# HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES <br> REGULAR MEETING <br> FEBRUARY 18, 2021 <br> 7:30 PM 

## CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Board Chair, Mr. Flanagan called the regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 and announced that adequate notice of the meeting had been made in accordance with the New Jersey State Open Public Meetings Act and State Executive Order 103.

## ROLL

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

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

## REGULAR MEETING

## MINUTES

Mr. Flanagan made a motion to approve the January 21, 2021 minutes as written. It was seconded by Ms. Sovolos. On a voice vote all eligible members voted to approve the January 21, 2021 minutes.

## ADMINISTRATIVE-Mr. Flanagan

Mr. Newlin discussed a previously created zoning requirement chart and possible revisions to the chart.

Mr. Flanagan noted the he was preparing a spread sheet to provide monthly application fee and technical review information to the Board.

The Board discussed the current Variance Application Checklist and is making the recommendation to the Township Committee to change its criteria by resolution instead of by ordinance.

## RESOLUTIONS-Mr. Flanagan

BOA Resolution 04-2021
Do Not Exceed Limit for Gary Hall for 2020

Mr. Flanagan made a motion to approve BOA Resolution 04-2021 Do Not Exceed Limit for Gary Hall for 2020._ It was seconded by Ms. Sovolos. On a voice vote all but Mr. Addonizio voted yes to approve the resolution. Mr. Addonizio abstained.

## OLD BUSINESS

Application BOA\# 17-18
New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless 8 Millbrook Road, B17/L1, PL Zone
Applicant requesting variance relief for use, per NJSA 40:55D70(d) for a cell tower.
Presenting:

Richard Schneider, Attorney
Frances Boshulte, RF Manager
Dr. Eisenstein, RF Specialist
Mr. Mlenak is acting Board Attorney for this application.
Robert Simon is an objecting attorney for this application.
Mr. Barree, a Planner from Heyer Gruel and Associates was in attendance for Ms. Mertz, the Board Planner.

There was a break hearing this application from 9:55 to 10:05.

Ms. Taglairino called the roll for the Board Members after the break and the following were present:

Mr. Boyan, Mr. Newlin, Mr. Flanagan, Mr. Maselli, Mr. Rosenbaum, Mr. Addonizio
Mr. Symonds, Mr. Cammarata, and Ms. Sovolos.

The application is carried to the March 18, 2021 meeting with no further notice.

A transcript of the testimony is appended to the minutes.

## NEW BUSINESS

| Application BOA\# 15-21 | Joseph Ginarte <br> 2 Welsh Lane, B49/L42, R-1 Zone <br> Applicant is requesting variance relief for a side and rear <br> setback and lot coverage and building coverage per <br> N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Presenting: |  |
| Robert Dunn, Attorney |  |
| Joseph Ginarte, Owner |  |

- Mr. Ginarte stated that he was the property owner since 1990. The existing pool was built at that time and was fully compliant at $14 \%$ lot coverage where now $10 \%$ is permitted.
- Mr. Ginarte is requesting relief to rebuild the pool in the same location.

The Board requested a Site Inspection of the property for February 27, 2021 at 9:00 am with an inclement weather date of March 13, 2021 at 9:00 am.

## Application BOA\# 13-20

Gregory \& Christine Ihnken
Tempe Wick Road, B34/L3, RR-Zone
Applicant is requesting variance relief for a side setback, building area per N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) and relief for an accessory residence per N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d).

Presenting:
David Scalera, Attorney
Richard Schommer, Engineer
Art Palumbo, Architect
Gregory and Christine Ihnken, Owners

Mr. Hall swore in Mr. Palumbo for testimony.

- Mr. Palumbo presented proposed plans for a barn renovation and addition for an existing barn.
- Mr. Palumbo presented plans for a first floor accessory dwelling with a living area, study, bedroom, bathroom and washer and dryer with an addition of a solarium for and entryway adjoining the existing silo. The proposed residence is 1,185 square feet in area.
- Mr. Palumbo presented plans for a second floor game room and storage room with a hall bathroom with a shower and changing area.
- Mr. Flanagan noted that his main concern about this project is the density on a property that does not meet the six acre zone requirement.
- Mr. Fox noted that there is not environmental impact and the property septic had been expanded.
- Mr. Rosenbaum noted that he was in favor of preserving the structure but struggled with the acreage requirement.
- Mr. Kirby, a Harding resident, spoke in favor of the project.
- Mr. Boyan raised concerns that the plan had two full baths and could easily be converted into a two apartment structure.

This application is carried until the March 18, 2021 meeting with no further notice.

## OTHER BUSINESS

None

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Flanagan adjourned the meeting at 11:15

## LoriTaglairino

Respectfully submitted by Lori Taglairino, Board of Adjustment Secretary

## HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT <br> RESOLUTION BOA\#04-2021 AUTHORIZING INCREASE IN CONTRACT AMOUNT FOR PROFESSIONAL LEGAL SERVICES -BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ATTORNEY- GARY HALL OF MCCARTER ENGLISH FEBRUARY 18, 2021

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment previously contracted Gary Hall, Board of Adjustment Attorney, of the firm McCarter English for legal services on January 16, 2020 via resolution BOA\#3-2020 for an amount not to exceed \$9,500.00; and
WHEREAS, Resolution BOA\# 06-2020, dated September 30, 2020 amended the do not exceed limit to \$15,000.00; and
WHEREAS, due to additional legal services now anticipated for 2020, there exists a need to increase the contract amount by an additional \$2,000.00; and
WHEREAS, the cost of this contract is not anticipated to exceed \$17,500; and
WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment recommends that the total contract amount be increased to $\$ 17,000.00$; and
WHEREAS, the Chief Financial Officer has certified that additional funds are available and shall be encumbered through account \#01-2020-1185-0185-2-00035 in an amount not to exceed \$17,000.00.
BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Harding in the County of Morris and State of New Jersey that an amendment to the existing contract with McCarter English to increase the contract amount by $\$ 2,000.00$ for a total not to exceed amount of $\$ 17,000.00$ be and is hereby approved; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Adjustment be and are hereby authorized to execute an appropriate Amendment to Contract on behalf of the Board to reflect the increased contract amount authorized by this resolution; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that notice of this contract will be published as required by law within ten days of the passage of this Resolution. DATED: February 18, 2021

For: Flanagan, Newlin, Rosenbaum, Maselli, Sovolos, \& Symonds
Abstain: Addonizio
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CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. I think that's it for the housekeeping. And I'll repeat it just in case anyone joined late.

The Agenda for tonight we're going to hear Verizon first. We expect that will go for probably around two hours. Maybe a little bit under. We are then going to hear the Ginarti application. And then finally we are going to hear the Inkin application. So if you were here for something other than Verizon you may want to come back a little bit later, probably in about two hours from now.

All right. So with that said, Mr.
Schneider, welcome back. Mr. Simon, welcome back. I hope you're both well.

MR. HALL: And I'll hand the torch off to Mr. Mlenak. And I did, as I think I mentioned already, Mr. Fox agreed to send me a text when you want me back. I'm not going anywhere. So I will be back when you finish Verizon for the night.

MR. MLENAK: Thanks, Gary.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you, Gary. Okay. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mike, you also want to note that the Planner is being represented by another member of Heyer, Gruel for this evening. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Yes. Where is
our other member of Heyer, Gruel today?
MR. BARREE: I'm here, Chairman. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Barree? MR. BARREE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you for joining us. Yes. McKinley and I spoke earlier. She said she will be with us a little bit later this evening. She had another obligation she could not change, but we're happy to have you here, so thank you.

MR. BARREE: Thank you for having me, and nice to see you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Schneider, as I recall, we are at the point where we had heard the $R F$ testimony or the extended RF testimony, and at this point Mr. Simon was going to begin his
cross-examination. Am I correct in that recollection?
MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct, Mr.
Chairman. My recollection is consistent with yours with the understanding that the cross-examination, since Mr. Simon had previously completed his cross-examination the cross-examination should be limited to those items testified to by Ms. Boschulte at the January 21 st hearing.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. That sounds right to me. Mr. Simon, does that sound fair to you as well?

MR. SIMON: Well, I don't think it was just the January meeting. I believe it was also inclusive of the meeting prior to that. So whatever $I$ have not had an opportunity to cross-examine her on in terms of testimony or submitted material that's what $I$ intend to cover tonight. Nothing repetitive.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Steve, is that -- and I don't recall where we ended off the last time.

MR. MLENAK: I'm trying to recall. Rob, there was additional testimony after you completed two meetings ago?

MR. SIMON: Yes. Frances started in with some testimony. There were some questions from the Board. And then I didn't question her at that moment. And then she came back -- hi Frances. I see you there. She came back I think with her report in January, and then testified to that report in January. And then that's what I intend -- those items that she covered it's really mostly the January meeting, frankly. That's what I'm going to be devoting my cross-examination to.

MR. MLENAK: Yes. You provided with what you just said that your cross-examination is going to be limited to the additional testimony after you
previously completed your cross-examination.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Absolutely correct.
MR. MLENAK: Okay.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. With that said, Mr. Schneider, anything else before Mr. Simon begins?

MR. SCHNEIDER: No. I'd like to -- I know you have matters behind us on the Agenda so I'd like to get started and hopefully move it along.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Mr. Simon, the floor is yours.

