law, but we would be happy to see what the condition would be and see if it was something we can accommodate.

MAYOR DeVITA: Just the issue about whether the antennae is on top of the
small cell facility.

So I understand it, I read in submissions, so Crown Castle's argument is the top cannister is really broken down into three sections with six antennas in each section. And Crown's position is that each section of the cannister is a separate small cell facility and, therefore, shouldn't add up the three together and come up with this total cubic feet.

Is that basically?
MR. GAUDIOSO: Close.

The definition includes a number of factors, one of which is each antennae shall be no more than 3 cubic feet. So we have a stealth cannister in the three sections. So not each section is not in and of itself a small wireless facility, it's that each antennae is less than 3 cubic feet; therefore, the entire facility meets the definition of a small wireless facility.

MR. AVRUTINE: You mean each of the 18 antennas?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Each of the 18 antennas.

MAYOR DeVITA: It's each of the six, you're talking saying each of -MR. GAUDIOSO: So what we showed was even if you went by sectors, we have three different sectors. Then we have six antennas per sector. So no matter how you splice it, no pun intended, you would have less than 3 cubic feet for each antennae, which is how the definition of a small wireless facility reads.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: So they all have different functions, each antennae.

MR. GAUDIOSO: So, in essence, the antennas operate at different frequencies, they operate and receive and transmit modes so they have some different features and some overlapping features.

What typically happens, and you will see this on a cell tower, you will see the tower and then you will see three sectors, usually about a 10 or

12-foot triangle on top, then you will see three or four antennas on each triangle. So if you didn't have that triangle, sometimes they'll put one antennae flush mount on the pole for three different sectors. So if we did that, we would have three different antennas which would be clearly less than 3 cubic feet.

What we've done is we've come up with an alternative technology, which is exactly what your code requires and preferences, and we come up with it inside a stealth radon cover to conceal everything.

MAYOR DeVITA: Talking about your RF emission reports. Are they based on frequency emissions for the total of 18 antennas or for one individual antenna?

MR. GAUDIOSO: For the entire facility.

MAYOR DeVITA: So we're talking 18 antennas.

MR. GAUDIOSO: So the number of antennas isn't what dictates radio
frequency exposure. A couple of terms to make sure we're talking about the same thing. The standard is not an emission standard. An emission standard is something that comes out of something. Exposure is something where a human can potentially be exposed to something. These are exposure standards, not emission standards. That is important to understand. It's all based on distance where a person can normally be.

MAYOR DeVITA: So exposure in this case is based on --

MR. GAUDIOSO: Is based on --

MAYOR DeVITA: Is based on --

MR. GAUDIOSO: -- the way the formula works, and I'm simplifying it, but it's in the report. The way the formula works is you look at frequency bands, that has an impact. It looks at power that goes in because that has an impact and it looks at the way the antennae propagates a signal, that has an impact. The way you could propagate
a signal is you could propagate the signal right now and would be in one location, or in a wider location. So the formula you take into account is those are different parameters and produces a final result of what the exposure would be. Then that is compared to what the allowable exposure is.

MR. AVRUTINE: Just to clarify, Mr. Gaudioso, the information that you provide in that regard is based upon a mathematical computation because, obviously, there is nothing to test. So that goes to the issue of what the Mayor has raised and the Board members have raised about the verification aspect of this at such time as the facility is installed to ensure that the math is proven out to be accurate, essentially.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I think the FCC has sole jurisdiction over that, but unless and until there is an approval with the condition, there's really nothing for me to oppose at this point.

MAYOR DeVITA: Let me ask about aesthetics.

A couple of hearings ago we produced this picture and we discussed this at the hearings that PSEG wanted to get into the act and they're metering all the preexisting ones in other communities, other preexisting Crown Castle installations, so, this is what they are coming out looking like. You did at the last hearing say you would try and find out information about how PSEG needs to work together to improve this appearance.

A couple of things. So, these are -- the reason what $I$ did was -- here, you will see there are two pictures for each node. They look the same. But, for instance, this you have, this was the original submission for this line, this is 40 Picardy Lane and it has the box. It doesn't show the PSEG attachments, the meters. And your new submission is -- maybe a tough one to tell, but you pictured it with the box
but colored on the same, instead of that gray, correct me if I'm wrong, this is --

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

MAYOR DeVITA: You have presented it as a brown-colored meter box attached to $a$ Crown Castle facility box.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct. We confirmed in the letter that we submitted that it could be located on the 9:00 or the 3:00 location on the pole so it will be on the side which I think would be more out of the way. We confirmed that we would work with PSEG to minimize the wiring which I think was a concern the last time. We also confirmed it could be pointed to match the pole and/or the box. So we showed what the rendering there was, what it would look like based on the side and specification we also submitted as well.

MAYOR DeVITA: This brought up another issue which counsel raised.

PSEG has the right to come into our communities and slap meter boxes in a
right-of-way. In any event, that is for another day.

But the other thing was with respect to PSEG, as part of your submission you indicated -- this, I believe, was part of your submission, to show the stealth poles you're working on to put the PSEG meters in the shroud at the bottom; is that right?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

MAYOR DeVITA: The thought was, the thought occurred to me is there any reason you can't -- instead of having boxes even for the wood poles, use the shroud pole which hides everything at the bottom, instead of having a 4-foot box and the meter on the wood pole.

So instead of having this, instead of having the box, everything in your line of sight --

MR. GAUDIOSO: The clamshell rather than the box, we can certainly look at that. That's the first I've heard that suggestion so that's certainly something we can look at.

MAYOR DeVITA: By the way, just so people understand, we're asking questions and talking now about moving poles and that is because part of your requirement is to see if there are better aesthetics of putting these things and where can they go and what they look like. It doesn't mean we are approving them. But part of our duty is to look into them to see what other options there are, again, all the different segments of our ordinance that require us to investigate the aesthetics of these things.

Do you want -- I'm not going to get into the vault. We talked about that. We're understand your position.

But there was a submission in your latest submission, May 14 th letter from Edward Champion, and on the second page of the letter it states:

As previously detailed, Crown Castle agreed to place utilities underground for proposed stealth facilities and overhead where there are
wood poles and existing aboveground utilities.

It seems to be at odds with what you were saying before.

Am I misreading that?
MR. GAUDIOSO: No. The utilities, the way your Code reads there is ground-mounted equipment. If you have a separate stand-alone ground-mounted equipment, just like a transformer box -- and we submitted photographs throughout the Village showing that these are permitted above ground. But in your wireless Code, you have a provision that if there is ground-mounted equipment, that it may be required to be vaulted.

Then there is -- and we are not ground-mounted equipment. Number 1; we're putting on a pole or the base of a pole, that is number 1. Number 2, we submitted and a letter regarding FCC requirements. Number 3, with respect to utilities which are the electric and fiber that go to the facilities, we have
agreed to go underground to the stealth poles, even though $I$ think there is a strong argument to be made under the FCC order that because you are not requiring that of any of the other infrastructure deployments in the right-of-way, that is not required.

But Crown Castle has agreed, with respect to its utility lines servicing the nodes, the stealth poles, that we would go underground or the areas where there is an above ground wood utility pole, we've asked for permission to go above ground saying the other utilities are currently above ground, to the existing utility poles in the area.

MAYOR DeVITA: This doesn't really -- under the section vaulting equipment really has to do with the attachment of the wires and we did talk about this. We knew they are already here or coming and Crown has agreed they would missile.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Whatever the specification is that the Village has. MAYOR DeVITA: This is saying not
referring to acceptance of a vaulting of the other Crown -- for instance, the boxes.

MR. GAUDIOSO: The term utilities in this letter is referring to the utilities that are servicing the pole, not at the ancillary equipment on the pole.

MAYOR DeVITA: Let's go back to the fan operation again.

Explain to the audience how this came up and $I$ would ask you to summarize it. So, the question was, there is a fan, a cooling fan in these ground boxes and I see falls in the shroud for the stealth poles and it does make some noise. Our ordinance requires basically an ambient noise requirement which is normal noises, that kind of thing. We want more specificity about when these fans would activate. And Mr. Gaudioso in the past indicated they would be temperature sensitive because the warmer they got, that's when the fans would come on and stay on or go off, whatever.

So the way this submission was, basically May 14 th or May $15 t h$ I think it was, I'm just going to read this one sentence, and maybe Mr. Gaudioso you can explain it. It clearly is -- and I'm not going to browbeat you over this -but it clearly is an accommodation that Crown is offering.

It says: In an effort to
accommodate concerns of the Village
Board and to minimize noise, Crown
Castle is willing to agree as a
condition of approval to set a maximum fan speed of 75 percent of maximum flow for ambient temperatures below -- forget celsius, 101 Farenheit. This will lower the noise below 45 decibels, 5 meters away, the equivalent of a quiet conversation. If the temperature goes above 101 degrees Farenheit, rare if ever -- well, not in the last few years -- the fans will go to the full 100 percent speed.

Could you kind of summarize what, exactly, that means in every day
experience. Last time we had someone here who said if you stand outside in your yard we wouldn't hear a car for an hour.

So how would this relate to that in terms of when it would go on?

MR. GAUDIOSO: We showed in the original report last year that a car at 5 miles-an-hour would be approximately 50 decibels at 15 meters away and a truck at the same speed would be about 74 decibels. As you increase the speed of a car or a truck, the car goes at 20 miles-per-hour up to 57 decibels and a truck goes up to about 75 decibels.

What we also showed is that at the same distance the fan, at maximum operation, would be well below that. It would be approximately 34 decibels, so it would be below the ambient amount of noise, and that is at 15 meters.

What we said was that the fan, we showed the exact numbers, but when the fan is not at maximum power it goes up depending on the temperature. But we
would lower the fan below 101 degrees Farenheit to a 75 percent output which at 5 meters, which is very close, it would be all the way down to 45 decibels which is a quiet conversation. If it's above 101, quite frankly, if we don't put the fans on the system it will overheat, the service will go out. That affects emergency service units.

You asked a question before about service. One of the things $I$ think $I$ overlooked is many emergency response providers use Verizon or other carrier's service, and that's just the reality. So we believe that at that type of temperature that's generally during the day, that's generally when other air conditioning units are on at residences, so we believe that's a reasonable accommodation above and beyond what the Code requires to go down to 45 decibels at 5 meters.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: Equal to what?
MR. GAUDIOSO: A quiet conversation.

MAYOR DeVITA: A couple of things.

In your submissions, you indicated one address that you had to move because it's too close to another node, this is not one of these nodes tonight. Just so you know, we have construction work on Cold Spring Road. We haven't had a chance to get out there, we're hoping to next week.

MR. GAUDIOSO: If you want us to join you we can send somebody to join you. We've offered an alternative spot. I think we couldn't go to the north, we can go to the south, we'd be happy to do that. But every other location and every other design change we've agreed to.

MAYOR DeVITA: So, just on the submissions about relocation there were just two comments. One was for node 677, of which I'm trying to remember the address. It's 8 Woodvale, it's the next hearing. But $I$ think we had also asked about screening, but we can talk about that at the next hearing.

Then with respect to node 701, which is really on Stillwell, but I think the address is for 3 Picardy, so it says no relocation requested. I'm not going to get into the whole thing. Across the street is the town property, Stillwell Woods.

So we had suggested that and know your position. You mentioned that. And in going over the transcript, you mentioned about needing a State Legislative Act because it's parkland. My experience has been that it is necessary for State land.

A perfect example up here is when they built the Cold Spring Harbor Library. That was State parkland and they got a legislative act to change it and to donate the land so they could build the Cold Spring Harbor Library. But this is town land, $I$ don't think that is required.

MR. GAUDIOSO: If it's parkland, there is no distinction.

MAYOR DeVITA: I'm not sure how
they characterize it.
MR. GAUDIOSO: If it's used, if it's dedicated, if it's deeded, even if it's just used as parkland, it requires state legislation. But $I$ think the bigger issue we indicated was the Oyster Bay situation.

MAYOR DeVITA: I understand, I don't want to get into all of that again. I just wanted to know, obviously, we did request -- I understand Crown Castle's position about it.

By the way, for this noise reduction information, would that be applicable to the shroud on the stealth pole, as well?

MR. GAUDIOSO: We can address the fan and the stealth pole, as well.

MAYOR DeVITA: Just so the audience knows, word has been out that this application is ongoing, it's been a long-term process. We have been out many times for each of the node positions throughout the Village, this
south part of the Village, the 25 , many times.

Some of us, actually, Rich and I recently went Monday to visit the ones that are the subject of tonight again, and Crown has been amenable to change the locations.

It's funny, you go out there now, we were out there maybe two months ago and there were no leaves. And you think, well, if you put it here, the leaves will cover it. If you go out now and it's different, it is or isn't covered. So I have some other suggestions that may have already been -- even though these poles may have already been moved or accommodated by Crown, I mention them, nevertheless.

I just want to go back. By the way, we might as well just get to this stuff, Kevin will probably mention it.

Trustee Jusko had taken this picture of Bryant Park in New York of Crown Castle, what we thought was a facility underneath. We thought maybe
that it was vaulted and Crown submitted this. You can explain that, Mr.

Gaudioso. Somebody went to Bryant Park and opened --

MR. GAUDIOSO: Yes. It's a fiber splice, it's not the ion, not an ion that would be in the shroud. That is an electronic piece of equipment that we have to keep cool and vent and exhaust. It's just completely an apples to oranges comparison to what we are proposing here.