MR. SIMON: Thank you.
MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll remind Ms. Boschulte that she is still under oath.

FRANCESBOSCHULTE, having been previously sworn, testifies as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. SIMON:
Q. Ms. Boschulte, good evening.
A. Good evening.
Q. Can you hear me okay?
A. I can. Can you hear me okay?
Q. I can hear you great. Thank you very much for asking.

And I may be slipping and referring to you either as Ms. Boschulte or Frances throughout my questioning; is that okay?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Just want to check. Thank you. So Ms. Boschulte, to start off, you stated a number of times on the record at the last hearing that the drive test you performed took place on March 3rd, 2020, but I believe that was actually the date of your report where the drive test data was presented and that actually the drive test was conducted on February 14th, 2020, over a year ago; is that accurate?
A. Yes, that's accurate.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clear the record on that. It was repeated a number of times.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. BY MR. SIMON:
Q. And Frances, there has been no other drive test conducted by you or PierCon since the February 14th, 2020 date, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You are not aware of any drive test conducted by Verizon or any other carrier for the gap area in question prior or subsequent to February 14th, 2020, correct?
A. Correct. There were not.
Q. And the data that you presented on $Z-3$

1 through $Z-8$ that you recently testified to, that numerical data was adjusted by you to account for RSSI data that was converted to RSRP calculation, is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. And was it also adjusted to represent the power level on the street?
A. Not sure what you mean.
Q. In other words, is the calculation that is shown on $Z-3$ through $Z-8$ or the numbers that you're showing, is that the actual power level on the street?
A. It's the power level that was taken by the receiver on top of the vehicle that we were driving around, so it is. There is, as indicated in the drive test report, that foliage factor, because the test was taken in the Winter.
Q. So that's the 7 dB foliage factor or correction that you put in for all the data shown on your exhibit $Z-3$ through $Z-8$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. So are the -- if we selected a number, whatever the number is, if it shows on $Z-3$ through Z-8 as let's say negative 100 , that reading was actually negative 93 and that you added 7 dB to that; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And I apologize if this is an ignorant question, but do you take that 7 dB foliage factor correction, do you do that before or after you convert your data from RSSI to RSRP?
A. That was taken after the conversion.
Q. And then you also mentioned at the last meeting, and I may have wrote it down incorrectly, that you make an adjustment to what the cell tower would provide in 4GLTE, is that what you said during your testimony?
A. Yes. The conversion includes a power adjustment. The CW test we only have a one watt transmitter. The actual site, of course, the macro site will have more than one watt of power, of transmit power.
Q. So --
A. So these -- I'm sorry.
Q. No. Go ahead.
A. So the conversion calculation was provided to Dr. Eisenstein for review and he accepted that conversion.
Q. Did you provide that to the Board?
A. I'm checking the report. I don't believe so. I have to double-check but I'm not 100 percent sure of everything that was submitted.

MR. SIMON: Mr. Chairman, I would just ask as a request that Ms. Boschulte supply the Board and really to me directly through Mr. Schneider whatever that calculation or conversion that she's referring to, please.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Schneider, could you supply those calculations to the Board and to Mr. Simon?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We'll be glad to do that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Thank you. MR. SIMON: Thank you, Rich. BY MR. SIMON:
Q. Frances, could you describe though, understanding that you're going to provide that to Mr. Schneider, who's going to provide it to the Board and myself, could you describe what that conversion just generally consists of?
A. Yes. Let me see if $I$ can actually -- so it consists of the difference in transmit power between the CW and an actual base station. It also consists of the difference between the antenna. Obviously, we're not utilizing the same panel antennas that will be provided at an actual macro facility. This was the crane test, so utilizing only an omni antenna there is a difference in gain, as well as the cable loss.
Q. Have you provided the actual raw readings from that $C W$ test to the Board?
A. The raw readings from the RSSI before --
Q. Before you converted to RSSI --
A. To RSRP?
Q. Before you add the 7 dB for the foliage, before you do the power adjustment to what the cell tower would provide in 4GLTE?
A. No. Because it has no meaning. You have to reference it to -- you have to convert it. As Dr. Eisenstein was indicating before to see something in meters and then in feet you have to do the conversion. So what I provided was the RSRP for LTE.
Q. Okay. As long as you provide that to the Board so that we can take a look at that, thank you. I'm going to move on.

In the areas of $Z-3$ that are colored in green, you don't know how far away from the road that you're showing as being covered there are there any buildings, correct? Have you done that analysis?
A. Sorry. Repeat your question.
Q. Sure. If you take $Z-3$ for example and you show certain areas in green that presumably mean that it meets the, your in-building, you know, negative 95 dBm RSRP; correct?
A. Okay.
Q. Right. And have you done an analysis as to whether there are any buildings in the vicinity of where you're showing, in essence, green coverage in Z-3, just as an example?
A. The neg 95 that is the design threshold is a street level that takes into account, it's a design criteria that takes into account what the -- takes into account the margin so that you would have communication services if you were inside a building structure.
Q. I understand that, Ms. Boschulte. I'm asking you whether you did any analysis as to whether within those areas where you're showing green they're actually buildings?
A. No. There isn't a need for me to do a specific analysis. The margin as in many link budgets give a --
Q. I didn't ask you whether there was a need. I'm not trying to be argumentative. I'm asking you whether you performed the analysis or not. That's all. Did you?
A. The analysis of the fact that there could be anywhere between a 10 and 20 dB of attenuation inside a building structure.
Q. I understand. You've testified to that
before. I'm not going back to that. I'm asking you whether you -- first question --
A. I did not physically go into buildings to see what the --
Q. I'm not asking you whether you went into buildings.
A. Then I'm not sure what it is that you're asking.
Q. My question is very simple. In the areas where you did the CW test and you drove through, and you believe that based on what you provided or what you will provide to the Board that it meets the in-building threshold. In those particular areas, whether it's along Blue or wherever, did you do any analysis to ascertain whether there's any buildings in those areas?
A. Yes. I identified areas where there were building structures.
Q. And did you -- how did you identify building structures, did you write them down, did you identify them any other way?
A. There are several ways that I identified building structures, one was through driving the area. The second was through Google Earth.
Q. So in terms of Google Earth, did you provide any type of Google Earth data to the Board that
you reviewed as to buildings within those areas that you drive tested?
A. I didn't supply a Google map, if that's what you're asking. I'm not sure. I think -- I mean, I identified building structures during my testimony.
Q. I'm asking you, did you record -- when you undertook your examination of this area, whether it was on February 14th, 2020, or another date, did you record in any manner the location of any buildings in the areas where you drive tested?
A. Yes. I recorded locations. They're mentioned in my reports of those building locations.
Q. So if the -- you've submitted, I believe, now three reports that your testimony tonight is that the extent of your identifying buildings within the coverage area in question are contained exclusively somewhere within those three reports; correct?
A. Yes. They're in the reports. They're mentioned in the reports, right.
Q. So other than those three reports, do you have other data that you have supplied or that you intend to supply the Board as to the location of buildings, whether they're residential or nonresidential, within the areas that you drive tested?
A. I'm sorry. I really don't understand the
questions that you're asking.
Q. Ms. Boschulte, you are showing on your exhibits in green what you refer to as proposed reliable in-building coverage of negative $95 \mathrm{dBm} \operatorname{RSRP}$; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm asking you, what buildings are actually located within the areas that you are showing in green on $Z-3$ ?
A. There are no buildings on the street where you're able to drive, if that's what you're specifically asking. The drive test can only be done on the street. You can't drive onto people's properties. So initially what were submitted were propagation maps, but then the question of the signal levels and drive test came into question. So the drive test was done. It's already been spoken to that the propagation gives a view that the CW does not because the drive test can only occur on the street; whereas, propagation helps provides a better picture of what occurs between the streets in the residential areas.
Q. Have you done any analysis as to how far any buildings are from the roadways that you conducted a CW test on?
A. I have looked at the distance in some of

1 the buildings, the distance from the houses from the 2 roads, yes.
Q. And have you recorded that data in terms of the distance of those buildings from the road anywhere?
A. Only in my notes.
Q. Have those notes been -- those notes -- I'm sorry. Apologize.

Are those notes any part of the three reports that you've submitted to the Board?
A. I would have to go through the reports to see if I called out any distances from residential houses from the streets.
Q. Okay. But you know, as I ask you the question you don't recall one way or the other right now?
A. I recall evaluating. I have some numbers that I know. Certain driveways the concern, there are very long driveways, and some of these driveways extend more than 500 feet from the main roads. Some of them as long as over a thousand feet that encompasses where the residential houses are from the main road.
Q. And have you identified in any of your three reports -- just your recollection, of course -where those driveway -- residential driveways that service homes are between 500 and a thousand linear
feet?
A. In my report $I$ don't recall if $I$ specifically called that out, but $I$ can, you know, give some examples of roads that I looked at and measured.
Q. Okay.
A. So some of those specifically along Pleasantville Road. The distance on Marino Drive and Wildlife Run, Wildlife Run was approximately around five to 600 feet. There were other driveways along Village Road that extended over a thousand feet into the resident -- toward the residential houses.
Q. Do you remember where those were?
A. One I already mentioned which was Wildlife Run that's off of Pleasantville Road and near Millbrook Road. The other one that I looked at when I was evaluating is -- it's called Featherbed Lane.
Q. Any others that you can recall right now?
A. Not off the top of my head, but I have been through the process looking at the roads specifically where the ones during my drive test route where it indicated the signs actually said private. And I noticed that to get to the end of some of those private roads where there are residential housing it was over 500 feet.
Q. And to the extent that you made a notation

1 of that you believe that that would be in one of your three reports?
A. I don't believe -- I would have to really look. I don't believe other than the fact of me jotting down and making a mental note and notes on paper.
Q. Okay. Let me move on. Just for clarification purposes, because I think there was some confusion at the last meeting. Z-3 through $Z-8$, which includes the CW test 700 megahertz at 120 feet, that assumes that the other sites in the area, including Harding, Harding 2, Morristown 3 Reel, and Chatham 2, that's all assuming that none of those sites are turned on at all; correct?
A. It's not assuming. The Exhibits of $Z-3$ through Z-8 specifically are the collection of data from the CW test. It is not the recording of the signal strength from the existing Verizon Wireless network.
Q. Right. That's what I'm saying. It doesn't show any -- it's as if none of those sites are in existence; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you. And in $Z-3$ through $Z-8$, none of those exhibits show the -- that BR site where the

Verizon headquarters is that you refer to in your dropped-call analysis; is that correct?
A. That's correct. BR --
Q. Go ahead.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And I went back and none of your prior reports or testimony on this application identify a reference to BR, or I think it's the Basking Ridge site; is that correct?
A. That is correct. That's correct.
Q. For the CW test the difference in coverage between 120 feet -- and we're talking about, I'm sorry, it's 700 megahertz, Ms. Boschulte. For the CW test the difference in coverage between 120 feet and 80 feet mostly only affects the local residential streets; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when I say the local residential streets I'm not referring to the main streets which I'm going to be referring to as either Glen Alpine, Blue Mill, Lees Hill Road, Village Road or Millbrook Road. Would you agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Ms. Boschulte, have you done an analysis, even though you haven't provided it to the

Board, as to what would happen with the coverage at 700 megahertz as the tower, the proposed tower that's at the DPW site goes below 80 feet?

So in other words, how much I guess fewer linear feet of roadway do you lose as you dip -- if you decided to reduce the height of the tower at the DPW yard below 80 feet?
A. Below 80 feet --

MR. SCHNEIDER: I guess the question is, Frances, have you done any analysis below 80 feet?

MR. SIMON: Thank you, Rich.
MR. SCHNEIDER: If you haven't done the analysis then you haven't done the analysis.

THE WITNESS: In my report I mention -sorry, were you referring to -BY MR. SIMON:
Q. Let me rephrase it, and I think Mr. Schneider makes a good point, that I did not see in any of your reports, and I do not recall in any of your testimony any analysis as to the coverage at 700 megahertz if you placed a tower at the DPW yard with antennas that were lower than 80 feet in height; is that accurate?
A. Only at 80 feet.
Q. Right. So I know you haven't provided the

Board with any reports analysis or testimony at below -- at what would happen if there were antennas below 80 feet. So my follow-up question is, have you independently, even though you haven't provided it to the Board, done that analysis?
A. No, I have not evaluated lower than 80 feet.
Q. And then let me move on then to some questions regarding your -- the drop call or dropped transmission data that you referred to. Have you reviewed any independent I guess peer-reviewed reports or studies that determined what is a reasonable standard of percentage of dropped data transmissions?
A. Have I reviewed, I'm sorry, any reports?
Q. Yes. Any report or studies that does an analysis and makes an independent determination as to what a reasonable standard of dropped calls or dropped data can be?
A. I've only, you know, read through research and through -- based on what Dr. Eisenstein has indicated that two percent has been an industry standard.
Q. You mentioned last time that two percent has been an industry standard, but I'm asking you that forget about the industry for the moment, have you read

1 any -- have you read any peer-reviewed report or studies that makes that finding?
A. I've come across it a couple of times from reading, you know -- what do I want to say -- articles that have been written about the two percent.
Q. And what article --
A. As a quality -- they refer to it as a quality of service.
Q. And those recalls say what, that it shouldn't be above two percent for dropped calls?
A. That they should stay below -- like two percent is a bench mark, so to speak, for the quality of service.
Q. And so do you recall what those articles were that you read?
A. No, but I'm sure I can find them again.

MR. SIMON: Okay. I would ask to the extent, Mr. Chairman, that Ms. Boschulte can find those articles if she can supply them. Thank you.
Q. So, and just to be clear, and I think you referenced it before at the last meeting, that when you talk in your report and your testimony about dropped calls it's really dropped data transmissions; correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: And dropped calls.
BY MR. SIMON:
Q. And dropped calls right. Go ahead?
A. Go ahead.
Q. No, no. Let me clarify the question. So when you have presented your dropped call data, is that comprised of both dropped transmissions, like on a text, as well as a dropped voice call that are mostly data calls now?
A. The dropped call includes all data connections, which includes voice, which is VOLTE.
Q. So it includes voice, and do you have any data that breaks down from what you have submitted and provided to the Board how much of that dropped data or call is voice versus non-voice?
A. I didn't request it, the separation of the two. I have to look to see if the data that $I$ was supplied actually has that specific bucket included for voice. I would have to separate it, but no, I don't recall.
Q. So in terms of the fact that the data encompasses both voice calls and non-voice data transmissions, if $I$ have my three kids in the back seat of my car, which I promise you in real life would never happen anymore, but if it did many years ago, and each kid is streaming a movie on their phone or their iPad and each of their respective data connection would drop
that would constitute three dropped connections as referenced on the excel spreadsheet provided to you by Verizon; correct?
A. Correct. It's a connection that was made and then lost. Correct.
Q. But you just don't remember right now whether they actually broke it down between the voice and the non-voice, or even within the non-voice if it's broken down by, you know, texts, versus streaming a movie, or music. Do you recall any of that?
A. The data that I provided does not distinguish between what the data connection was used for. So whether it was -- whether they were connecting for a movie or a zoom call or whatever the case may be, it's a connection that was made and was lost.
Q. Ms. Boschulte, does the transmission, the dropped transmission data that was provided to you by Verizon, does that also reflect a situation where someone's accessing a wireless connection from a home or an office with a computer that has a built-in cellular, let's say, a wireless card or a USB device?
A. It's any smart device that's accessing the LTE network when the connection is made and if it's lost it's pegged as a drop.
Q. And that's regardless of whether you're in

1 a home, you're in a building, you're driving, it doesn't just settle?
A. That's correct.
Q. And either prior to the last meeting where you testified, or even subsequent to the last meeting, have you reviewed any of the backup data used to create the excel spreadsheet that was provided to you by Verizon?
A. No. I don't know what you're referring to as backup data.
Q. Well, you testified, I believe, last time that they provided to you an excel spreadsheet?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then you took the excel spreadsheet and you created your exhibit that you put forth in your latest report?
A. That's correct.
Q. But you have not seen the backup data that created -- that led to the creation of that excel spreadsheet; correct?
A. Correct. I do not have access to the performance tool that they use to pull the actual information from the network.
Q. And so you haven't seen any data either where the overwhelming majority of the calls or data
transmissions were not dropped; correct? That's the good data, $I$ guess?
A. No. The total number of connections made, that I do have. It's part of the data provided to show the difference to get the percentage, yes.
Q. So, right. So you had that number, right? You don't have the backup data, but you have the actual number, and that's what you did to calculate the percentages, right?
A. Correct. They have -- right. Yes. Well --
Q. Go head. I'm sorry. Did you want to say something?
A. I should say -- I'm going to look at that, but I believe the excel spreadsheet has the columns for percentage, and has the columns of total number of connections and the number that's dropped.
Q. Okay. So you didn't do any then independent calculation yourself then? You just took the calculations that were done by someone in Verizon and then you created an exhibit from that; correct?
A. That's not correct. I do recall looking to make sure I understood where the percentage numbers came from, and to which buckets they came out of. So I did verify that the percentages did make sense. That
they did include the number of dropped failures, connection failures, and the total number of connections made.
Q. So you verified the percent calculation?
A. Yes.
Q. And again this may be an ignorant question, but at what point does Verizon consider a data connection as being dropped? So is it actually losing the connection where the user has to reinitiate the data connection, or can there be some, let's say, interference with the transmission which causes delay or freezing of the connection, and then it comes back before it actually, you know, fails, completely fails?
A. The connection loss is a connection that's lost. What you're indicating is some latency or lag time, but however it's still connected. So it's only when the connection has ended.
Q. Okay. During -- I'm assuming that in the past year or so that folks presumably have been using their smart phones more than ever because of COVID and the related state of emergency; is that a fair assumption?
A. It's fair.
Q. Have you reviewed any data from Verizon indicating whether or not that is the case?
A. That there has been an increase?
Q. Yes, Ma'am.
A. I do have data that extends more than the recent data provided, which I believe was from November to --
Q. I guess my question or really curiosity is that, if you provided the November to December 2020 data, and how does that compare to the November to December 2019 data. Have you looked at that?
A. I have not looked at the 2019. What I did look at was from the start of the COVID, which I believe was March of 2020 to maybe August or something. I have to look back to see the date, but it more evaluated the year of 2020 .
Q. But you have not done a comparison, nor have you asked for the data from Verizon to do the comparison to pre-pandemic times; correct?
A. No. Not in the year 2019. No.
Q. And as you -- and as you have more users, and again this is a little bit of an ignorant question admittedly, but as you have more users to the wireless system my understanding is that the available power sort of shrinks or becomes less available; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And a dropped data connection can be, you
know, the user's fault, right, whether it's a dropped phone or otherwise, the phone's fault or the network's fault, correct, one of the three?
A. When you say user's fault, what --
Q. So in other words --
A. What are you referring to?
Q. So in other words, if I drop my phone, right, it's not that I'm making a call and all of a sudden the call goes dead, I actually do something, you know, human error that results in losing the call. The phone's fault is if my battery goes dead in my example, and the network's fault is that $I$ believe what you are trying to show. Is that a fair, at least, summary?
A. I don't see how a user can --
Q. Let me go back. Okay. Can a phone case on your phone that can block a cell signal from reaching your phone's internal antenna; correct?
A. Yes, can weaken the signal, yes.
Q. And the user -- because I do this from time to time -- can inadvertently block the internal antenna while actually holding the phone which causes problems; correct?
A. Yes. Your body can shield, yes.
Q. And then the user, I'll give myself as an example, I can accidentally drop my phone, especially
if I'm multi-tasking and trying to do a number of things at once, right? And that can cause a data transmission failure, right? Correct?
A. I guess if you drop your phone.
Q. Right. And then $I$ can also accidentally disconnect whatever the data connection is, I hit the wrong button or something happens?
A. If you hit the wrong button and you terminate the call then it's a termination, it's not a drop.
Q. But let's say I do something with my phone that results in the connection dropping. So for example --
A. Yes, for example if you --
Q. If I don't charge my phone and I probably have a dead battery or a low smart phone or a computer battery that can negatively impact the ability to hang onto a cell signal; correct?
A. I don't know for sure. I'd have to verify, but I don't believe if your battery dies it's pegged as a dropped call.
Q. All right. But you don't know one way or the other?
A. I don't know that for sure.
Q. Okay. That's fair.