So in this case, with a fiber splice we're able to put it underground; with an ion for a DAS node, we're unable to. That's what we submitted in the report.

MAYOR DeVITA: So this is --
originally, it was across the street and Crown did agree to move it to the sump. And our only thought was now we see out there, it's hard from this picture, but those in the neighborhood know, so right across the -- really, across the street from here there is a -- I apologize, I
don't know the resident's name, but it's kind of a corner slanted house -Donovan. One thing I said the objective standard is you have so much frontage these things should not go in front of someone's house.

So, the thought was really when you -- even with trees out from their house across the street looking at it, the thought was we had -- Rich and I were out there. If you moved it 30 feet or so to the right and placed it not in the sump in the -- closer into the bushes so it's virtually invisible.

MR. GAUDIOSO: So we don't have permission to go into the sump. We're happy to push it up against the bushes if you think there is a spot within 30 feet that would be amenable to the Village, I think we can accommodate that.

MAYOR DeVITA: Node 695, 139 Laurel Lane.

So, we were out there. Again, there is a stealth pole, $I$ believe,
under consideration. Our initial
assessment was there's a pole 6 that could be used. We don't -- those poles are not --

MR. GAUDIOSO: We agreed to use a stealth pole.

MAYOR DeVITA: So we thought that there was an area further southeast where there are trees where this could be placed.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is the top of the hill, crest.

MAYOR DeVITA: Up and down, and you don't want to go -- are the Flints here?

Their house is right down this way and there's actually construction that is the Salinger's old house and are they here? People who lived right to the right here, the Bakers. Anyway, their house is right here. But just here is a very wooded area across the street, not in front of anyone's house, across the street there, also. We suggest just to move it further south about 30 feet.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I think we did agree to move that one.

MAYOR DeVITA: But, at least from this picture --

MR. GAUDIOSO: This is an older picture. So in our site notes which we submitted recently, we agreed to move this one to the location.

MAYOR DeVITA: This is pole 6 -- I can't tell if it's a LIPA pole or a Verizon pole. It seems to be the perfect pole. But in any event, we can discuss that, if it's turns out to be a LIPA pole. But the thought was if it was a stealth pole it can be buried in the wooded area there.

MR. GAUDIOSO: We will see the photo, we agreed to that. That was 695, you said, correct?

MAYOR DeVITA: Yes.

MR. GAUDIOSO: We agreed to relocate it down where the stake was, actually showed a photograph of that in our site notes and move the location.

MAYOR DeVITA: 40 Picardy, these
are the recently submitted ones.
MR. GAUDIOSO: These are the
original locations. I take that back, these are the amended locations. After your consultant had made a
recommendation, we made changes. Then we did update these with the LIPA meter pans. And then we submitted the sight notes where we agreed to relocate and change the design based on our --

MAYOR DeVITA: Correct. As I said before, $I$ recognize that. The only difference is it's a different season, you see things differently, especially with the trees out. There may be places with better coverage.

So this 40 Picardy house across the street, I thought if this could be moved down or deeper. This is where the leaves barely come out.

MR. GAUDIOSO: We've agreed to move it one down, I believe to the left.

MAYOR DeVITA: In terms of -- the stakes are still out there. I assume -I think the stakes are there, so this
one is indicating a further southern position in the wooded area.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct. I think we agreed to that.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: So the stakes are the newest, the latest.

MR. GAUDIOSO: When we were out -Trustee Jusko, I believe was, and Trustee Nemshin and Mayor DeVita -- I believe we moved some of the stakes, but I don't remember whether we had agreement on the relocation. So...

MAYOR DeVITA: I recognize that.

MR. GAUDIOSO: We took photographs of that.

MAYOR DeVITA: Correct. What Rich is saying now is it's a different season, maybe a few feet can make a big difference.

MR. GAUDIOSO: If it's matter of a few feet, as long as there's not some type of obstruction, we're willing to accommodate that request. I think we just need something back detailing where, exactly, you want it so we can
take a look at it.
MAYOR DeVITA: The next one is 78 Cherry. This one had been a -- Crown has agreed to move. Rich and I were out there and it's a tough area. It's really -- we couldn't agree as to where it should go because it's an area of Cherry that is very open, there is not a lot of foliage.

MR. GAUDIOSO: This one we agreed, it's a stealth pole, we agreed to relocate it.

MAYOR DeVITA: Actually, further right now, there is a bend around, because actually where it is right here, it's at the end of someone's driveway. They're probably here. And the thought was, my thought was moving to the right seemed to be around the bend there. But Rich had the idea we put a pole there. Maybe it would be better if there was another pole, move the pole on the left.

Rich?
TRUSTEE NICKLAS: Next to the left a little bit closer to the --

MR. GAUDIOSO: We can't be right on top of the hydrant.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: What is the distance?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Depends on where the water line is. That's why we have to use that distance.

MAYOR DeVITA: Let me ask you a question. I know we have Syosset Cherry Hill residents here.

So going back to the bridge. The Cherry Lane nodes. This, I believe, is the one we're talking about.

Now, presently, in the Oyster Bay Syosset part of Cherry Lane there are two antennae node facilities that have been installed.

Have they be been turned on?
MR. GAUDIOSO: I would have to know the exact location.

MAYOR DeVITA: There are only two on Cherry Lane.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I'm not familiar with them.

MAYOR DeVITA: Do you know?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can $I$ show you?
MAYOR DeVITA: Do you know if they're turned on?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You can't tell
from looking at them.
MAYOR DeVITA: We have seen them.
I guess my question is at the beginning of all of this, we talked about this, establishing a grid for service.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Right.
MAYOR DeVITA: Are those facilities that are installed, whether or not they are on, is that part of the same grid that Crown Castle is establishing?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Unless I know exactly what you're talking about, I don't want to speculate. I would have to look into it.

MAYOR DeVITA: I would have to think they are because that's close.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I don't know. I don't know if they're Crown facilities. I don't know if they are on air, if they're the subject of litigation that
your counsel and your consultant are aware of in Oyster Bay. So, unless I saw exactly where it was and the address was I don't speculate.

MAYOR DeVITA: 40 White Oak.

Rich and I out were out there, it's also a very tough one. And we agreed to move it, put in the stake. We thought if it was hidden by trees it is not in direct view of someone's front yard. The thought was if it was moved down to the wooded area here where it was not across from anyone's house, and how far 50,100 feet, so we make that suggestion.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Again, I think that's where we agreed to move it. MAYOR DeVITA: No, this is after the, after the --

MR. GAUDIOSO: This is new? MAYOR DeVITA: Yes, I understand. MR. GAUDIOSO: What I suggest is that you provide us with a detailed map showing the location that you prefer, then we could have the engineers confirm it.

MAYOR DeVITA: Okay, fair enough.
Okay, there seems to be a very easy solution to this one, it's 40 Woodvale. Up the hill right around here there is a cul-de-sac but it's very wooded and there is a -- right before someone's property begins, there is a wooded section where the pole -- actually, the pole that is there ends the - it's a utility line. That may be a LIPA pole. But the thought was to move this pole, the cell pole to that area. I thought we discussed that once before.

Anyway, again, we'll provide you with a more determinate location.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Right.
MAYOR DeVITA: Jeff?
TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Hi, Mr. Gaudioso, how are you.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Good evening, thank you.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: I know some of the questions that I asked before I'll probably repeat some of them. I have
some new ones just for the benefit of the audience and the residents for this new node that we are looking at for this hearing.

One of the newer questions was you talk about the $R F$ emissions from these nodes and you said there's 1.5 percent for the wood pole at a certain height; is that accurate?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: 2.8 percent for the stealth pole?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: That's the emissions based on standing a certain distance away.

MR. GAUDIOSO: The exposure.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Those
calculations come from an analysis and a lab, essentially, or a calculation based on what is in there?

They're not actually checked on site at other installations that you have; is that correct?

MR. GAUDIOSO: We have checked
other installations with the FCC which has sole jurisdiction to regulate radio frequency exposure and has said the way to determine whether a facility would be in compliance is to follow formulas set forth in its Bulletin OET 65. And the report that we did is based on these formulas, which are in those reports, with all the relative data and then those are the conclusions.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: Then the exposure is at what distance?

MR. GAUDIOSO: So that is at the maximum highest level distance, and shown in the report is different distances. You can see that other distances are less than that, but that amount, that is the highest amount at any location.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: 2.5 percent?

MR. GAUDIOSO: 1.5 and a 2.8.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: If this is by
someone's house, how far is that exposure?

MR. GAUDIOSO: So it's going to
generally be -- so, it will be less than what this number is. This number is based on worst case distance. Worst case distance is not necessarily directly under the pole, because up on the pole it's propagating and is still less than --

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Those calculations, 1.5 or 2.8 percent, that is based on one single carrier in that unit?

MR. GAUDIOSO: That's based on the proposed installation with Verizon Wireless.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: How many more carriers could be added to those boxes?

MR. GAUDIOSO: At least one, possibly two, depending on the technology.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: So would the calculations of the RF be three times this 1.5 and 2.8 , or would it be higher?

MR. GAUDIOSO: It would be higher.
TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: And what they should provide --

MR. GAUDIOSO: We don't know what the other carriers would use.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Do different carriers have different emissions, different equipment?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Absolutely.
MAYOR DeVITA: So the audience understands, this colocation means, our ordinance provides -- generally, telecommunications ordinances will provide colocation which encourages carriers to use the same structure so that you wouldn't have AT\&T coming in tomorrow and say we want to put up a new pole, or Sprint coming in the day after, we want to put in new poles. The idea is to encourage as many carriers as possible to share facilities.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: So let's talk about the fans. You talked about, and they agreed to after the first two hearings, they came back and said we'll lower the speed of the fans which will produce less noise into the environment. That happens, I guess, when they set the
equipment.

How often is the equipment serviced? If it's working nobody comes to check it?

MR. GAUDIOSO: It's remotely
monitored.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: The fans, as well?

MR. GAUDIOSO: I don't know if the fans are specifically remotely monitored, but if the system overheats, that is generally a fan issue.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: I would be curious to know if it is an annual checkup where they come in say, okay, the fans should be at 75 percent, now it's at 100 percent.

Is that something they would do, commit to?

MR. GAUDIOSO: I believe this is a preset speed on the fan that it's set, preset. There's nothing to change, anything like that, it's preset when they install it.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: That same
question applies to checking the RF during the term of the life of the unit.

MR. GAUDIOSO: The facility,
because they're operated on FCC
frequencies by FCC regulation, they have to be in compliance with the FCC regulations.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Does the FCC come in there and verify?

MR. GAUDIOSO: If someone would make a complaint, the $F C C$ would come and verify it.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: How would someone know?

MR. GAUDIOSO: You would have to make -- you would have to leave that to the FCC to come and verify. The Town or the Village or any other municipality simply would not have the jurisdiction. The $F C C$ has sole jurisdiction of that.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: To check that, even over you guys?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct, over any facility that is providing licensed services.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Have you known any situation where a neighborhood or a neighbor or a person called the FCC and said $I$ want you to check the $R F$ on this unit in front of my house.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I've heard of complaints and I've heard of where the FCC has come out and I've heard everything was fine. I could not tell you chapter and verse it's been so long.

I think I mentioned at the least meeting there was a situation in Huntington where Crown Castle voluntarily performed a test and the facility was well within compliance.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: When and if this application gets approved, how long is the installation process, putting nodes up? How long does it take to put one node up? How long does the whole process take? Are you going to be --

MR. GAUDIOSO: It depends on the design. So with the stealth poles we have to put in a foundation, so that's a little bit more difficult. Usually, it's a couple day process for a node. It's usually done a new node at a time. TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: When they come in they typically get it all done quickly and get out?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Yes, absolutely.
TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Would they be agreeable to a set timeframe to complete the job, obviously, within reason of -MR. GAUDIOSO: It would have to be reasonable. Again, $I$ don't know of any other utilities that has a set timeframe to do the work, it also depends on the --

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Once the job is halfway done, left alone.

MR. GAUDIOSO: It is not in our best interest, obviously, because we want to get the service up and running. It also depends on weather and having equipment on hand. It is not like building a shopping center where it's a 12-month process. This is a couple of days, if not, a couple-hour process in most cases.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: For each node? MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: What kind of equipment, is it heavy equipment?

MR. GAUDIOSO: It depends on the type. Usually you come in with a bucket truck and that's how they install it with a bucket truck. But, again, to put in a foundation for the stealth pole they have -- that's a little bit more complicated.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Thank you.
So this whole concept of it's bigger than -- I'm not sure what Dick Comi explained to me. It's done to meet the requirement of the node, the size requirement.

Can these antennas be out in the open or do they have to be in a box, just curious.

MR. GAUDIOSO: You have seen --

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Or is the box
part of --

MR. GAUDIOSO: The cannister is the stealthing that stealths everything
together, that's the benefit of it. If you see some older facilities, even by some Crown competitors, you will see two big paneled antennas strapped to a utility pole. That's the older style.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: They are
enclosing them to hide them?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: I asked you once before whether Crown would commit to, if these units were to go in, if you would commit to update the technology; in other words, if what you have at the node is $X$ cubic feet, then let's say a year or two they come out with the same thing but much smaller, would you commit to reducing the size of the --

MR. GAUDIOSO: This is way too speculative for me to make any type of commitment on something like that.