All right, now, what happens -- there's also circumstances where your SIM card, your subscriber identity modular card which is needed to connect to the carrier's network and identifies you and your activity on, for example, Verizon's network that could be damaged also, right, that can be bent, that can be chipped, it can be broken, right? That's possible, right?
A. Okay.
Q. Right. And then also I understand that you could have multiple applications on your phone that are running at the same time that are taking up space and memory that could result in a dropped data connection, right? Like if one of my kids has, you know, 20 or 30 background apps running simultaneously that it could result in a dropped data connection; correct?
A. In one of your applications?
Q. Yes. If I'm overloaded.
A. Yes. If there's not enough bandwidth, yes.
Q. Right. And in fact, if you don't also have updates that you install that can also result in a dropped transmission data, correct, in some cases?
A. Okay. That I'm not sure about, but go ahead.
Q. And also -- all right. I'm going to leave
that. I think I've made my point.
The dropped call data that you've presented is just for 4 G ; right.
A. Correct.
Q. And again, one of my many ignorant questions. Can an LTE drop be recorded when the connection tries to drop down from 4G, let's say, to 3G? That could be a circumstance where you have a dropped call?
A. Right. If there is weak signal and is unable to complete its handdown or handover to another cell, yes, it's a drop.
Q. And in your report I believe when you're talking about dropped calls or now we know they should be called dropped data transmissions, that you say that the dropped call performance data further, I think it was something like further concludes poor service in Harding Township toward the area of the proposed DPW location; do you recall writing that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And when you say "toward the area of the proposed DPW location," what do you mean by toward the area?
A. So what $I$ mean is, in evaluating, and again you pointed out several scenarios that how a person
uses their phone in different ways. And again the design threshold is to take into account, as it was stated before, there's a margin. There's a margin for signal fading. So if you have your cell phone out or if you have your cell phone in your pocket, or you put your cell phone in the bottom of your book bag, or you're standing behind a tree, or you're standing behind a refrigerator there are certain factors in your environment that are going to attenuate the signal.

So there is a level of margin to take those fluctuations in the environment into account so that you still have communication, an adequate signal remaining to have a communication. So in my report when I'm referring to toward the proposed, you have surrounding wireless facilities. Each of those wireless facilities have a sector, an antenna that's pointing toward the proposed location. The proposed location is in the center.
Q. Well, let me back you up there. Why would it be -- are these antenna sectors each pointing directly toward the DPW site?
A. If you actually look at the azimuths that are mentioned and you drew a line in the direction of those azimuths, yes, it's pretty close to that geographical area that I mentioned where you have the
triangle of Lees Hill Road and Sand Spring Road and Glen Alpin Road and Village Drive, yes. It's all toward in that geographical location.
Q. Have you provided any such diagram or exhibit to show specifically what -- where those azimuths are angled toward in relation to the DPW yard?
A. There isn't a diagram. Maybe that will be helpful, but I did call out the site reference and the azimuth reference.
Q. Well, you did do that, yes. I agree. I concur. But a dropped data connection can actually happen not necessarily as you're driving toward the DPW site, it could be as you're driving away from the DPW site; correct?
A. Well, if you're driving --
Q. You can have a dropped data transmission if you're driving away, right? Just like you can have an updated transmission if you're driving parallel to the antennas that you're calling out, you could, right?
A. You could drop a call anywhere between the proposed site and the site that's transmitting. I think the point that $I$ was making in my report is that you have these surrounding wireless facilities all with the sector pointing in the direction of the proposed, and if you look at the scanned data, if you look at the
signal levels, the area where the sectors are pointing shows an area of signal levels that are weaker than neg 95. They're in the areas --
Q. I know what the exhibits show.
A. Can I finish?
Q. Go ahead.
A. Thank you. Which in conjunction with the dropped percentages gives an indication that the drops are occurring in this area of weak signal strength, of signal strength that's weaker than the neg 95, indicating that there's a problem in this geographic area that neg 100 or neg 105 is not providing adequate signal to maintain data connections.
Q. All right. Where do these dropped data connections actually take place, do you know where precisely each of these data connections was dropped?
A. No. I don't know precisely a latitude and longitude location.
Q. And you don't know whether a dropped data connection took place at neg 96 or even negative 106 or negative 110, you don't have that data, it wasn't provided to you by Verizon as to where the data connection was dropped in relation to the area of coverage; correct?
A. The actual geographical latitude and
longitude location was not provided, but as I mentioned what -- it does indicate that the drops are occurring in that direction of the proposed. Those sectors that have the high dropped call percentages are providing coverage in the vicinity of the proposed. So those signal strengths that are weaker than neg 95, those areas it's showing that there's a problem. They're showing that the weak signal strength --
Q. But you're not -- you can have perfect coverage in an area of neg 95 and you can still have a dropped call, correct? Right?
A. You can have a dropped call, yes, at neg 95.
Q. Right. Where you currently show reliable in-building LTE coverage it's even better than negative 95, correct?
A. Yes, but it would be less.
Q. Okay. But have you -- but you can't tell me that the dropped calls are -- because we have identified the locations of the dropped calls. And many of them are right here and as opposed to right over here. You're just basically taking the antenna and having the recording done as to where there was a dropped data transmission that that antenna had at one time; correct?
A. Those antennas are the best servers in this geographic location, and they have a high dropped call percentage, not at the high band but at the low band. The fact that they don't have a high dropped call at the high band gives an indication that the high band which we know covers close to the site where there's going to be a stronger signal level, and then as you move out you're going to switch down to the 700 megahertz. And it's the 700 megahertz that have the high dropped call rate, because you're further away from the cell sites and you have a weaker signal strength.
Q. But you're the same distance from the cell site. If you're a mile away from the BR site you're a mile of way whether you're low frequency or a high frequency; correct?
A. A mile away did not show an indication of having adequate signal strength at the high band.
Q. So there were dropped calls at the high band? There weren't.
A. They're very low, showing that you're fine as you're closer to the site. The problem occurs when you're moving further away from the site towards the proposed.
Q. Now, you testified a number of times now
over many months that what you're proposing to cover with the DPW site is not going to be achieving the closing of all the gaps in the Harding area; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. I'm sorry. I want to let you finish.
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. And so what percentage of the dropped data connections took place within the area that you're going to be covering by the DPW cite versus outside that coverage area?
A. That $I$ don't know, but --
Q. Go ahead.
A. Okay. I don't know specifically, but if you look at the propagation of the proposed, and you look at the, or the CW test of the proposed, the coverage footprint covers at 120 feet covers a significant amount of the area that has poor coverage.
Q. When you say poor coverage, do you mean weaker than negative 95 dBm RSRP; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And do you have, I guess -- you show, and I'll get to the outdoor DAS exhibits that you provided in a little bit, but where you have the installation of those outdoor DAS nodes, did you have -- do you have dropped calls currently in those areas?
A. We already established that there isn't any latitude or longitude locations for the dropped call. That the dropped call percentages on the sectors, the sectors cover the geographical area pointing toward the proposed site.
Q. And it's like -- and it's not just a line, though, it's like a pie; right?
A. Correct.
Q. So within -- so somewhere within that pie, right, that triangle as which you say is aimed toward the DPW site, somewhere within that pie is where you have the dropped call or dropped data transmission?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. But we don't know whether it's right at the apex or as you're moving away and it's out on the corners, we just don't know. Okay. I got it, because you don't have the latitude and longitude. I understand.