MAYOR DeVITA: The right-of-way agreement you indicated you can agree to put newer technologies after a certain legacy period, correct?

MR. GAUDIOSO: I'm not 100 percent
following. The reality is that telecommunications equipment is constantly evolving and sometimes it gets bigger, sometimes it gets smaller. This is our proposal right now. I can't commit to something so speculative.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: One more question.

The LIPA meter, I know you
explained. I guess this was since the last hearing you got some additional feedback from LIPA as far as incorporating those electric meters, blending them in more into the installation. So for the wood pole installations, it would still be basically on the side of the box now painted brown, as opposed to what we had in the past. Your box was brown, their stuff was gray, all can sort of be blended up.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Cleaned up.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: And for the stealth installation, those LIPA meters would be actually inside?

MR. GAUDIOSO: We're trying to obtain the ability to do both with LIPA and internally. If we can, we're happy to do that. If not, we show in the renderings what it would look like, that small 9 by 13-inch meter just above the base of the equipment.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: So that would also be on the outside of the -- really, you have the stealth thing.

MR. GAUDIOSO: The meter is on the back side.

TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Okay, thank you.
MAYOR DeVITA: Rich?

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: As a Board, we are trying the best we can to mitigate the aesthetic impact on the residents. I appreciate the fact you seem to be willing to work with us on that.

The thing -- and it's nothing that we can control as a Board that was stated to us that the emission thing is that we're not going to have any right to deny the application based on emissions. But $I$ know, and we have not
heard from these folks yet, but at all the other meetings this has been a big concern of people.

You can tell from the question $I$ asked, $I$ 'm trying to get a handle on it and, frankly, I'm confused. You know, you can give me numbers and exposure and that type of thing, but $I$ don't know what impact that has and maybe there is some way you can bring it back down.

How do you compare this thing which is up against our head every day?

MR. GAUDIOSO: So, I appreciate your comment. And I think a lot of people struggle with it because it's something we don't see and something we don't normally do. That is the exact reason why Congress preempted the issue because it wanted an expert agency to handle the issue and that's why they preempted it.

But some of the information that we have talked about in the past is they've been compared to the emission WIFI routers or baby monitors. Everything
gives off RF, whether it's the lights or whether it's your body.

When we've done the tests inside the homes, it is not the microwave, the oven. The refrigerator has a large motor that creates the radio frequency exposure. So, that is what we've seen. That has been the experience. Those are the anecdotal comparisons I'm trying to put in context for you.

But at the end of the day, the FCC has set a limit that's the law of the land. Not only are we below that limit, we're literally 50 times below that limit. So that's the best $I$ can offer.

MAYOR DeVITA: I don't mean to
interrupt you but just so the public knows, outside of the context of the lawsuit and the hearings, $I$ have had discussion, and I sent a letter around to our residents, that Congressman Suozzi has been active in this and kind of --
(Applause.)
We don't need that, please, hold
your comments.

That any change has got to come from the federal level. We have the second most powerful Senator in the country from New York, and we have another Senator -- is he running for president? I don't know what he's doing. Those are the people you should be writing with respect to these health issues.

I will say this, the federal
standard is from essentially 1997, and Congressman suozzi, with respect to the RF emissions, has asked the FCC to do updated studies about it. There have been all types of impending scientific studies, many inconclusive. There is an infamous toxicology report. I have read that, the opposition, the reply, and there is quite a debate about that. It has to do with tumors developed in mice. One thing at the end of that report they say is tell your kids don't sleep with the phone under their pillow and don't have young men walk around with that
phone in their front pants. I'm not kidding, that it what the report says. So, the point is, what Rich is trying to say and what $I$ tried to say at the beginning, for instance, and you have three, four lawyers here involved with the Board. If we were to issue a decision that said we don't want these nodes because we are afraid of health concerns the Federal Judge in this case would say oh, that is your decision? Judgment for Crown Castle. You can put these things wherever and however you want.

Am I right, gentlemen?
MR. MACY: Yes.
MAYOR DeVITA: The other thing is we have been asked and it might have been by people who have been here before, you know, the community is against this.

So here we go. We even -- and someone even recommended the last time a referendum.

First of all, the Board has a
responsibility as fiduciaries to do what's best for the Village, and $I$ can't tell you how seriously we take that and how hard we work. If we were to have a referendum and the Village votes, I don't care 51 percent, 75 percent, okay, against it. We issue a decision saying Crown Castle's application is denied because the public doesn't want it. Guess what? The Federal Judge said, oh, is that your decision? Judgment for Crown Castle, you put these wherever and however you want.

Our job is, under the facts as submitted, which are thousands of pages of documents, hundreds of pages of what will be here in transcripts, the law as promulgated by federal government, the FCC, local ordinance, those are things we have to consider in the end. And part of your comments we are going to hear them and we love to hear them. That's fine.

We know there are going to be health concerns raised and we are happy
to hear all of that. We just want you to understand what the limitations are with respect to what we can do, how we can incorporate that into our decision. That's why we asked about our RF emissions compliance testing, which, if and when if these things were to be approved, we would have to make it more detailed so they would understand it. Of course, that would be part of any type of condition of approval. Again, that is not saying we are.

So we are aware of the law. We are aware of what our obligations are. We are aware of what is in the best interest of the community and I think that is kind of what Rich's question is getting at. And I'm sorry for that long interruption.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: That's all right, you did a good job.

A quick question. These are being installed, 25 down the southern part of the Village. How big an area is that going to help? Is the cell phone
improvement going to be in the house across the street, two blocks away or what?

MR. GAUDIOSO: So that whole southern area, we submitted a map showing exactly where it would be improved and I think the whole area where the 25 nodes are will be coming.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: Right outside that node.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Nodes, unlike a large 150-foot tower, they don't cover a small area. They cover -- they don't cover a large area, I'm sorry. They cover a small area because of the height, because of the low amount of power and light design, that's technology.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: But all our residents over there are going to be helped.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

MAYOR DeVITA: Kevin?

TRUSTEE JUSKO: I have one
follow-up question.

Most of the times you've addressed in the last two meetings, I asked many questions and they have been addressed. One that has not yet been addressed was the question of LIPA, of your equipment mounted on the LIPA pole, Rogues Path in Huntington.

Have you had a chance to look into that?

MR. GAUDIOSO: We have. Once we have the protective order in place we can respond to that, as well.

TRUSTEE JUSKO: The protective order -- my understanding was that it has to do with the cost.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

TRUSTEE JUSKO: Okay, thank you.

MR. GAUDIOSO: That is not the
same. There are differences between that particular node and the applicant and this particular project. We will detail that once we have the protective order.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Nothing.

Really most of my questions have been answered, except for one to you and can I ask a question to the audience?

MAYOR DeVITA: You did the last time, you did a survey.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: I'll do that one first.

Everyone sitting in the audience, what do you like, which do you prefer, the stealth poles, which are these, or the telephone pole which would blend, you think would blend in more.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Telephone poles. Stealth poles don't --

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Stealth pole, wood pole. Hands up for wood pole?

MAYOR DeVITA: Stealth poles,
these are not final designs. We submitted other recommendations, things that look like a light pole, whatever, so this is just a first representation. And I believe Crown Castle is trying to basically make it look like a utility pole or a tree of some type.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Not a tree, but something more photographic that was
presented.
MAYOR DeVITA: I'm sorry, Jeff.
TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: The second question, the RF emissions.

Are there little gadgets that can test these that a layman can use?

MR. GAUDIOSO: So there are meters. It's very important that the meter be the appropriate meter. They are not cheap, they should be calibrated properly. They should be set by a person who knows how to use them. If someone wants to use something that they find on the Internet, I'll caution you that it might not be a proper reading.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Would Crown ever consider making one available to us so that we can kind of monitor, maybe teach one of our people how to use it and maybe we might feel better if we can self-monitor these ourselves on an ongoing basis.

MR. GAUDIOSO: I've never heard of such a thing. I can certainly take it back to my client. I think it's an
preempted issue, again, the issue of radio frequency compliance and monitoring, so that would be my initial inclination.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: I think it would be -- if we could set up a little bit to have something like that available to us, not a toy, something that might work.

Other than that, that is all my questions.

MAYOR DeVITA: Marty?
TRUSTEE NOVICK: Mr. Gaudioso, if we were able to lease another; in other words, if another carrier comes in, AT\&T, or Sprint, what would the pole look like? In other words, would they have to have their own antennae, their own equipment?

With what we are seeing now proposed by Crown Castle, what would it look like with two more carriers using that pole?

MR. GAUDIOSO: Again, that depends on what the carrier wanted but what our
experience is with this size antenna and with this size box there would be no outward change in the appearance to add another carrier. We believe that that would be likely for a third carrier, but it would depend on exactly how much equipment they wanted.

But from what our experience is today in other jurisdictions, having two carriers with this design, we're able to accommodate the second carrier with no change to that antennae for this box.

TRUSTEE NOVICK: It would be financially and economically a plus with you guys, your client, if they could lease space since you own the antennae or the node.

MR. GAUDIOSO: Correct.

TRUSTEE NOVICK: See, the more tenants you have, the more profitable the deal.

MR. GAUDIOSO: And that's the benefit of a mutual host
telecommunications provider, such as Crown Castle. They're not building infrastructure only for themselves, as maybe one carrier would.

TRUSTEE NOVICK: I understand.

MR. GAUDIOSO: They're complying with your Code.

TRUSTEE NOVICK: I'm going to defer to the people. It's now getting late and they've been so nice sitting here, I know it's got to be tough.

MAYOR DeVITA: Anything else, Mr. Gaudioso, before I go to the audience?

MR. GAUDIOSO: No. Thank you for your time.

MAYOR DeVITA: Nancy or Liz, do you have a list?

I'm sorry, one of our attorneys, Todd Steckler, would like to make comments.

MR. STECKLER: I would just like to address the Board on four things that came up here.

The first involves Mr. Gaudioso's first statement concerning the Certificate of Public Convenience Necessity, CPCN, does permit them to be
a telecommunications provider. If I was a retailer of long distance telecommunications service, I'd want the CPCN. It has nothing to do with the installation of infrastructure anywhere in the state. In fact, the state Public Commission said wireless company providers do not need a CPCN, so you should be aware of that.

The second is the right-of-way.

As I said, the CPCN does not
provide any rights to be in the right-of-way. That right is granted under the Transportation Corporation Law in the State of New York and based on the standards set in there, Crown Castle does not meet the standards to be a transportation corporation.

With respect to the antennas, as the Board will recall in looking at the original submissions, the schematic drawings that were submitted by Crown Castle identified the antennae as a single omni-directional antennae, singular, not plural. So their
submission to this Board, prior to what was requested at the beginning of this month, identified the antennae as a single antennae, omni-directional.

Finally, with respect to vaulting, we became aware that in certain places in this country Crown Castle has vaulted their equipment, either consensually with the municipality involved or with the municipality requiring that down the road. As an example, in Palo Alto they recently allowed them to be above ground, the equipment. They found they did not think that the telecommunications providers, Crown Castle-Verizon, were being honest with the Board in their ability to put them underground and required them to be underground.

We investigated that issue and we believe there is nothing to prevent vaulting in these particular instances.

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you.

Do you have any response, Mr. Gaudioso?

MR. GAUDIOSO: I do.
We do have a CPCN. Wireless providers do not require a CPCN to come in and provide telecommunications service. Crown Castle is a wire-line provider, it's laid out in the CPCN. They provide telecommunications service and they provide personal wireless service facilities that then Verizon Wireless provides the wireless service.

So what Mr. Steckler said was correct, but it was inapplicable to the situation here.

Secondly, regarding the vaulting, again, I don't know what goes on in Palo Alto. I know that there's not the snow and ice that there is in the northeast, that's a big difference from here. We detailed very specifically, both under the FCC order which just became effective in January and the Village Code, why vaulting is not required, in addition to the fact that vaulting is not required on any of the infrastructure providers within the

Village.
Thank you.
MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you.
When your name is called, please step up to the microphone and say your name and address because it's being taken down.

Marsha Held?

MS. HELD: Thank you.
I have not seen --
MR. AVRUTINE: Please give your name and address for the record.

MS. HELD: Marsha Held, 94 Cherry
Lane.

I guess, as a homeowner, I listened and honestly, I'm not interested in this. I think of, personally, I think it's a visual eyesore, visually. I think of the noise. I love living in Laurel Hollow, it's peaceful. You go outside your house. I ask myself as a homeowner does the Village need this at this time.

Now, legally, I'm interested in what the conditions are for denying

Crown Castle. And shouldn't we -- also, I know they probably aren't the only ones who made the application. Aren't there other vendors, if we are going in this direction we want to hear from, other than Crown Castle?

Also, when I listen -- I live on Cherry Lane so, of course, I have a vested interest. I hear that we have two of these nodes in the Syosset part. Why would we then add one on 78 Cherry Lane. How is the grid determined? And, also, why is the north, the northern part of the Village not part of this? Is it just the southern part of the Village, and if so, for what reason.

MAYOR DeVITA: I'll try and answer that backwards, but my opinion is with respect to why only this part of Village, $I$ think it's my opinion, and Mr. Gaudioso told us numerous times that he has no information from his client what the plans are for the future, but I think this is phase one. I mean, really, it covers, this grid is only 40
percent of the Village. There is still a good part south of 25A that is not covered and all of north of 25 A is not covered.