And besides the latitude and the longitude and not knowing whether it's a voice versus non-voice, do we have any idea whether it's broken down by, you know, whether somebody is in a car versus outside, versus in a building?
A. There's no distinction. The fact that you can't maintain a connection, whether it's voice or data
or wherever you are, is still a failure to maintain that connection.
Q. And just for clarification, the RRC drop number that's in your report, how does that relate to the number of data connections per day?

Dose that show up on the corresponding percentage sheet, and then $I$ just need to do the math to back into it?
A. Let me make sure that I understand you.
Q. I didn't see the total number of data connections per day. I just saw --
A. Yes. If you did the math --
Q. Okay. I'm not going to waste anyone's time with that then.

Are both the higher and lower frequencies using the same antenna or the same azimuth?
A. The azimuths are the same.
Q. For both high and lower, right?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. And you know, you talked about the fact that we had very, very few dropped calls or dropped data transmissions at the higher frequencies. I'm assuming, and I think you stated it earlier, that it's because most of the calls in this area operate at the lower frequencies, right, that propagate further, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And in this area certainly of the state it's not a question of having inadequate capacity in the gap area in question, right?
A. Correct. This is not -- right. If you --
Q. Did you want to finish? I'm sorry.
A. No. It's okay.
Q. So from Morristown three, for example, how many of those dropped calls at the, let's say at the higher frequencies, the 2100 megahertz band, occurred in areas that you're going to be covering now with the Harding DPW site at the 2100 megahertz band? Any?
A. Repeat that again.
Q. Sure. And it may be an improper question, you'll tell me it is.

For Morristown three you show a dropped call that's 2100 megahertz band, right?
A. Right.
Q. So how many of those dropped calls at the 2100 megahertz band occurred in areas, if you know, that you're now going to be covering with the Harding DPW site at 2100 megahertz?

Because it seems to me that because you have such limited area of coverage at the higher
frequencies you're not going to pick anything up at the higher frequencies in terms of dropped data transmissions for Harding DPW?
A. Correct. The --
Q. I got it.
A. The handoff is going to primarily occur for the existing wireless facilities at the low band.
Q. Right. Okay. And then, did you I guess do any type of analysis to determine whether you can, let's say, adjust the electrical tilt of the antenna, or swapping out the antennas at the existing sites for a more effective antenna so to reduce the dropped call -- dropped transmission data?
A. The antennas that are on the existing sites, if you swap out an antenna -- I think what you're indicating is if there was a faulty antenna where it wasn't performing --
Q. No. I'm not talking about a faulty antenna, I'm talking about whether you can adjust the antennas, you can get a more powerful antenna, or change the -- I guess degree of the antenna, or the azimuth of the antenna, to reduce the number of dropped data transmissions. Have you looked into that?
A. I've looked into whether or not the tilts on the surrounding sites have -- can play any role.

1 I've looked into the azimuths. I haven't looked to see if there's a better antenna on the market that would give it an extra $d B$ or two, but what $I$ have -- what I have evaluated so far is that changing the azimuth is not going to give you an increase in signal strength levels that are already weaker than neg 95 in this area. They're already pointing, I believe, at an optimal azimuth trying to cover the center which is the triangle that I always refer to where the DPW is located.

So it's not a scenario where the -- it's pointing, let's say, for the Morristown 3 Relo it's pointing north, and then -- which would be away from the DPW. They actually have a sector that's pointing toward the area. So I think the azimuths are optimal. The tilts -- the tilts are not going to have any significance again in adding more gain or increase in dB levels towards the proposed. You're talking about distances that are over a mile away.
Q. Okay. And again, just so the record's clear, let's say I'm on, let's say, Harding 2 and I'm driving through azimuth 125, and I, I guess, catch azimuth 40, or I catch azimuth 240, azimuth 125 is not going to record a dropped data communication under that scenario; correct?
A. If you have handed over to the other -- an adjacent sector of that cell site or a sector of another site, correct, it's not going to be -- the dropped call will not be pegged on the sector that you were initially on.
Q. And a dropped data communication, though, can in some instances, $I$ know, be caused by interference between two sites where there's overlapping coverage; correct?
A. There can be interference. There can be a degrade in signal quality if you have too many signals serving with weak signal levels, yes.
Q. So do you know -- well, two questions, I guess. First of all, I'm assuming that you don't know from the data that was provided to you in the excel spreadsheet as to the dropped data transmissions as to what percentage of them were caused by overlapping coverage, you don't know that; correct?
A. No.
Q. And if this site -- if this site is approved have you done an analysis to determine what percentage of overlapping coverage will there be in relation to the other sites in the area?
A. No. I haven't looked at the -- to calculate the percentage based on a best server plot.
Q. You stated the -- in order to identify which sector should be investigated, I guess, for the dropped transmission data, that you said a mapping of the sector or ID in the scanned drive data was used identifying the sites or the sectors mostly serving in and around the coverage gap area in the proposed location, something like that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you provide the Board with that mapping of the sector ID?
A. No.
Q. And there are other sectors and there's other sites serving the coverage gap area of the proposed location with different sector IDs than those that you used for your dropped data transmission data; correct?
A. This area because there's no dominant server and the signal levels are very weak, worse than neg 100, you can have other cell IDs showing up in this area at very weak levels, yes, creating essentially noise.
Q. Right. So the -- for example, let me take Harding 2, the alpha sector azimuth at 125 degrees. You say that that antenna is facing the DPW site; correct?
A. Yes. If you look at, yes, the azimuths 360 degrees and the orientation, yes.
Q. And the distance and the width of that coverage would presumably be shown on your propagation maps of existing coverage; correct?
A. The propagation maps do not show you who's serving where, it's all green. If you wanted to see which sector is the dominating server for that particular geographic area, because if you look you do have Harding 2, and Morristown 3 Relo, and they both have sectors pointing in the southern direction, but one will be dominant over the other at certain geographical locations. So if you wanted to see that that is what we would consider a best server map which would give you an indication of who is specifically serving where.
Q. But we can't figure that out from the propagation?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let me see what else I want to -- oh, in terms of this dropped call data that you presented, you don't have any information as to, I guess, percentage or number of Verizon customers actually complaining as to the dropped calls; correct?
A. No. I did not request customer complaint
information.
Q. So you know nothing about recording of complaints or how many or anything like that; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, let me move onto the ODAS plan that you provided in Z-13 and Z-14. So Verizon designed this ODAS, I guess, plan shown on $Z-13, Z-14$, and not you or PierCon; correct?
A. I did not. This plan was provided by Verizon.
Q. And you didn't do any tweaking of the plan; correct?
A. No tweaking.
Q. And how does this design that was supplied by Verizon shown in Z-13 and Z-14 compared to what was previously formally submitted by Verizon to this Board actually and then withdrawn?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We're unaware of what was submitted to the Board or withdrawn. Unless Ms. Boschulte knows what was submitted to the Board and withdrawn.
A. What I have -- what I have is what is as current of today.
Q. My question -- okay. Let me back up. Are you aware of any ODAS plan that was
formally filed with the Harding Township Board of Adjustment?
A. Now you said it --
Q. I'm sorry. Is that a no?
A. You just stated that there was something formally submitted and then withdrawn.
Q. Are you aware of whether that took place?
A. So I'm not aware that anything formally was done.
Q. So is it safe to say since you are not aware, you have not seen anything that may have been submitted to this Board in the past for an ODAS network; correct?
A. No. What I've seen is what's now.
Q. Did you inquire of Verizon, particularly in response to or in reaction to a prior question $I$ may have asked you regarding an ODAS plan, whether they had, in fact, submitted an ODAS plan to Harding Township Board of Adjustment?
A. I did not -- sorry. I did not inquire to anything that was done. Previously I asked for the ODAS conceptual design that they had been working on.
Q. Okay. So when you say they had been working on it, for how long had they been working on it?
A. That $I$ don't know.
Q. Have you seen any prior iteration of the -of what you submitted at $Z-13$ and $Z-14$ ?
A. So I -- no. What I have submitted is what

I have seen based on the propagation analysis that I've done. That's it.
Q. Well, regardless if it's based on the propagation analyses that you've done or not, you've not seen any other ODAS plan?
A. Why do you keep asking the same question?
Q. Ms. Boschulte, I'm trying to get a clear answer. Have you seen any other plan, ODAS plan for this area in Harding other than what you've submitted as $\mathrm{Z}-13$ and $\mathrm{Z}-14$ ?
A. Other than this one, no.
Q. And with regard to, let's say $Z-13$, based on the scale that you provide in the top left-hand corner for $Z-13$ it appears to me that the coverage from the ODAS nodes extend on either side of the roadway width-wise for between one-eighth of a mile or 650 linear feet and a quarter of a mile or 1,320 linear feet in some locations, is that a fair conclusion based on the scale that you provided?
A. All the nodes combined together?
Q. I'm sorry, Ms. Boschulte?
A. I'm sorry. Can you hear me?
Q. I apologize. I missed that last --
A. I'm sorry. Are you asking -- I'm not sure. Are you referencing one node that covers, or all the nodes combined?
Q. Well, I'm saying any particular node will extend it appears for between one-eighth of a mile and a quarter of a mile based on the scale that you attach to $Z-13$ and $Z-14$, is that a fair reading of the exhibit?
A. I see very few that cover a quarter of a mile. I'm not sure which ones you're referencing that covers a quarter of a mile.
Q. Okay. So your testimony is that you don't believe that the coverage -- I'm looking at Z-13 -- and you don't believe that based on your scale that these -- that any of these cover a quarter of a mile; is that what you said?
A. They look to be covering less than based on the scale.
Q. Can you estimate for me based on the scale how long are they covering both along the roadway and also perpendicular?
A. Sorry. I have to bring it up on my computer screen so $I$ can see it.
Q. That's all right.

BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rob, just for clarification, do you mean a quarter mile each way or one-eighth of a mile each way? Maybe that's the confusion.

MR. SIMON: So if I'm looking, Mr. Newlin, at Z-13 and I'm kind of comparing it to the scale. It appears that each one of these DAS nodes will extend in each direction, for clarification, at least between an eighth of a mile and a quarter of a mile, and then also perpendicular the same distance.
A. Okay. I see what you're saying. Yes, so I'm looking at it now in the light.
Q. It's okay.
A. Yes. So based on the scale above from zero to one, which is a mile, and then the halfway point is a half a mile, and then a quarter, and then one-eighth. Yes, I would agree that it is in that range, correct.
Q. Okay. And there's typically -- and oh, I'm sorry. I know you have in response to questions I've asked you in the past and just for confirmation, that depending on line-of-site issues the poles will typically be between 500 and 1500 feet apart; is that a fair statement?
A. They can be in that range.
Q. And there's no dense forest between the street and most of the homes on the streets that you're trying to cover here; correct?
A. There are dense trees between the homes.
Q. Well, when you say -- what's the -- how far a setback, let's say, front the yard setback from the road to the front doors of these homes?

MR. SCHNEIDER: If you know, Frances.
BY MR. SIMON:
Q. If you know?
A. Well, I think -- to the front door -- I mean, they vary. So in some cases there are some homes that are closer to the road, like such as Pleasantville Road. And then as I mentioned before other homes are situated along on the hillside where there are several trees between the road and the next residential house. And that does -- it is greater than 500 feet in some cases.
Q. But most cases not. Most cases the setback from the road to the front door is less than 500 feet; correct?
A. I don't know where you're looking, but I don't agree that in most cases. In most cases there are several homes that are set back from the main
roads.
Q. I know they're set back from the main road, are you saying that the majority of the homes are set back more than 300 feet, or a football field away from the road?
A. There are several homes that I am looking at. Sorry?
Q. Ms. Boschulte, I'm asking, is it your testimony that the majority of the homes in this area are set back greater than 300 feet from the roadway; if you know?
A. I will have to evaluate every home to say if it was the majority.
Q. And then with regard to Z-13 and Z-14 do you know how many of these nodes that you're showing will be utilizing existing telephone poles or other structures, versus how many are going to need new structures?
A. Based on my -- I don't know for sure, but --
Q. Finish your answer. It's okay.
A. I can only tell you from my experience in designing ODAS networks on utility poles and from what I've seen driving up and down these roads that many of them have primary and secondary power and have risers
on them. So to a certain degree they're not going to be usable.
Q. So you'd have to put in --
A. Put in a new -- correct.
Q. But you haven't done that analysis;

## correct?

A. I haven't done a thorough analysis, that's correct.
Q. And have you looked to see whether there's in addition to telephone calls whether there's opportunities for small cell installations on, let's say, traffic lights or buildings or rooftops, anywhere along let's say Glen Alpin or Blue Mill Road, Lees Hill Road, Village Drive or Millbrook Road?
A. There's very little rooftops in this area. So I have looked at to see existing rooftop structures, and there isn't -- other than the ODAS solution that Verizon is proposing other areas to put a small cell opportunities are very minimal.
Q. What about at the Harding DPW? There are buildings and structures there, right?
A. They have the sheds and the actual facility that's there. It's like a one story. Putting a small cell structure on a one-story rooftop is really not going to provide much service, especially if it's
surrounding the amount of foliage that's in this area other than covering the DPW.
Q. Would it provide coverage similar to that if you placed an ODAS node in the same location?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Same location as what?
A. The DPW?
Q. As the DPW?
A. I haven't done the analysis, but if you're asking whether or not a small cell or an ODAS node would have comparative coverage; is that what you're asking?
Q. Yes.
A. If the heights are about the same, but you have -- I think you have -- with a small cell the installation is slightly different, the antenna configurations can be slightly different than what you're able to do on an ODAS node type of installation.
Q. Is it fair to say that the two
installations in terms of coverage that would be achieved are comparable?
A. Yes. They would be very small.
Q. But they're comparable, right?
A. Yes, but $I$ think we can already see that the coverage footprint of an ODAS is very small.
Q. I didn't ask you that. I asked you compare

1 ODAS to small cell. And it would be similar, correct, in terms of coverage?
A. Correct.
Q. And you're not aware of locations within the gap area where additional ODAS nodes physically cannot be placed; correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Do you understand the question, Frances?

THE WITNESS: No. I don't understand the question. BY MR. SIMON:
Q. Is there anything about whether it's wetlands, environmental issues, flood plain, is there any area within the gap in question where you could not physically install an ODAS node?

MR. SCHNEIDER: If you've done that analysis. BY MR. SIMON:
Q. If you know?
A. I haven't done that analysis.
Q. And you're aware, or I should say it this way.

Are you aware or familiar with Harding's right-of-way ordinance regarding the placement of wireless telecommunications equipment?
A. I am aware and I have read it, although it was a while ago.
Q. And based on your recollection, even though it was a while ago, isn't it true that installing ODAS nodes to your recollection is permitted within the right-of-way provided you comply with the ordinance?
A. I do know that the ODAS nodes are permitted in the municipal right-of-way. I think it says municipal right-of-way.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Subject to all compliance with all of the provisions of the ordinance.

MR. SIMON: That's what I asked. I said subject to complying with the ordinance.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay.
BY MR. SIMON:
Q. Are there any -- so do you believe that for purposes of this application that the right-of-way ordinance does not pertain to an installation of an ODAS node within the county right-of-way?

MR. SCHNEIDER: That calls for a legal conclusion. I'll object to that.
A. I don't know what you're asking.
Q. I'll move on.

Your Exhibit Z-13 shows 25 ODAS nodes, and they're all proposed outside the area intended to be

1 covered by the DPW macro site; is that accurate?
A. Yes. That's accurate. It's in areas where, almost all where the DP -- the proposed coverage from the DPW is not covering.
Q. And the ODAS nodes along the roadways are propagated based on what Verizon perceives as reliable in-building LTE coverage; correct?
A. The propagation is at the neg 95 dBm RSRP.
Q. In building, right.
A. Correct.
Q. So I will try to ask this somewhat artfully enough.

If the desired signal strength was not in-building but let's say hypothetically in car, and that the desired signal strength accordingly would not be negative 95, but more like negative 105, that in that scenario or hypothetical the ODAS propagation that we're seeing in $\mathrm{Z}-13$ would extend further; correct?
A. I can tell you that in this particular case it is not correct. And although this exhibit was not provided I did -- when I did my evaluation I did look at the weaker signal levels at say, for example, the in-vehicle threshold for neg 105, and the concern as I mentioned previously in my testimony is that in this particular area, especially along Pleasantville Road

1 and Long Hill Road and some of the other areas, the fact that the ODAS antenna is low and within the tree line, and there is dense trees in these areas, in addition to severe changes in ground elevation, the roll off between neg 95 and neg 105 is -- happens very quickly. So you do not see a significant or even an adequate amount of large footprint between the neg 95 and the neg 105.

I did do that evaluation. The fact that it's not -- I mean, we have just submitted so many exhibits already that I did not submit that exhibit showing the weaker signal levels, but that can be provided. But I did evaluate that in my analysis.
Q. So for example, I'm just looking at this, let's say there is no Harding DPW site, and hypothetically you wanted to cover this entire area, exclusively with an ODAS network, and you put some nodes, for example, on Blue Mill Road near the Harding DPW site where it meets with Glen Alpin, are you telling me that the coverage would be the same if your desired signal strength was 105 -- negative 105 as opposed to negative 95?
A. What I'm telling you is that first I did not do an evaluation of placing additional nodes anywhere other than what is in this conceptual design.

So I can't answer your question regarding --
Q. I understand. I'm going to ask it differently and $I$ think it will be a better question, which is, for the areas that you looked at, or the ODAS areas that you looked at were exclusively the ones that are identified on $Z-13$ and $Z-14$; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And for those areas where there's ODAS nodes shown on $Z-13$ and $Z-14$, if the desired signal strength was not negative 95 but negative 105 it really wouldn't make it much of any difference in terms of the propagation from those particular ODAS nodes that are shown on Z-13 and Z-14; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So the -- do the ODAS nodes on Z-13 and
Z-14, do they cover any areas where there are buildings?
A. No.
Q. If you know.
A. No.
Q. Okay. And why -- do you know why ODAS nodes are shown along Spring Valley Road and Van Beuren Road when they don't represent areas that you even drive tested as part of this application?
A. Do I know why Verizon has conceptual design there? Is that what you're asking?
Q. Yes.
A. It's an area that clearly has poor signal strength, and a gap in coverage.
Q. Right. But it's a different gap than what you've been focusing on for purposes of this application?
A. Correct. I -- yes, correct.
Q. And when we started this application a while back, in your initial report I believe you stated that Verizon Wireless focused on the major road -- I think you said the major roads and central areas within Harding Township such as the municipal court, the police department, and the fire department; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when we talk about the major roads I assume we're talking about Lees Hill Road, Blue Mill Road and Glen Alpin?
A. Yes, and Village Road, yes.
Q. And Village Road?
A. Yes.
Q. So right now you have ODAS nodes proposed along Glen Alpin Road and Blue Mill Road, right, on Z-13, for example?
A. And Pleasantville Road and Long Hill Road.
Q. Plus included are ODAS nodes along Glen Alpin and Blue Mill, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You currently are showing six along Glen Alpin and four along Blue Mill, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You also suggest that, I believe at the last meeting, that you could place an ODAS node at the intersection of Blue Mill Road and James Street, right? Didn't you say that at the last meeting?
A. Yes. The question was why wasn't there one placed? And I said, based on the data presented one could be utilized there for not meeting -- for having poor signal strength.
Q. At that particular location?
A. Correct.
Q. And you would need, it seems to me in looking at Z-13, only about eight or nine more nodes along Blue Mill Road to cover the entire stretch of Glen Alpin and Blue Mill that extends beyond where the DPW macro site is intended to cover; correct?
A. I haven't done that evaluation. So as -if you look at the current ODAS design --
Q. Which one, Z-13?
A. $\quad \mathrm{On} \mathrm{Z}-13$.
Q. Okay.
A. You know, in some cases the nodes are closer together. In other cases they're slightly further apart. So that would have to be evaluated based upon the terrain.
Q. So can you -- as you're looking at this right now and being familiar, Ms. Boschulte, with the terrain, can you estimate for me how many additional nodes would we be able to install along Blue Mill Road to cover the entire stretch of Glen Alpin and Blue Mill, approximately, like a range?
A. Between where the current design ends on Blue Mill Road, all the way down to Glen Alpin?
Q. Yes. Right. So how many additional ones?
I figured -- I'm looking at the terrain
data, and other data. I'm not an expert, but I came up with between eight and nine.
A. It's possible. Probably around nine or ten. I think you'll need some additional ones around the bend where Blue Mill Road bends off and then there's a change in elevation again. So --
Q. And then it also, in terms of where Lees Hill Road is, how many do you think we would need along Lees Hill Road to cover the area where the macro site
is intended to cover? I counted approximately four or five.
A. I think that's more difficult, because as you can see the area of coverage is not just along Lees Hill Road. You are covering the residential area within that triangle of Lees Hill and Glen Alpin. If you look at it from a triangle perspective up to Fawnhill --
Q. Right. And I misspoke and I apologize. I'm just talking about covering the roadway. Okay.

So how many more nodes -- I counted, you know, four or five, in fairness, given the topography along Lees Hill to cover the area that -- the area of Lees Hill Road that the DPW macro site's intending to cover.
A. That's a good approximation to cover the road.
Q. And the -- and along Village Drive -- along Village -- I think you say it's Village Road here. Along what you call Village Road --
A. Village Drive.
Q. I think -- right. In terms of covering that roadway that's being covered by the Harding DPW site, we're probably five or six nodes and then you've got to also take into consideration the fact that it
looks like it's already being covered by another site, right, because of the green?
A. Yeah. This is where -- based on the actual drive test this was like an over prediction, because it doesn't really get in there due to the terrain, but based on approximation, yes, I would say probably four or five.
Q. And so -- and then along Millbrook Road it seems that where the DPW site's intending to cover, you know, we're talking also probably even closer to four. Does that sound right?
A. I think that area is going to be a little bit more challenging, but --
Q. Maybe five? I understand what you're --
A. Yeah. It could be more like maybe five or six.
Q. So that would be five or six along Millbrook Road?
A. But again we're just talking about roads.
Q. I totally agree. Right. So it seems that -- so and right now on the $\mathrm{Z}-13, \mathrm{Z}-14$ ODAS plan you're showing 25 nodes that are all in areas that are not intended to be covered by the Harding DPW; correct? Right?
A. Correct.
Q. So 25, and I just did the math in my head. We're talking about maybe 25 more nodes to cover all the main roads in the area at the signal strength Verizon desires, correct? Including areas outside the coverage area, right, just for the roads; correct?
A. Just for the roads.
Q. Right. But you're also getting -- sounds like a Ginsu knife -- you're also getting Pleasantville Road, you're getting Long Hill, you're getting Red Gate Road, you're getting Spring Valley Road, you're getting Van Beuren Road in addition to that; correct?
A. But you're missing all the residential houses in between.
Q. Okay. I understand what you're saying. And I'm assuming, or do you know the amount of traffic that's on, let's say, Glen Alpin, Blue Mill, Lees Hill, Village Drive and Millbrook Road as compared to those more minor roads such as Pleasantville Road and Red Gate and Spring Valley?
A. The vehicular traffic you mean?
Q. Yes.
A. That was a long time ago. I'd have to look for those numbers again.
Q. And so, if you -- if you added, let's say, the 25 ODAS nodes, and again this is just for the major

1 roads, to the ten currently proposed on Blue Mill and Glen Alpin, that's a total of 35 ODAS nodes that are needed for what you believe to be the major roadways in the area. Again, we're just talking about roadways, right, does that sound right?
A. Sorry. Did you say a total of 35?
Q. Thirty-five, for the main roads as you've identified.
A. Are you just adding in Blue Mill and Lees Hill?
Q. Yes.
A. And not Village?
Q. I'm adding in Village, Glen Alpin, Blue Mill, Lees Hill?
A. I thought that was an extra 20, plus 25. Isn't that like 45?
Q. No. I think that we just need another 25. There's ten right now.
A. Sorry.
Q. I mean, my math -- okay.
A. I'm trying to figure out, are you looking at the --
Q. The bottom line is that if you wanted to just cover those roadways you would need approximately 35 to 40 ODAS nodes; correct?
A. Okay. Not including the current conceptual --
Q. Yeah, not including the --
A. Oh, okay. That's why I was confused.
Q. Well, I'm including -- obviously, I want to use the nodes that are on Glen Alpin and Blue Mill that you show, but not the ones that are on like Van Beuren and Spring Valley and those?
A. Okay.
Q. Right. Are you following?
A. Understood.
Q. And you recall because PierCon worked on it, that for the Burnsville Mountain site or area that Verizon installed with PierCon's assistance 32 ODAS nodes in that area; correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Do you know that number to be true, Frances?

THE WITNESS: I don't know. I wasn't
involved in the installation. I was involved in the design, but $I$ don't know any of the approvals or outcomes of what transpired.

BY MR. SIMON:
Q. But based on your involvement in the design do you remember how many nodes were involved?
A. I don't recall. I'd have to look back.
Q. If I said it was 32, does that refresh your recollection one way or another?

MR. SCHNEIDER: If you don't know, you don't know. BY MR. SIMON:
Q. If you don't know, you don't know.
A. No. It was too long ago.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon --
MR. SIMON: Yes. I'm almost done.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We're approaching a little over the two hours, I think.

MR. SIMON: I have like four questions left.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Thank you.
Q. Let me see here. Okay. You mentioned at the last hearing about the school, the elementary school. And you've not done any analysis as to whether that can be covered by any in-building DAS or small cell rooftop installation; correct?
A. I haven't done any, no, that's correct, whether or not that's a viable candidate.

MR. SIMON: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I want to stick to my word. I'm done.

Thank you, Ms. Boschulte. Always a pleasure to speak with you.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Mr. Simon, thank you.

Ms. Boschulte, can I ask one quick question? Just because $I$ forgot to ask it last Monday. How tall are these ODAS towers or structures in your plan?

THE WITNESS: In the propagation analysis they all have an antenna centerline of approximately 33 -- 33.5 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thirty-three and a half. And how does that compare, and I know this is a tough thing to find, but a normal telephone pole?

So as you've driven around town you've seen the telephone poles. How tall are those?

THE WITNESS: I think they kind of average -- through my experience they average between 25 and 35 feet.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough.
Fair enough. Thank you.
Mr. Simon, thank you.
Are there any members of the public who are not represented by Mr. Simon that have any questions for Ms. Boschulte? (No reply.)

I'll give people a moment to turn their mics on if they do have any questions.

Okay. I'm going to take that as a no. Mr. Schneider, thank you very much. Ms. Boschulte, thank you for coming back.

Mr. Schneider, I'd like to pick this up again next month. Do you have -- what's your plan for testimony next month?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Mr. Chairman, we had talked about at the conclusion of last month, based on your agenda, the possibility of a Special only because my intention next month is while I'll reserve the right to call back Ms. Boschulte, my clear intention and hope is to proceed with planning at next month's hearing, whether that be by Special or not. And I think I respectfully was trying to highlight the need to want to do that in one fell swoop so as not to have that, I think, really important testimony broken up.