Any business model, when we were -last year when we got our Triple A bond rating from $S \& P$ Global they cited one of the reasons, one of the standards is your ability to repay. The cited to us Laurel Hollow being the eighth wealthiest community in the country. So I can't imagine these companies don't see us as a profit-making center. My opinion, this is the first step and I think there will be more.

Just so you know, it wasn't brought out, that all of these nodes because they don't have an infinite distance of travel. Dick, maybe you can explain why you need a significant number of nodes for this system to work, the short length of travel for these signals.

MR. COMI: Yes. Compared to a tower, an antennae is on a tower, this is much less power and below the tree
level. So, with that in mind, it goes a much less distance from each node so they have to determine where they need to put the adjacent ones in the network so that they are completely covering the area as they stated. In other words, the entire area within the circumference of the 25 nodes will be covered with the service they are talking about.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Can I ask a question?

MAYOR DeVITA: Go ahead.
TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Why would they put more than they need?

MR. COMI: Why would they put more than they need?

We have run into, over the years in a lot of places, the industry putting in what it wants, rather than what it needs, put the best instead of reliable. And, yes, you can say I'm playing semantics, but those semantic words, the reliable, is what is required, not the best service. So sometimes the industry will put in things that it wants that it
doesn't really need.
You heard me tonight. The first thing I said is I am not convinced because I haven't seen what I would like to see in the way of information that they need all of these. I'm not saying that they don't need any of them. I am just saying maybe they can do with 20 , but I don't know yet.

Why would they do it? Because once they put in the first ones, the additional expense when they have got to go through this Board and the hearings and everything else is not significant to put in the others. And if they get, which they do, paid rent on a per-node basis, eventually each one of these is a money maker, so they put them in.

MS. HELD: I would just like to ask, other than Jeff $I$ know, are any of these proposed nodes on any of your streets?

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Yes.
MS. HELD: Personally, I asked myself sitting here, do we need this at
this time? And I would like to ask Dan about what are the grounds for denying Crown Castle? I would like to be clear about that.

Thank you.
MAYOR DeVITA: At this point, maybe Howard can answer that.

Basically, our Code has a laundry list of requirements that they would have to meet. Aesthetics is a big one. We do not have to grant all 25. We can deny some, basically be on aesthetics or some comparable reasoning. We can't say no, because of health concerns.

Joe?

MR. MACY: Can we consult?
MR. AVRUTINE: I think I know where you're headed with this.

I think, unfortunately, due to
litigation that questions are not appropriate for this hearing and to be answered in this context.

Unfortunately, though, I can say
this, whether the community or this
Board feels that they don't need it is
probably not a legal basis upon which you can deny something like this.

The law is clear, and $I$ think as Dan said during his opening statement and comments that the federal government, in its wisdom if you want to call it that, has determined that the country, as a whole, and the economy needs this type of service to flourish. Everyone has read about the competition with other countries, with China, to get to the next level. So that is a public policy set by the government to achieve that. And in their judgment they've removed, really, the ability of local jurisdictions such as Laurel Hollow to limit the carriers and their people that they work with such as Crown Castle to propose and install these antennas.

So it is not something that this Village can do just because it does not like what it hears. The law is very clear as to what the Village can regulate and is very clear as to what it
can't. And that is the work that this Board is so diligently doing in terms of these hearings in terms of this entire process.

MAYOR DeVITA: One other thing I want to make clear, Marsha, because I had a conversation with a resident once and $I$ got the impression that -- and $I$ know you're not saying this but just so you understand when you say why do we need this, just so you understand, we did not invite Crown Castle into this Village. By the same token, we cannot stop them from making an application. So, when I was talking to other residents $I$ was quite surprised because that is certainly not something we did. But they are here. This is the application process and we have to go through it.

Thank you.

Stephanie Perry?

MS. PERRY: Stephanie Perry, 428

Harbor Road, house G.

I understand that we are not able
to make -- based on the concern of the 4G and emissions, but it seems that when asked about -- not from your part but from the attorney representing Crown Castle, that going from the 4 G to a 5 G , from my understanding, and I might need clarification, that once the $4 G$ is in place, then the $5 G$ can get switched. MAYOR DeVITA: That's a good point. That came up at the last hearing. The attorneys tell us no, there would have to be a new application process. And we know, at least from reading, and, again, depending on when $5 G$ is -- and the stuff I read is that the emissions are greater than 4G. In any event, we don't concern ourselves with that. But it just can't come in a way that it's done when we wake up and they swap $4 G$ to 5 G . They have to go through the whole process.

MS. PERRY: The other thing about more than visual components, actually the sound. I walk through all these neighborhoods 10 miles a day, so I know them all very well. And when we're
talking about 5 meters away from a pole, that is actually like if you're walking next to the curb, you're much closer than that and you're actually walking, having a conversation. These are neighborhoods. We live in a quiet, peaceful place. Right now if you go outside, your children are outside. Children are on bicycles, people are walking their dogs. People are working outside in their community. That sound that it is, they are all right there. 5 meters is much further than just walking next to the curb.

To me, that as far as quiet conversation from 5 meters away you're not walking in the middle of the road. We really do use our neighborhood in this way that if you walk around, we are using this space as a community and that sound does affect the way that you and I live in the community and that is the part of it that is concerning.

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you very much.
Debbie Persampire?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She had to go home, I put my name in to read.

MAYOR DeVITA: Just tell me your name.

MS. B: Susan B.
MAYOR DeVITA: Susan, come on up.
MS. B: Susan B, 58 Soundview
Drive, Huntington Bay.
The reason I am here is that I am a representative of Citizens for 5 G Awareness.

First of all, $I$ would like to thank you and commend you all because our Village of Huntington Bay is also being sued. And none of the Huntington Town Board or the Huntington Bay Trustees have been anywhere near how thorough and how responsive you have been to your community.

Tom Suozzi wrote the letter that you referred to because we as a group have brought this to his attention because no one is aware of the rollout of these antennas in our communities. The residents are not aware. And we
just found out that Huntington put them up.

I want to read this that our little founder, I call her founder, Debbie, wrote.

You tell us that small cells only emit 2 percent of $F C C$ limits for microwave radiation. Our United States limits are not protective of health. They were set by industry for industry based on studies from the $80 s$ and have not been updated for over 20 years, despite recommendations to do so from the AAP and GAO. Many other countries' limits are 100 times lower than ours here in the U.S., Italy, Switzerland China, Poland, Lithuania, France and others. In fact, 2 percent of our limits, which you say these small cells emit, is equal to 2 times the amount of radiation these other countries allow, and that's without colocation.

I'm going to submit this, it's just a little chart.

MAYOR DeVITA: Howard, do you want
to -- Liz, can you hand to that Howard?

MR. AVRUTINE: Before you continue, let me just mark this.

It's a document that has at the top: Outdoor pulse RF Radiation Exposure Limits. We will call that Resident's Exhibit Number 1 .

Thank you.

MS. B: Thank you, sir.

Our group has a something that was contributed to us which does measure about 2 percent inside our homes, the homes of those of us who have already been forced to have these small cells outside our children's bedroom windows. On the ground standing within 50 feet of some of these small cells we are measuring 6 percent of the U.S. limits, equal to six times the amount allowable in Italy, Switzerland, Poland and France. This is on our front lawns, on the street where our children play and our backyards. I remember a time that it was safe to let your kids play outside. Even our beaches, schools and
parks have these, there is no break from it.

Why are we so readily exposing our children to this. There are no studies proving children are safe when exposed to long term radiation at these levels and there are thousands of studies showing adverse biological effects at magnitudes lower than the FCC guidelines.

I would like to submit to you a list of these thousands of studies.

Thank you.
MR. AVRUTINE: Before you continue, let me mark this.

This is a multipage -- I'm not
going to count them -- a multipage document with the title on the first page that states the science, it will be marked as Resident's Exhibit Number 2.

MAYOR DeVITA: The 5 G community is not a resident, Howard.

MR. AVRUTINE: I'm sorry.
MAYOR DeVITA: Community.
MR. AVRUTINE: I will change the
other one. I am just marking it for identification purposes.

MS. B: Thank you.

Might $I$ say that the $F C C$ is a captive agency run entirely by telecom people, okay.

MAYOR DeVITA: Please wrap it up, susan.

MS. B: I will.

Having small cell antennas placed every five to 10 homes really changes the feel of the neighborhood. It looks terrible. No one wants to see these as they drive down the street or look out their windows. The stealth pole is even more intrusive than these. Property values will decline. Research indicates that over 90 percent of home buyers and renters are less interested in properties near cell towers.

Documentation of a price drop up to 20 percent is found in multiple surveys. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development considers cell towers as hazardous and nuisances. The National

Association of Realtors did many studies on the impact of cell phone towers on house prices and revealed that proximity to cell phone towers negatively affects house values.

I have some surveys here.
MAYOR DeVITA: You can hand those up to Liz.

Do you want to take them from
Susan? Hand them to our clerk.
MS. B: Thank you so much, thank you for everything, all you're doing.

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you very much, thank you.

Ingrid Wright?
MS. WRIGHT: Ingrid Wright, 103
Cherry Lane.
First, I want to thank you, Dan, and all the Trustees for all the hard work that you give. Thank you all for your diligence.

One thing I want to comment on and this was brought up and it has to do with, and was already mentioned, there are already two existing poles on our
street that are in very close proximity to the pole being proposed.

I noticed the attorney for Crown Castle said, well, $I$ don't know, but I wanted to be sure we are doing due diligence.

It's easy to draw a barrier around the Village and say let's put it here, but obviously, it is all part of the bigger puzzle. If you can avoid putting them in a location because the proximity is in another jurisdiction, we think about the greater space and not just our Village. So that's my first point.

The second one is my husband, believe it or not, the pole closest to our home is actually on the next hearing which we can't be at that one because we have a high school event to be at.

One thing I wanted to mention is looking at state areas, if there's a way it can be pushed closer by the sump, water basin, anyplace to mitigate the location, if you can be thoughtful about that. We can't be at the next one, but

I know Jeff walks his dog and he knows where it is, if you would just be mindful of that, we would certainly appreciate it.

MAYOR DeVITA: Absolutely. I am sure many of us will be out there again.

MS. WRIGHT: Feel free to ring the doorbell.

Thank you, again.

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you very much.

Anne Mayer?
MS. MAYER: Anne Mayer, 10 Harbor Circle, Centerport.

The last time $I$ was here $I$ told you I am an electrical engineer and a safety engineer for 21 years for Underwriter's Laboratory.

MAYOR DeVITA: You're also part of the 5 G .

MS. MAYER: Citizens for 5G, because $I$ care about the Town of Huntington and the women and the children and the men, as a matter of fact.

Let me just tell you something
else. As a daughter of the American Revolution our forefathers would be rolling around their graves hearing you say, well, the federal government says this. Who is the federal government? We are the federal government. We, the people, and the people -- we are old enough to have been taught how to think and be critical thinkers and not just lay down and take this, because it is dangerous.

I can tell you, they haven't done the safety testing on the $4 \mathrm{G}, 5 \mathrm{~g}$ and 6 G . They have done it on the 2 G and 3 G . It is not an infamous study. There is nothing infamous about it except that it's bad for the industry, unhealthy and dangerous and they just sort of wash that away.

There is a website it's called the whistleout.com if you want to see the coverage in your area. You've got 4G, you've got 3G.

These poles, to answer what you said, sir, $I$ don't remember your name,
the poles only have to be as close together as they are putting them in your neighborhood for $5 G$ because you've got 3 G and you've got 4G. They're getting ready and are just laying the ground work to roll in the 5 G .

Also, the stealth pole tower in Centerport was denied, yahoo, and we're really happy about that for a number of reasons. One of the reasons was they did not prove that there were significant gaps in the coverage.

As a gentleman said during that hearing, either there's false advertising when they say there's coverage here, they're either lying or there's coverage and they've got other reasons, as $I$ said, for the $5 G$ to bring these poles in. That's the only reason. You don't need these poles close together for $3 G$ and $4 G$.

The property value issue has been spoken to.

But do you guys have an expert witness to come in here and testify
about property values?

MAYOR DeVITA: We're having a report prepared.

MS. MAYER: And if the property values come down 20 percent, whose --

MAYOR DeVITA: First of all, I
don't want to debate with you. But just so you understand, the attempt to measure property devaluation with respect to these devices is almost -how would you put it, Joe?

MR. MACY: It's extremely
difficult. There are any number of factors that influence it. We are looking at it. Crown has provided a report to us in which they contend there is no effect on the property valuation as a result of this. We are having an appraiser look at that and provide us with a critique so the Board can consider that as part of their -- in consideration of the application.

MS. MAYER: There was a gentleman at the Huntington Zoning Board meeting that sold his house in Centerport 15
years ago because the first antennae they were proposing to put in there. He sold it at a loss and I would say he's an expert witness and --

MAYOR DeVITA: Can $I$ just mention two things on that point? I don't mean to interrupt your presentation. I know you have more to say, but it's very interesting. Not every Village or every Mayor has the same position or thought about that. Number 1, in Old Westbury, Mayor Pete, he basically invited them into his community and they set up nodes. Number 2, another Mayor on the North Shore thinks that it will increase the value of their homes because younger people are moving in and looking to have all the wonderful things -- I'm just telling you, Anne.

MS. MAYER: I know about the health.

MAYOR DeVITA: I'm not saying that's our position. But it's funny, it is not 100 percent.

MS. MAYER: I think if you try to
make that argument everyone will laugh, I'm just telling you.

I have to commend you for what you're doing with your LED lighting. Let me explain something to you that most people don't know. LED lighting, right, you save all this energy. But guess what? Wireless technology, all the nodes, you're concerned about climate change, what's happening. It's 10 times more electricity for a wire-to-wire than for them to bring the fiber optics to their home. You're going to all this trouble to save all that electricity and then they're stealing it from you, from us. Also, the power plants in the Midwest are going to have to be polluting to make the energy that is going to drive 5 G . Nobody talks about that, it's bad for climate change. And we shouldn't be using 100 percent renewable energy, which is what New York State is aiming for, it also wastes 10 times more energy on wireless.

The stealth, just the name of it is deceptive. You mentioned about moving the stealth away from the driveway. Be careful where you move these things because if it's further away from the person's home, they're safer.

Aesthetics, I understand, like you want it to look nice, but you're going to be putting that particular neighbor in more danger moving it closer to their home.

MAYOR DeVITA: We're not doing that to anybody. We're moving it away. We don't want it in front of people's homes.

Why not wrap it up.

MS. MAYER: I am going to wrap it up.

Then he talked about the FCC expert as the experts. They're not experts. It's a revolving door industry, just like every other federal agency which is really sad where our country has gone to.

By the way, the health expert that

Crown Castle had come to Debbie's house, and he actually -- the testimony that he gave that we have more RF emissions in our home is a lie. When you have one of these small cell towers outside of your home, their expert, Crown Castle's expert went to Debbie's home and measured more in her -- from inside her home from that small cell than what you would have from your refrigerator and other devices in your home. And they are cumulative. The more of them you have in your home, like the Alexa and the Internet and bringing in the smart this and that, the more exposure you have and the more you are putting your family at risk.

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you very much. Anybody else?

Yes, go ahead. Say your name and address.

MR. ROMANO: Salvatore Romano, 67 Cherry Lane.

In regards to the tower for 78

Cherry Lane, you are proposing moving it
around the bend which is, in essence, bringing it closer to my home.

MAYOR DeVITA: You are right across?

MR. ROMANO: I am just around that bend, and right around that bend is a family with two young children. So, again, aesthetically pleasing, you want to move it away from the driveway. There is -- where are you proposing to move it towards? There are two on Cherry Lane, one in front of 51 and one further down.

MAYOR DeVITA: I'm glad you
mentioned that, and I hope you heard, too. We can't even really figure out -we had differences of opinion here. No one is saying -- I'm glad you mentioned that.

MR. ROMANO: Again, as you said, I know you're trying to keep it being aesthetically pleasing, but keep in mind there's two on Cherry Lane out of your jurisdiction.

MAYOR DeVITA: What's your address again?

MR. ROMANO: I'm at 67. There is one at 51 and $I$ believe there is one at 31, 37. So moving it around that curb will bring it closer to me and my neighbor.

TRUSTEE NICKLAS: You're right by the fire hydrant.

MR. ROMANO: Right by the fire hydrant there is a cul-de-sac. You can see my home in the picture.

MAYOR DeVITA: The Syosset cul-de-sac is this house.

MR. ROMANO: One other question I had.

Is there any federal requirement for testing after the installation?

Like water has to be tested annually.
MAYOR DeVITA: That came up and I don't want to misstate. Mr. Gaudioso, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe he states that the $F C C$ doesn't require it. Our Code does require it. So to the extent that there is a decision one way or another, our position is we can require it, actual testing.

MR. ROMANO: Obviously, you can't deny them. They're looking to come into the community. I'm sure there's an opportunity to agree on certain conditions.

One of the conditions should be that if there are any changes to something that is approved it has to be brought in front of the committee again?

MAYOR DeVITA: Yes, in other words, swapping out the appearance.

MR. ROMANO: Any change. It's approved on the basis that this criteria today it is approved, it's installed, any changes they have to revisit.

MR. AVRUTINE: That would be what the Village would require.

MR. ROMANO: Okay, thank, you.

MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you.

At this point, there being no further comments -- oh, yes, Chris Melito.

MR. MELITO: Chris Melito, 40 White Oak Tree Road.

My question is has a coverage study of theirs been done with the existing service? And then we have heard 25 cells are not necessary for the requested coverage areas.

Is Crown Castle requesting these nodes for the purpose of upgrading to 5 G where more cells are needed? Currently, 4G you don't need them to be as close. Are they asking for 25 nodes with the intent of ramping up?

MAYOR DeVITA: Dick, you have an answer to the coverage issue, do you want to address that?

MR. COMI: I can address that by saying, as I said, I don't have the information yet that demonstrates the proof of the need for 25 of them. I requested the studies in terms of what you have now. We requested drive test data that was not provided and we requested it for all of the four frequency bands to show what service you have at the present time. That would demonstrate the issue of what coverage
they have now, and we can make a much better determination on what and how many of the nodes are actually needed. I don't have that information. I hate to be the one not being able to give you an answer.

MAYOR DeVITA: You are saying you can't.

MR. COMI: I can't make that
determination without that information.
MAYOR DeVITA: Okay. Do you have any other questions?

MR. MELITO: I think it's interesting.

I have no other questions.
MR. GAUDIOSO: And we have submitted that data, that drive test data. It's in the record.

MAYOR DeVITA: I understand. I
think there is a difference of all opinions as to what information has to be submitted with respect to what bands.

MR. COMI: The service band issue they submitted to date on 700 and 19 -2100, the 4G LTE, the two data bands.

We've requested the information on the four bands that Verizon is authorized, which is the cellular and the PCS that shows what kind of service you have right now.

By the way, you can operate data in those bands, it's just not as robust as the data that you can put in the 700 and 21. That is the information we've asked for, that's what we have not gotten.

MAYOR DeVITA: And Crown Castle's position is they are not required to submit that.

MR. COMI: That's because the only thing they're providing in the nodes is the 700 and 21. They're not putting in new service in the 850 and the 1900 . They're only putting in the two bands and, therefore, they say all we have to do is prove that we have a gap in those two bands. There is nothing that I'm aware of in any federal regulation that says a service provider must have ubiquitous coverage in all of the bands. If they have coverage in the cellular
band in your community they have coverage, they don't have a gap.

MR. GAUDIOSO: The new FCC order
just completely changed that issue. So with all due respect, the new order supercedes --

MAYOR DeVITA: Is that the January?
MR. GAUDIOSO: The order, that was
from September of 2018 that was
effective in January.
MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you.
At this time, $I$ will make a motion
to close the public hearing and keep the record open for 30 days for other written submissions and comments and reserve decision.

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Second.
MAYOR DeVITA: I will poll the Board.

Trustee Jusko?
TRUSTEE JUSKO: Aye.
MAYOR DeVITA: Trustee Nicklas?
TRUSTEE NICKLAS: Aye.
MAYOR DeVITA: Trustee Nemshin?
TRUSTEE NEMSHIN: Aye.

MAYOR DeVITA: Trustee Miritello?

TRUSTEE MIRITELLO: Aye.
MAYOR DeVITA: Trustee Novick?

TRUSTEE NOVICK: Aye.
MAYOR DeVITA: Thank you very much, everyone.

$\qquad$

Mary Anne Coppins
Court Reporter

| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5[1]-71: 20 \\ & 2.8[5]-38: 23,70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125: 24 \\ 428 \\ 41]-105: \end{gathered}$ | $52: 14,53: 15,54: 2,$ <br> 74:16, 86:6 | addition [1] - 97:23 <br> additional [5] - 12:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$1,000 [1] - 30:20 | 71:21, 72:9, 72:22 | 43 [1] - 38:1 | 78 [6]-2:16, 23:11, | 14:4, 14:11, 80:11 |
| \$100 [1] - 30:19 | 20 [5]-53:13, 102:8, | 45[4]-13:15, 52:17, | 23:12, 65:2, 99:11, | 102:12 |
| 1 | 18:5 | 27: | 7:00 [1] - 1:3 | 55:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1[7]-1: 5,2: 14,29: 22, \\ & 49: 19,49: 21,110: 7, \\ & 119: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2014[1]-18: 18 \\ & 2018[2]-9: 2,129: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 35:10, 36:12, 37:14, | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 20,98: 6,98: 12, \\ & \text { 122:21, 123:25, } \\ & 126: 14,126: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 06:2, 106:5, 106:7, |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 1.5[5]-38: 16,70: 7, \\ 71: 21,72: 9,72: 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 11,8: 15,8: 19, \\ & 8: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:13, 116:22, } \\ & \text { 117:4, 117:21, } \\ & \text { 126:9, 127:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $8[1]-55: 22$ | addressed [4]-19:11, 89:1, 89:3, 89:4 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 80 s[1]-109: 11 \\ & 84[1]-18: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10[7]-8: 24,41: 25 \\ & \text { 106:24, 112:11, } \\ & \text { 115:12, 120:11, } \\ & 120: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21[3]-115: 16,128: 9, \\ & 128: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | adjacent [1] - 101:4 <br> adjusted ${ }^{[1]}$ - 21:10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2100[2]-34: 22, \\ & 127: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 9 | advance [1] - 32:15 |
|  |  |  |  | adverse [3]-6:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 100[8]-38: 17,52: 22, \\ & 68: 14,74: 17,79: 25, \\ & 109: 15,119: 24, \\ & 120: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 3}_{[1]-1: 2} \\ & \mathbf{2 5}[13]-2: 6,9: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5[8]-13: 15,52: 17, \\ & \text { 53:9, 54:3, 54:22, } \\ & \text { 107:1, 107:13, } \\ & \text { 107:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9[1]-81: 6 \\ & 90[3]-30: 12,30: 14, \\ & 112: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 6:14, 111:8 advertising ${ }_{[1]}$ - 117:15 <br> aesthetic [4]-6:9, |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 58:1, 87:23, 88:8, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 94[1]-98: 13 \\ & 9: 00{ }_{[1]}-46: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 101[6]-13: 11,19: 16, \\ & 52: 16,52: 20,54: 1, \\ & 54: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:8, 103:11, } \\ & \text { 126:3, 126:10, } \\ & \text { 126:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \text { [6]-27:5, 29:1, } \\ & 53: 10,68: 14,83: 14, \\ & 110: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  | aesthetic [4]-6:9, $7: 10,32: 6,81: 17$ <br> aesthetically [2] - $123: 8,123: 22$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 103_{[1]}-113: 16 \\ & 1_{[1724}^{[1]}-1: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 25A [2] - 100:2, 100:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 51[3]-86: 6,123: 12, \\ & 124: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { aesthetics }[7]-6: 17, \\ 45: 2,48: 6,48: 13, \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $26[1]-8: 15$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AAP }_{[1]}-109: 14 \\ & \text { ability }[5]-20: 5,81: 2, \\ & 96: 17,100: 9,104: 16 \\ & \text { able }[6]-33: 19,59: 14, \\ & 92: 14,93: 10, \\ & 105: 25,127: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 12-foot [1] - 42:1 12-moth | $28{ }_{[1]}-29: 2$ | 57 [1]-53:14 |  | ```103:10, 103:12, 121:7 affect [1] - 107:21``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12-month }{ }_{[1]}-77: 23 \\ & 13[1]-12: 22 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{29}{ }_{[1]}{ }^{\text {[1] 8:6 }}$ | 58 [1] - 108:7 |  |  |
| 13 [1]-12:22 <br> 13-inch [1] - 81:6 | 2G [1] - 116:14 | $\begin{gathered} 5 G[23]-35: 11,35: 16, \\ 35: 22,35: 25,36: 12, \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 139[3]-2: 15,21: 24, \\ & 60: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 22,35: 25,36: 12, \\ & 36: 19,36: 21,37: 7, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 30: 21,54: 9,113: 4 \\ \text { Affidavit }[3]-8: 3,8: 8, \end{gathered}$ |
| 14 [1]-27:4 | $3{ }^{[12]}$ - 8:11, 18:17 | 37:9, 37:11, 106:5, | 49:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Affidavit }[3]-8: 3,8: 8 \text {, } \\ & 8: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 14-153 [1] - 18:19 | 18:22, 27:1, 27:20, | 106:8, 106:14, |  | affidavits [1] - 31:5 <br> afraid [1] - 85:9 |
| 145 [1] - 6:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:3, 40:16, 40:20, } \\ & \text { 41:10, 42:9, 49:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 106:19, 108:10, | absolutely [4]-20:15,73:6, 77:6, 115:5 |  |
| 14th [2] - 48:19, 52:2 |  | 111:21, $1115.19,3$, |  | afraid [1] - 85:9 <br> agency $[3]-82: 19$, |
| 15 [5]-4:6, 18:14, | 56:3 | 115:20, 117:3, | acceptance [1] - 51:1 | 112:5, 121:22 |
| 53:10, 53:21, 118:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 30[5]-4: 3,60: 11, \\ & 60: 18,61: 25,129: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:6, 117:18, } \\ & 120: 19,126: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accommodate [5] - } \\ & 39: 23,52: 10,60: 20, \\ & 64: 23,93: 11 \end{aligned}$ | ago [9]-4:6, 18:13, |
| 150 [2]-30:1, 30:11 |  |  |  | 28:8, 28:9, 29:14, |
| 150-foot [1] - 88:12 | $31[1]-124: 4$ |  | 64:23, 93:11 accommodated [1] - | 31:3, 45:3, 58:9, |
| 15th [1] - 52: $17{ }^{[1]}$ - 8:19 | 36.1 [1] - 6:11 |  | 58:17 <br> accommodation [2] - | agree [7]-24:25, |
| $18[6]-19: 6,29: 8$, | 36.1( ${ }_{\text {d }}$ [1]-6:6 $\mathbf{3 6 . 1}$ [1]-6.19 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 12,59: 20,62: 1, \\ & 65: 6,79: 22,125: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 40:25, 41:1, 42:18, | $37[1]-124: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6[3]-61: 2,62: 9, \\ & 110: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 52:7, 54:20 |  |
| 42:22 |  | $60[1]-30: 14$ | account [1] - 44:4 <br> accurate [4]-19:10, | agreeable [1] - 77:8 |
| $18-133$ [1]-26:21 $19[3]-2: 9,12: 22$, | 3:00 [1] - 46:11 | $67[2]-122: 22,124: 2$ | $44: 20,70: 9,130: 14$ | agreed [20] - 18:1, |
| 127:24 | $\begin{gathered} 3 G_{[4]}-116: 14, \\ 116: 23,117: 4 \end{gathered}$ | 670 [1]-27:23 | achieve [1] - 104:14 <br> acquisition $[1]-33: 13$ | $50: 8,50: 22,55: 16$ |
| 1900[1] - 128:17 | 117:21 | 677 [1]-55:21 |  | 61:5, 62:7, 62:18, <br> 62:21, 63:9, 63:21, <br> 64:4, 65:4, 65:10, |
| 1970s [1] - 4:14 | 3rd [1] - 31:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 695[3]-21: 24,60: 22, \\ & 62: 18 \\ & 6 G_{[1]}-116: 13 \end{aligned}$ | Act [2] - 4:23, 56:12 |  |
| 1980s [1]-4:15 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { act }[3]-30: 9,45: 6, \\ & 56: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1996 [1]-4:24 | 4 |  | action [1] - 9:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 11,68: 7,68: 17, \\ & 73: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1997[1]-84: 12 \\ & 1 G_{[1]}-36: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{4}_{[1]}-23: 11 \\ & \text { 4-foot }_{[1]}-47: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 7 | [1]-51:2 | Agreement [1] - 11:16 |
|  |  |  | ]-83:2 | agreement [4]-17:9, |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 40[15]-2: 15,2: 16 \\ & 2: 17,23: 5,24: 4 \\ & \text { 24:14, 27:24, 28:18, } \\ & 45: 21,62: 25,63: 17, \\ & 68: 5,69: 4,99: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 700 \text { [4]-34:21, } \\ \text { 127:24, 128:8, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { actual }[5]-20: 13, \\ & 26: 2,39: 8,39: 19, \\ & 125: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 25:22, 64:12, 79:22 <br> ahead [3] - 3:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2[7]-49: 21,109: 7, \\ & \text { 109:18, 109:20, } \\ & \text { 110:12, 111:20, } \\ & \text { 119:14 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 16 \\ & 701[1]-56: 1 \\ & 74[1]-53: 12 \\ & 75[7]-13: 13,19: 16, \end{aligned}$ | ```125:1 add [5] - 18:10, 27:22, 40:9, 93:3, 99:11 added [1] - 72:16``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { 101:12, 122:20 } \\ \text { aiming }[1]-120: 23 \\ \text { air }_{[2]}-54: 17,67: 24 \\ \text { Alexa }[1]-122: 13 \end{gathered}$ |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:8, 29:9, 40:6, } \\ & \text { 40:25, 41:2, 41:8, } \\ & \text { 41:17, 42:2, 42:8, } \\ & \text { 42:19, 42:23, 42:25, } \\ & \text { 78:18, 79:4, 95:19, } \\ & \text { 104:20, 108:24, } \\ & \text { 112:10 } \\ & \text { anyplace }[1]-114: 23 \\ & \text { anyway }[2]-61: 20, \\ & 69: 15 \\ & \text { apologize }[3]-10: 2, \\ & \text { 10:14, } 59: 25 \\ & \text { apologizes }[1]-11: 9 \\ & \text { appearance }[3]- \\ & 45: 14,93: 3,125: 12 \\ & \text { Applause }[1]-83: 24 \\ & \text { apples }[1]-59: 10 \\ & \text { applicable }[2]-38: 20, \\ & 57: 16 \\ & \text { applicant }[14]-2: 24, \\ & 3: 2,3: 3,5: 19,6: 4, \\ & 8: 21,9: 23,10: 20, \\ & 17: 4,25: 13,28: 1, \\ & 29: 19,29: 20,89: 20 \\ & \text { application }[24]-2: 4, \\ & 5: 12,5: 24,6: 24, \\ & 7: 16,9: 11,10: 8, \\ & 10: 24,18: 12,30: 9, \\ & 33: 5,35: 9,37: 7, \\ & 37: 12,37: 13,57: 22, \\ & 76: 17,81: 24,86: 8, \\ & 99: 3,105: 14, \\ & 105: 19,106: 12, \\ & 118: 22 \\ & \text { applies }[1]-75: 1 \\ & \text { apply }[1]-9: 22 \\ & \text { appraisal }[1]-15: 3 \\ & \text { appraiser }[1]-118: 19 \\ & \text { appreciate }[3]-81: 18, \\ & 82: 13,115: 4 \\ & \text { appropriate }[3]-9: 6, \\ & 91: 9,103: 21 \\ & \text { approval }[5]-13: 8, \\ & 39: 18,44: 23,52: 13, \\ & 87: 11 \\ & \text { approved }[5]-76: 17, \\ & 87: 8,125: 9,125: 14, \\ & 125: 15 \\ & \text { approving }[1]-48: 9 \\ & \text { April }[1]-8: 11 \\ & \text { area }[23]-4: 11,15: 6, \\ & 21: 13,22: 9,32: 14, \\ & 50: 16,61: 8,61: 22, \\ & 62: 16,64: 2,65: 5, \\ & 65: 7,68: 12,69: 13, \\ & 87: 24,88: 5,88: 7, \\ & 88: 13,88: 14,88: 15, \\ & \text { 101:6, 101:7, 116:22 } \\ & \text { areas }[4]-20: 21, \\ & 50: 11,114: 21,126: 5 \end{aligned}$ | ```argue [1]-22:17 argument [3] - 40:3, 50:3, 120:1 arrangement [1] - 18:6 aspect [1]-44:17 assessment [2] - 11:22, 61:2 Association[1] - 113:1 assume [4] - 39:7, 39:9, 39:12, 63:24 assuming [1] - 39:4 AT&T [2] - 73:13, 92:16 attached [1] - 46:6 attachment [2] - 25:22, 50:19 attachments [2] - 17:23, 45:23 attempt [1] - 118:8 attempting[1] - 27:19 attendance [1] - 26:11 attendant [1] - 2:7 attention[1] - 108:22 Attorney[2]-1:13, 2:22 attorney [2] - 106:4, 114:3 attorneys [4]-10:11, 32:23, 94:16, 106:11 audience [9]-33:2, 36:17, 51:11, 57:20, 70:2, 73:7, 90:2, 90:7, 94:11 AUDIENCE [5] - 61:11, 67:1, 67:4, 90:12, 108:1 auspices [1] - 32:24 authorized [1] - 128:2 available [3] - 25:15, 91:17, 92:8 avoid [1] - 114:10 Avrutine[2]-2:22, 31:7 \\ AVRUTINE \(_{[19]}-1: 13\), \\ 7:14, 11:3, 11:13, \\ 25:9, 26:16, 27:21, \\ 28:10, 28:14, 30:3, \\ 40:24, 44:10, 98:11, \\ 103:17, 110:2, \\ 111:14, 111:23, \\ 111:25, 125:17 \\ aware [11]-11:10, \\ 22:21, 68:2, 87:13, \\ 87:14, 87:15, 95:9, \\ 96:6, 108:23, \\ 108:25, 128:22 \\ Awareness [1] -None``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aye }{ }_{[5]}-129: 21, \\ & 129: 23,129: 25, \\ & 130: 2,130: 4 \\ & \hline \text { B } \\ & \hline \text { baby }[1]-82: 25 \\ & \text { backwards }[1]-99: 18 \\ & \text { backyards }[1]- \\ & 110: 23 \\ & \text { bad }[2]-116: 17, \\ & 120: 20 \\ & \text { Bakers }[1]-61: 20 \\ & \text { balance }[1]-11: 12 \\ & \text { ballpark }[1]-31: 13 \\ & \text { band }[4]-34: 22, \\ & 34: 23,127: 23,129: 1 \\ & \text { bands }[12]-34: 15, \\ & 34: 18,37: 5,43: 21, \\ & 126: 23,127: 22, \\ & 127: 25,128: 2, \\ & 128: 7,128: 18, \\ & 128: 21,128: 24 \\ & \text { barely }[1]-63: 20 \\ & \text { barrier }[1]-114: 7 \\ & \text { base }[6]-14: 6,22: 8, \\ & 32: 3,49: 20,81: 7 \\ & \text { based }[23]-5: 12, \\ & 12: 16,14: 22,15: 5, \\ & 28: 25,42: 17,43: 11, \\ & 43: 14,43: 15,43: 16, \\ & 44: 12,46: 20,63: 10, \\ & 70: 15,70: 20,71: 7, \\ & 72: 3,72: 10,72: 12, \\ & 81: 24,95: 15,106: 1, \\ & 109: 11 \\ & \text { basic }[2]-33: 7,33: 16 \\ & \text { basin }[1]-114: 23 \\ & \text { basis }[4]-91: 22, \\ & 102: 17,104: 1, \\ & 125: 14 \\ & \text { Bay }[6]-57: 7,66: 14, \\ & 68: 2,108: 8,108: 14, \\ & 108: 16 \\ & \text { beaches }[1]-110: 25 \\ & \text { became }[2]-96: 6, \\ & 97: 20 \\ & \text { become }[2]-21: 16, \\ & 21: 20 \\ & \text { bedroom }[1]-110: 15 \\ & \text { beginning }[3]-67: 8, \\ & 85: 5,96: 2 \\ & \text { begins }[1]-69: 8 \\ & \text { behalf }[1]-10: 19 \\ & \text { below }[11]-13: 10, \\ & 13: 12,13: 17,52: 15, \\ & 52: 17,53: 18,53: 20, \\ & 54: 1,83: 13,83: 14, \\ & 100: 25 \\ & \text { bend }[5]-65: 14, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 65:19, 123:1, 123:6 } \\ \text { benefit }[7]-26: 10, \\ 29: 20,33: 12,33: 17, \\ 70: 1,79: 1,93: 23 \\ \text { Berkman }[1]-10: 13 \\ \text { best }[9]-17: 8,24: 13, \\ 77: 18,81: 16,83: 15, \\ 86: 2,87: 15,101: 20, \\ 101: 24 \\ \text { better }[6]-4: 8,48: 6, \\ 63: 16,65: 21,91: 20, \\ 127: 2 \\ \text { between }[4]-11: 10, \\ 29: 16,31: 19,89: 19 \\ \text { beyond }[2]-29: 24, \\ 54: 20 \\ \text { bicycles }[1]-107: 9 \\ \text { big }[6]-64: 18,79: 4, \\ 82: 2,87: 24,97: 18, \\ 103: 10 \\ \text { bigger }[4]-57: 6, \\ 78: 14,80: 4,114: 10 \\ \text { binder }[1]-24: 19 \\ \text { biological }[1]-111: 8 \\ \text { bit }[4]-65: 25,76: 25, \\ 78: 10,92: 7 \\ \text { blend }[2]-90: 10, \\ 90: 11 \\ \text { blended }[1]-80: 21 \\ \text { blending }[1]-80: 14 \\ \text { blocks }[1]-88: 2 \\ \text { Board }[30]-3: 1,4: 6, \\ 5: 21,7: 2,9: 5,9: 15, \\ 9: 24,10: 17,15: 9, \\ 20: 3,25: 5,30: 8, \\ 44: 16,52: 11,81: 15, \\ 81: 21,85: 7,85: 25, \\ 94: 20,95: 20,96: 1, \\ 96: 17,102: 13, \\ 103: 25,105: 2, \\ 108: 16,118: 20, \\ 118: 24,129: 19 \\ \text { BOARD } \\ \text { [1] - } 1: 1 \\ \text { board }[1]-8: 5 \\ \text { Board's }[1]-32: 21 \\ \text { body }[1]-83: 2 \\ \text { bombarded }[1]- \\ 35: 14 \\ \text { bond }[1]-100: 6 \\ \text { bore }[1]-17: 25 \\ \text { bottom }[2]-47: 9, \\ 47: 16 \\ \text { box }[15]-45: 22, \\ 45: 25,46: 6,46: 7, \\ 46: 18,47: 17,47: 19, \\ 47: 22,49: 11,78: 19, \\ 78: 22,80: 17,80: 19, \\ 93: 2,93: 12 \\ \text { boxes }[5]-46: 25, \\ 47: 14,51: 3,51: 14, \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| ```compared [3] - 44:8, 82:24, 100:23 comparison [3] - 38:20, 38:22, 59:11 comparisons [1] - 83:9 competition [1] - 104:11 competitors [1] - 79:3 complaint [1] - 75:11 complaints [1] - 76:7 complete [2]-5:22, 77:8 completed [1] - 35:19 completely [4]-14:2, 59:10, 101:5, 129:4 compliance [12] - 38:3, 39:1, 39:6, 39:7, 39:8, 39:11, 39:13, 71:5, 75:6, 76:15, 87:6, 92:2 complicated [1] - 78:11 complies [1] - 38:9 comply [4]-12:12, 13:5, 27:6, 27:15 complying [1] - 94:4 component [1] - 13:10 components [1] - 106:22 computation [1] - 44:13 conceal [1] - 42:14 concealment [2] - 23:20, 28:3 concept [1] - 78:13 concern [6] - 2:13, 5:5, 46:16, 82:3, 106:1, 106:16 concerned [1] - 120:9 concerning [2]- 94:23, 107:23 concerns [5] - 9:8, 52:10, 85:10, 86:25, 103:14 conclusions [1] - 71:10 condition [8]-13:8, 20:22, 39:17, 39:18, 39:21, 44:24, 52:13, 87:11 conditioning [1] - 54:18 conditions [3] - 98:25, 125:6, 125:7 Conference [1]-1:4 confirm [1] - 68:25 confirmed [3] - 46:9, 46:14, 46:17 confirming [3] -``` | 12:11, 13:4, 14:25 <br> confirms [2]-8:13, 8:17 <br> confused [1] - 82:6 <br> confusion [1] - 29:15 <br> Congress [3]-4:22, $4: 24,82: 18$ <br> Congressman [2] 83:21, 84:13 <br> connection [2]-7:24, 9:20 <br> consensually [1] 96:8 <br> consider [3] - 86:20, 91:17, 118:21 <br> consideration [2] - $61: 1,118: 22$ <br> considered [1] - 9:14 <br> considers [1] - 112:24 <br> constantly $[1]-80: 3$ <br> constructed [2] - $20: 7,32: 13$ <br> construction [5] - $5: 8$, 7:3, 20:12, 55:6, 61:17 <br> consult [1] - 103:16 <br> consultant [6] - 10:7, <br> 12:11, 15:17, 30:18, <br> 63:5, 68:1 <br> Consultant ${ }_{[1]}-1: 16$ <br> containing [1] - 13:24 <br> contend [1]-118:16 <br> context [3]-83:10, <br> 83:18, 103:22 <br> continue [2] - 110:2, <br> 111:14 <br> contributed [1] - 110:11 <br> control ${ }_{[1]}$ - 81:21 <br> Convenience [2] - 11:1, 94:24 <br> conversation [7] - <br> 13:18, 52:19, 54:5, <br> 54:25, 105:7, 107:5, <br> 107:16 <br> convinced [1] - 102:3 <br> cool [1]-59:9 <br> cooling [1] - 51:14 <br> Coppins [2]-130:12, 130:19 <br> COPPINS $_{[1]}-1: 23$ <br> copy [3]-8:1, 25:23, 130:14 <br> corner [1]-60:2 <br> Corporation [1] 95:14 <br> corporation [1] 95:18 <br> correct [26]-27:3, $\qquad$ |  |  | ```dated [1] - 9:2 daughter [1] - 116:1 days [10] - 4:3, 28:8, 28:9, 30:1, 30:11, 30:13, 30:14, 77:24, 129:14 de [3]-69:6, 124:10, 124:13 deal [1]-93:21 debate [2]-84:20, 118:7 Debbie [2] - 107:25, 109:4 Debbie's [2]-122:1, 122:7 deceptive \({ }_{[1]}\) - 121:2 decibels [9]-13:15, 52:17, 53:10, 53:12, 53:14, 53:15, 53:19, 54:4, 54:21 decided [1] - 4:24 decision [7]-85:8, 85:11, 86:7, 86:11, 87:4, 124:24, 129:16 decline \([1]\) - 112:17 dedicated \({ }_{[1]}\) - 57:3 deeded [1] - 57:3 deems [1] - 9:6 deeper [1]-63:19 defer [1]-94:6 define [2] - 36:21, 36:24 defined [1]-27:14 defines [2]-26:24, 28:24 definition \([7]\) - 18:16, 26:9, 29:10, 29:18, 40:14, 40:22, 41:12 degrees [4]-13:11, 19:16, 52:20, 54:1 demonstrate [1] - 126:25 demonstrates \([1]\) - 126:17 denials [1] - 4:20 denied [2] - 86:8, 117:8 Denise [1]-4:7 densify [1] - 34:24 deny [6]-5:12, 5:24, 81:24, 103:12, 104:2, 125:3 denying [2] - 98:25, 103:2 Department [1] - 112:23 depicting [1] - 28:4 deployments [2] - 32:13, 50:6 deploys [1] - 18:20``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```Deputy \({ }_{[2]}-1: 8,1: 14\) design [6] - 22:7, 55:16, 63:10, 76:23, 88:17, 93:10 designs [2] - 14:8, 90:17 despite [1] - 109:13 detail [1] - 89:22 detailed [5] - 6:25, 48:22, 68:23, 87:9, 97:19 detailing [2] - 12:19, 64:24 details [1]-14:11 determinate [1] - 69:16 determination [3] - 9:16, 127:2, 127:10 determine [2]-71:4, 101:3 determined \({ }_{[2]}\) - 99:12, 104:7 determining \([1]-38: 8\) devaluation [1] - 118:9 developed \({ }_{[1]}\) - 84:21 Development [1] - 112:24 device [1]-34:11 devices [2]-118:10, 122:11 DeVita [119]-1:7, 2:1, 4:8, 10:1, 15:12, 21:1, 25:7, 32:20, 34:12, 35:7, 35:13, 35:22, 36:16, 36:23, 37:15, 39:3, 39:24, 41:3, 42:16, 42:22, 43:13, 43:16, 45:1, 46:5, 46:22, 47:11, 48:1, 50:17, 50:25, 51:9, 55:1, 55:18, 56:25, 57:8, 57:20, 59:18, 60:22, 61:7, 61:13, 62:3, 62:9, 62:20, 62:25, 63:11, 63:23, 64:9, 64:13, 64:16, 65:2, 65:13, 66:8, 66:21, 66:25, 67:2, 67:6, 67:12, 67:20, 68:5, 68:18, 68:21, 69:2, 69:18, 73:7, 79:21, 81:14, 83:16, 85:17, 88:23, 90:3, 90:16, \(91: 2\), 92:12, 94:10, 94:14, 96:23, 98:3, 99:17, 101:12, 103:6, 105:5, 106:9, 107:24, 108:3,``` | ```108:6, 109:25, 111:21, 111:24, 112:7, 113:7, 113:13, 115:5, 115:10, 115:18, 118:2, 118:6, 119:5, 119:22, 121:12, 122:18, 123:3, 123:14, 123:25, 124:12, 124:19, 125:11, 125:20, 126:12, 127:7, 127:11, 127:19, 128:11, 129:7, 129:11, 129:18, 129:22, 129:24, 130:1, 130:3, 130:5 Dick [2]-10:5, 78:14 dick [3]-10:7, 100:19, 126:12 dictates [1] - 42:25 difference [6] - 31:19, 31:22, 63:13, 64:19, 97:18, 127:20 differences [2] - 89:19, 123:17 different [25] - 14:2, 14:22, 23:16, 31:4, 34:13, 34:14, 37:5, 37:23, 38:12, 41:7, 41:15, 41:17, 41:20, 42:6, 42:7, 44:5, 48:12, 58:13, 63:13, 64:17, 71:15, 73:3, 73:4, 73:5 differently [1] - 63:14 difficult [3]-5:10, 76:25, 118:13 digital \({ }_{[1]}-5: 2\) diligence [2] - 113:21, 114:6 diligently [1] - 105:2 diminution [1] - 15:4 direct \([1]\) - 68:10 direction [1] - 99:5 directional [2] - 95:24, 96:4 directly \({ }_{[1]}-72: 5\) disagree [1] - 18:7 discuss [1] - 62:13 discussed [3]-14:19, 45:4, 69:14 discussion [2]-3:3, 83:20 distance [12] - 43:11, 53:17, 66:4, 66:7, 70:16, 71:12, 71:14, 72:3, 72:4, 95:2, 100:18, 101:2 distances [3] - 20:14,``` | 71:16, 71:17 <br> distinction [1] - 56:24 <br> distributed [2]-2:6, <br> 7:19 <br> document [6]-8:12, <br> 8:16, 18:14, 18:18, <br> 110:4, 111:18 <br> documentation [6] - <br> 13:20, 18:5, 24:23, <br> 25:1, 32:18, 112:21 <br> documented [2] - <br> 24:12, 29:5 <br> documents [1] - 86:16 <br> $\operatorname{dog}[1]-115: 1$ <br> dogs [1] - 107:10 <br> donate ${ }_{[1]}-56: 19$ <br> done $[10]$ - 42:10, <br> 77:2, 77:4, 77:16, <br> 78:15, 83:3, 106:18, <br> 116:12, 116:14, <br> 126:2 <br> Donovan [1] - 60:3 <br> door ${ }_{[1]}$ - 121:21 <br> doorbell ${ }_{[1]}$ - 115:8 <br> down [23] - 11:6, <br> 13:13, 16:7, 19:16, <br> 30:1, 30:19, 40:5, <br> 54:4, 54:21, 61:13, <br> 61:16, 62:22, 63:19, <br> 63:22, 68:11, 82:10, <br> 87:23, 96:10, 98:7, <br> 112:14, 116:10, <br> 118:5, 123:13 <br> drafted $[1]-5: 19$ <br> draw [1] - 114:7 <br> drawing [1] - 14:5 <br> drawings [2]-11:24, <br> 95:22 <br> drive [5] - 31:3, <br> 112:14, 120:19, <br> 126:20, 127:17 <br> Drive [3]-2:18, 24:4, 108:8 <br> drive-test [1] - 31:3 <br> driveway [5] - 23:19, <br> 23:23, 65:16, 121:3, <br> 123:9 <br> drop [1]-112:21 <br> due [3]-103:19, <br> 114:5, 129:5 <br> duration [1] - 36:15 <br> during [5] - 9:13, <br> 54:16, 75:2, 104:4, <br> 117:13 <br> duty [1] - 48:9 <br> E <br> early ${ }_{[1]}-4: 14$ <br> easier $[1]-16: 10$ | ```East \({ }_{[1]}-7: 17\) EAST \({ }_{[1]}-1: 19\) easy [2] - 69:3, 114:7 economically [2] - 31:11, 93:14 economy [1] - 104:8 Edward [1] - 48:20 effect \([3]-5: 7,26: 21\), 118:17 effective [2] - 97:21, 129:10 effects [3]-5:13, 6:15, 111:8 effort [1] - 52:9 eighth [1] - 100:10 either \([6]-3: 13,3: 15\), 28:19, 96:8, 117:14, 117:16 electric [3]-17:23, 49:24, 80:13 electrical \({ }_{[1]}-115: 15\) electricity [2] - 120:11, 120:15 electronic [1]-59:8 ELIZABETH [1] - 1:13 Elizabeth [1] - 8:4 emergency [2]-54:9, 54:12 emission [7]-37:17, 42:17, 43:4, 43:9, 81:22, 82:24 emissions [15]-5:14, 20:8, 20:14, 37:20, 42:18, 70:6, 70:15, 73:4, 81:25, 84:14, 87:6, 91:4, 106:2, 106:15, 122:3 emit [2]-109:7, 109:20 encloser \({ }_{[1]}\) - 29:15 enclosing [1] - 79:7 encourage [1] - 73:17 encourages [3] - 6:6, 6:12, 73:11 end \([4]-65: 16,83: 11\), 84:22, 86:20 endanger [1] - 7:6 ends [1] - 69:10 energy [4]-120:7, 120:19, 120:22, 120:24 enforcement \({ }_{[1]}\) - 39:6 engineer [4]-29:11, 31:5, 115:15, 115:16 engineers \({ }_{[1]}\) - 68:25 ensure \([4]-7: 2\), 20:15, 39:11, 44:19 entire [5] - 36:14, 40:21, 42:20, 101:7,``` | ```105:3 entirely [1] - 112:5 entrance [1]-23:23 environment \({ }_{[1]}\) - 73:24 environmental \([3]\) - 7:9, 11:22, 12:8 equal [3]-54:23, 109:20, 110:19 equipment [33]-2:8, 7:5, 13:2, 13:25, 22:7, 22:14, 22:16, 22:18, 22:20, 22:22, 23:2, 29:3, 32:2, 49:8, 49:10, 49:16, 49:19, 50:18, 51:7, 59:8, 73:5, 74:1, 74:2, 77:21, 78:4, 80:2, 81:7, 89:5, 92:19, 93:7, 96:8, 96:13 equivalent [1] - 52:18 especially \({ }_{[1]}\) - 63:14 Esq [2]-1:15, 1:16 ESQ [1] - 1:15 essence [4] - 30:18, 35:17, 41:16, 123:1 essentially [4] - 13:9, 44:20, 70:20, 84:12 establish [1] - 18:5 establishes [1] - 35:3 establishing [2] - 67:9, 67:15 estimation [1] - 26:8 et [1] - 20:4 evening \([5]\) - 15:10, 15:24, 19:12, 19:14, 69:21 event [4]-47:1, 62:12, 106:16, 114:19 eventually [1] - 102:17 evidence [1] - 9:13 evolving \({ }_{[1]}\) - 80:3 exact [3]-53:23, 66:20, 82:17 exactly [8]-34:4, 42:12, 52:25, 64:25, 67:17, 68:3, 88:6, 93:6 example [2] - 56:15, 96:11 exceed [2]-13:12, 26:9 exceeds [1] - 18:16 except [2] - 90:1, 116:16 exception [1] - 31:8 exhaust [1] - 59:9 Exhibit [2]-110:7, 111:20``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```exhibit \([5]-8: 8,8: 12\), 8:16, 8:20, 8:25 exhibits [2]-2:24, 7:24 existing [10] - 15:5, 17:11, 17:17, 30:13, 30:19, 36:6, 49:1, 50:16, 113:25, 126:2 expect \([2]-36: 7\), 36:12 expectation \([1]\) - 37:10 expense [1] - 102:12 experience [5] - 53:1, 56:13, 83:8, 93:1, 93:8 expert [7]-82:19, 117:24, 119:4, 121:19, 121:25, 122:6, 122:7 experts [2]-121:20 explain \([7]-26: 10\), 34:19, 51:11, 52:5, 59:2, 100:19, 120:5 explained [2]-78:15, 80:10 exposed [2]-43:7, 111:5 exposing \({ }_{[1]}-111: 3\) exposure [17]-12:14, 38:10, 38:16, 39:2, 43:1, 43:6, 43:8, 43:13, 44:7, 44:8, 70:17, 71:3, 71:11, 71:24, 82:7, 83:7, 122:15``` <br> Exposure ${ }_{[1]}$ - 110:6 <br> extent [1]-124:24 <br> extremely [2] - 19:23, <br> 118:12 <br> eyesore [1] - 98:18 | ```46:7, 58:25, 71:4, 75:3, 75:24, 76:15 fact \([9]-18: 5,19: 13\), 22:23, 27:9, 81:18, 95:6, 97:23, 109:18, 115:24 factor \([1]\) - 30:16 factors [3] - 28:25, 40:15, 118:14 facts [1]-86:14 fair [1] - 69:2 falls [1] - 51:15 false [1] - 117:14 familiar [1] - 66:23 family [2]-122:17, 123:7 fan [14]-13:9, 19:18, 19:19, 51:10, 51:14, 52:14, 53:17, 53:22, 53:24, 54:1, 57:19, 74:12, 74:21 fans [10]-19:22, 51:21, 51:24, 52:22, 54:7, 73:20, 73:23, 74:7, 74:10, 74:16 far [4]-68:13, 71:23, 80:12, 107:15 Farenheit [4]-13:11, 52:16, 52:20, 54:2 faster [1]-37:2 FCC [35]-12:13, 18:18, 28:24, 32:5, 32:10, 34:23, 38:6, 38:10, 38:15, 38:24, 39:1, 44:21, 49:22, 50:3, 71:1, 75:4, 75:5, 75:6, 75:8, 75:11, 75:17, 75:20, 76:3, 76:8, 83:11, 84:14, 86:19, 97:20, 109:7, 111:9, 112:4, 121:19, 124:22, 129:3 fear [1]-5:13 feasible [1]-31:11 features [4]-6:17, 7:10, 41:20, 41:21 federal [17] - 5:5, 19:25, 25:16, 26:19, 32:25, 37:18, 39:20, 84:3, 84:11, 86:18, 104:5, 116:4, 116:5, 116:6, 121:22, 124:16, 128:22 Federal [5] - 2:3, 4:23, 10:11, 85:10, 86:10 feedback [1]-80:12 fees [1] - 30:22 feet [22]-18:17, 18:23, 27:2, 27:5,``` | 27:20, 29:1, 29:3, 29:4, 38:13, 40:11, 40:16, 40:21, 41:10, 42:9, $60: 11,60: 19$, $61: 25,64: 18,64: 21$, 68:14, $79: 14,110: 16$ fence $[1]-21: 12$ few $[5]-6: 2,28: 17$, $52: 21,64: 18,64: 21$ fiber $[5]-14: 1,49: 25$, $59: 5,59: 13,120: 13$ fiduciaries $[1]-86: 1$ figure $[1]-123: 16$ figures $[1]-31: 14$ filed $[1]-30: 9$ fill $[1]-3: 12$ final $[3]-8: 25,44: 6$, $90: 17$ finally $[1]-96: 5$ financially $[2]-31: 23$, $93: 14$ financials $[1]-32: 23$ fine $[4]-3: 21,3: 25$, $76: 9,86: 23$ finished $[1]-35: 22$ fire $[2]-124: 8,124: 9$ Firm $[1]-10: 12$ firm $[2]-10: 18,19: 1$ first $[24]-5: 6,8: 1$, $10: 5,15: 13,16: 2$, $16: 11,23: 17,26: 13$, $47: 23,73: 21,85: 25$, $90: 6,90: 20,94: 22$, $94: 23,100: 14$, $102: 2,102: 11$, $108: 12,111: 18$, $113: 18,114: 14$, $118: 6,119: 1$ five $[2]-24: 3,112: 11$ flourish $[1]-104: 9$ flow $[1]-52: 14$ flush $[1]-42: 5$ foliage $[1]-65: 9$ folks $[4]-19: 18,23: 9$, $30: 4,82: 1$ follow $[2]-71: 5,88: 25$ follow-up $[1]-88: 25$ following $[1]-80: 1$ follows $[2]-2: 20,7: 25$ forced $[1]-110: 14$ forefathers $[1]-116: 2$ forget $[1]-52: 15$ forgot $[1]-10: 3$ form $[2]-11: 23,31: 14$ formula $[4]-38: 15$, $43: 18,43: 20,44: 4$ formulas $[2]-71: 5$, $71: 8$ forth $[1]-71: 6$ foundation $[3]-33: 4$, | ```76:24, 78:9 founder [2] - 109:4 four [8]-2:12, 9:8, 33:24, 42:2, 85:6, 94:20, 126:22, 128:2 France [2]-109:17, 110:21 frankly [2]-54:6, 82:6 free [1]-115:7 frequencies [2] - 41:18, 75:5 frequency [14]-5:14, 12:9, 12:14, 37:5, 37:19, 38:10, 39:2, 42:18, 43:1, 43:20, 71:3, 83:6, 92:2, 126:23 front [10]-8:6, 60:5, 61:23, 68:10, 76:5, 85:1, 110:21, 121:14, 123:12, 125:10 frontage [1]-60:4 fruition [1] - 37:7 full \([1]-52: 22\) functionality [1]-26:2 functions [1]-41:15 funny [2]-58:8, 119:23 future [2] - 36:9, 99:23``` <br> gadgets [1] - 91:5 gaining ${ }_{[1]}$ - 25:20 <br> GAO ${ }_{[1]}-109: 14$ <br> gap [2]-128:20, 129:2 <br> gaps [1] - 117:12 <br> gate [1]-21:19 <br> GAUDIOSO ${ }_{[116]}$ - <br> 1:16, 10:16, 11:9, <br> 11:14, 28:16, 30:7, <br> $33: 18,34: 20,35: 12$, <br> 35:21, 36:1, 36:20, <br> 36:25, 38:6, 39:15, <br> 40:13, 41:1, 41:5, <br> 41:16, 42:20, 42:24, <br> 43:15, 43:17, 44:21, <br> 46:4, 46:8, 47:10, <br> 47:21, 49:6, 50:23, <br> 51:4, 53:7, 54:24, <br> 55:10, 56:23, 57:2, <br> 57:18, 59:5, 60:15, <br> 61:5, 62:1, 62:5, <br> 62:17, 62:21, 63:2, <br> 63:21, 64:3, 64:7, <br> 64:14, 64:20, 65:10, <br> 66:1, 66:5, 66:19, <br> 66:23, 67:11, 67:16, <br> 67:22, 68:16, 68:20, |  |
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| 51:14, 96:13, | hearing [23]-2:2, 2:4, | 119:16, 121:15 | 97:12 | inside [8] - 19:6, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $\text { guess }[7]-21: 24 \text {, }$ | Hearing [1] - 8:22 | $60: 2,60: 6,60: 8,$ | 32:6, 34:4 | $: 15,80: 24,95: 5,$ |
| 7:7, 73:25, 80:10 | hearings [10] - 2:13, | 1:18, 61:21 | inconclusive ${ }_{[1]}$ | 17 |
| 86:10, 98:15, 120:8 | 9:14, 9:21, 12:17 | 23, 63:17, 68:13, | 84: | installations [6] - |
| guests [2]-3:5, 3:8 | 45:3, 45:5, 73:22, | 1:23, 76:5, 88:1, | incorporate [1] - 87:4 | 5:23, 26:9, 45:9, |
| guidelines [3] - 38:11, | 83:19, 102:13, 105:3 | 98:21, 105:24, | INCORPORATED ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 70:23, 71:1, 80:16 |
| 39:2, 111:10 | hears [1]-104:23 | 13:3, 113:5, | 1:1 | installed [10] - 2:8, |
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| 47:23, 76:6, 76:7, | 98:15, 98:22 | improved [1] - 88:7 | inhibition [1] - 35:1 | involves [1] - 94:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76: 8,82: 1,91: 23 \\ & \text { 102:2, 123:15, 126:3 } \end{aligned}$ | homes [7]-21:11, 83:4, 110:12, | improvement [1] - <br> 88:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { initial }[3]-34: 1,61: 1, \\ & 92: 3 \end{aligned}$ | ion [5] - 13:24, 22:25, |
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| $\text { item }[7]-17: 20,17: 21 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { knows }[4]-57: 21, \\ & 83: 18,91: 12,115: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 24,45: 10,60: 9 \\ & 67: 5,70: 3,95: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 23,23: 5,23: 11, \\ & 23: 25,27: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { items }[1]-31: 25 \\ & \text { itself }[1]-40: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 114:21, 118:15, <br> 119:17, 125:3 |
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| visually ${ }_{[1]}-98: 18$ <br> volume ${ }_{[1]}-19: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 1,15: 16,15: 21, \\ & 28: 21,28: 24,29: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:12, 115:16, } \\ & \text { 119:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| voluntarily [1] - 76:14 votes [1]-86:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:17, 30:11, 34:3, } \\ & 34: 9,38: 9,40: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { York }[7]-1: 5,11: 2, \\ 14: 2,58: 23,84: 5, \end{gathered}$ |
| W | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 7,97: 2,97: 8, \\ & 97: 10,120: 8,120: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { young [2] - 84:25, } \\ & 123: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```wake [1] - 106:19 walk [3]-84:25, 106:23, 107:19 walking [5] - 107:2, 107:4, 107:10, 107:14, 107:17 walks [1] - 115:1 wants [5]-4:4, 91:13, 101:19, 101:25, 112:13 warmer [1] - 51:23 wash [1] - 116:18 wastes [1]-120:24 water [3] - 66:6, 114:23, 124:18 ways [3]-21:17, 29:21, 34:14 wealthiest \([1]-100: 11\) weather \({ }_{[1]}-77: 20\) website [3]-8:14, 8:18, 116:20 week [1]-55:9 weekend [2]-11:11, 15:25 welcome [2] - \(3: 5,3: 8\) welfare [2] - 7:7, 7:9 Westbury [1]-119:11 Westchester [1] - 15:7 whatsoever [1] - 15:21 whereby [2] - 22:7, 28:1 whistleout.com [1] - 116:21 White [4]-2:17, 24:4, 68:5, 125:24``` | Wireless [6]-1:16, 4:9, 34:2, 34:3, | younger [1]-119:16 |
|  | 72:14, 97:10 | Z |
|  | wires [1]-50:20 <br> wiring [1] - 46:15 <br> wisdom [2]-20:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zoning }[2]-6: 1 \text {, } \\ & 118: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 104:6 |  |
|  | witness [2] - 117:25, 119:4 women [1] - 115:22 |  |
|  | wonderful ${ }_{[1]}$ - 119:18 |  |
|  | wood [16]-2:10, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:17, 24:19, 24:20, } \\ & 28: 2,28: 9,28: 20, \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:2, 28:9, 28:20, } \\ & 37: 24,47: 14,47: 17, \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 1,50: 12,70: 8, \\ & 80: 15,90: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | wooded [6]-61:22, <br> 62:16, 64:2, 68:12, |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 69:6, 69:8 } \\ \text { wooden [3] - 24:5, } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | 24:7, 38:18 |  |
|  | Woods [1] - 56:7 |  |
|  | Woodvale [6]-2:17, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 15,27: 24,28: 18, \\ & 55: 22,69: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | word [1] - 57:21 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { words }[6]-79: 13, \\ & 92: 15,92: 17,101: 6, \\ & \text { 101:22, 125:11 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { works [3] - 15:22, } \\ 43: 18,43: 20 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | worst [2]-72:3 |  |
|  | wrap [3]-112:7, |  |
|  | 121:16, 121:17 |  |
|  | Wright [2]-113:15, |  |