So my respectful request would be whether it's at the Board's regular meeting where we can be given the night, or some mutually acceptable Special Meeting to be able to proceed with my planner so that testimony and cross-examination can all be effectuated in one setting.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. How long do you think the testimony will be?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Famous last words, but I

1 would -- off the top of my head I'm thinking about an hour and a half in terms of direct. Could it be to two hours? It could be. Let me err on the side of caution.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So the bulk of the Cross I would imagine is going to come from you, Mr. Simon. Having not heard the testimony, but you have experience in these matters, how long do you expect your cross would be?

MR. SIMON: It typically would be over two hours. I think that's a fair estimate. You know, two and a half. And Rich is correct. It's very, very important testimony and that's why, you know, we need to take the time with it.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. And Mr.
Schneider, so right there even if it's only two hours by Mr. Simon, not including any of the Board's questions, not including any of the other public's questions we're over the three and a half hours we have slotted for a meeting.

I would say regarding a Special Meeting if the need arises we will have a Special Meeting and I will move the non-Verizon applications to the Special Meeting. All right. As we sit here I just don't know what the Agenda is going to look like for next month.

1 We may have some, we may have none, but I would like to play it by ear. But in any case, this application will be heard at the regularly scheduled meeting. If something gets moved to a Special Meeting it will not be this application. So if everybody keeps this on our calendar I think it's easier so we don't have to change our schedules around.

I would like to if we can talk, and you Steve, and you and Steve can talk, and I'll talk with Steve, we'll figure out exactly what's on the Agenda, and how to organize the -- or how to get your planning testimony in. It doesn't sound like it's feasible to do both the Direct testimony and the Cross in one meeting anyway. So anyway, let's plan on getting together again at the regularly scheduled meeting next month.

MR. SCHNEIDER: And just for the purposes of the record, we would carry the matter without further notice contingent upon mutual extensions of the Shot Clock to the Board's March 18th 7:30 p.m. meeting. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that the correct date, Lori? I'm not sure of the date. Let's look. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Looks correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: March 18th, yes. And yes, carried without further notice. And yeah, the

Board consents to an extension of the Shot Clock.
MR. SCHNEIDER: And I reserve the right, Mr. Chairman, although it's not my intention at this point to bring back Frances, but just for purposes of the record $I$ certainly reserve that right. But my intention to move the matter along is to have our planner on March 18th.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Sounds great. MR. SCHNEIDER: And we'll submit, if anything, in terms of any visual analysis to assist the Board that in advance of the hearing for the Board's benefit.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Great. Thank you. MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So we will see you next month. Thank you very much.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Thanks for all your time tonight.

MR. SIMON: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. All right. So for anyone on the meeting that is the conclusion for the evening of the Verizon matter. We'll pick it up again next month as you heard.
(Whereupon, the hearing on this application concludes at 9:49 p.m.)
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| 67:17 | 25:15,19,23 | 36:24 37:11,16 | 51:15 56:3,10 |  |
| comparing 52:7 | 28:2,8,9,10,12 | 37:25 38:16 | 56:19,24 57:2 | D 1:18 3:1 |
| comparison | 28:14,14,17 | 39:3,4,6,19,20 | 59:3,7 60:20 | d/b/a 1:5 |
| 29:15,17 | 29:25 31:6,12 | 40:8,13 41:19 | 62:5 65:4 67:5 | damaged 32: |
| complaining | 32:13,16 33:7 | 42:1,2,6 43:4 | covered 6:19 | DAN 1:12 |
| 47:23 | 35:11 36:20,23 | 44:25 45:3,9 | 12:19 59:1 | DAS 39:22,24 |
| complaint 47:25 | 40:25 41:2 | 45:18 46:16,25 | 65:23 66:1,23 | 52:8 70:18 |
| complaints 48:3 | connections | 47:5,19,24 | 70:18 | data 8:7,25 9:2,3 |
| complete 33:11 | 24:9 25:1 27:3 | 48:3,4,8,12 | covering 39:9 | 9:18 10:4 |
| completed 5:20 | 27:17 28:3 | 49:13 52:19 | 42:12,22 51:19 | 14:25 15:21 |
| 6:117:1 | 36:13,15,16 | 53:4,22 55:4,6 | 51:22 56:2 | 17:3 19:16 |
| completely | 39:8 41:5,11 | 55:8 57:1,3,6 | 59:4 65:5,10 | 22:10,13,18 |
| 28:13 | consents 75:1 | 59:7,10,18,20 | 65:22 | 23:23 24:4,7,8 |
| compliance | consider 28:7 | 61:6,7,13,14 | covers 38:6 | 24:11,12,15,19 |
| 58:10 | 47:14 | 62:9,9,15 | 39:16,16 51:4 | 24:20,25 25:11 |
| comply 58:6 | consideration | 63:17,22 66:23 | 51:13 | 25:12,17 26:6 |
| complying 58:13 | 65:25 | 66:25 67:4,5 | COVID 28:20 | 26:10,18,24,25 |
| comprised 24:5 | consistent 5:18 | 67:11 68:25 | 29:11 | 27:2,4,7 28:7 |
| computer 25:20 | consists 11:17 | 69:15 70:19,20 | crane 11:24 | 28:10,24 29:3 |
| 31:16 51:25 | 11:19,20 | 73:12 74:21,23 | create $26: 6$ | 29:4,8,9,16,25 |
| conceptual | constitute 25:1 | correction 9:18 | created 26:15,19 | 31:2,6 32:13 |
| 49:22 60:25 | Consultant 1:19 | 10:3 | 27:21 | 32:16,22 33:2 |
| 62:1 69:2 | contained 15:16 | corresponding | creating 46:20 | 33:15,16 35:11 |
| concern 17:17 | contingent | 41:6 | creation 26:19 | 35:16,25 36:13 |


| 36:14,16,19,21 | 60:21 61:9 | DPW 21:3,6,21 | 36:14,16,19,23 | encompasses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36:22 37:24 | desires 67:4 | 33:18,22 34:21 | 37:4,11,12,19 | 17:20 24:20 |
| 39:7 40:12,25 | determination | 35:6,12,13 | 37:20,24 38:2 | ended 6:8 28:17 |
| 41:5,10,22 | 22:16 | 39:2,9 40:11 | 38:4,10,19 | ends 64:13 |
| 43:2,13,22 | determine 43:9 | 42:13,23 43:3 | 39:7,25 40:2,3 | Engel 2:10 |
| 44:24 45:6,15 | 45:21 | 44:9,14 46:24 | 40:12,12 41:21 | entire 60:16 |
| 45:16 46:3,4 | determined | 55:20 56:2,6,7 | 41:21 42:10,17 | 63:20 64:11 |
| 46:15,15 47:21 | 22:12 | 59:1,4 60:15 | 42:20 43:2,12 | environment |
| 63:13 64:17,17 | device 25:21,22 | 60:19 63:22 | 43:13,22 44:24 | 34:9,11 |
| date 8:6,18 15:8 | devoting 6:21 | 65:14,23 66:9 | 45:4,6,16 46:3 | environmental |
| 29:13 74:22,22 | diagram 35:4,7 | 66:23 | 46:15 47:21,24 | 57:13 |
| 76:8 | dies 31:20 | Dr 1:19 10:20 | dropped-call | equipment |
| Dated 76:17 | difference 11:19 | 12:10 22:20 | 20:2 | 57:25 |
| David 2:9 | 11:21,25 20:11 | drew 34:23 | dropping 31:12 | err 73:3 |
| DAVIS 2:2 | 20:14 27:5 | drive 8:5,7,8,16 | drops 36:8 37:2 | error 30:10 |
| day 41:5,11 | 61:11 | 8:20 9:14 15:2 | drove 14:10 | especially 30:25 |
| dB 9:17 13:23 | different 34:1 | 15:10,24 16:11 | due 66:5 | 55:25 59:25 |
| 44:3,18 dBm 12.25 16:4 | 46:14 56:15,16 | 16:12,13,16,16 |  | ESQUIRE 2:3,5 |
| dBm 12:25 16:4 | 62:6 | 16:19 18:7,20 |  | $2: 8$ |
| 39:19 59:8 | differently 61:3 | 35:2 46:4 | E 2:1,1 3:1,7 | ESQUIRES $2: 5$ |
| dead 30:9,11 | difficult 65:3 | 55:14 61:25 | 7:14,14 76:1,1 | essence 13:4 |
| 31:16 | dip 21:5 | 65:18,21 66:4 | ear 74:2 | essentially 46:20 |
| December 29:7 | direct 73:2 | 67:17 | earlier 5:6 41:23 | established 40:1 |
| 29:9 | 74:13 | driven 71:13 | Earth 14:23,24 | estimate 51:21 |
| decided 21:6 | direction 34:23 | driveway 17:24 | 14:25 | 64:9 73:11 |
| degrade 45:11 | 35:24 37:3 | driveways 17:17 | easier 74:6 | Eunice 2:9 |
| degree 43:21 | 47:11 52:9 | 17:18,18,24 | effective 43:12 | evaluate 54:12 |
| 55:1 | directly 11:3 | 18:9 | effectuated | 60:13 |
| degrees 46:23 | 34:21 | driving 9:13 | 72:21 | evaluated 22:6 |
| 47:2 | disconnect 31:6 | 14:22 26:1 | eight 63:19 | 29:14 44:4 |
| delay 28:11 | distance 16:25 | 35:12,13,15,17 | 64:18 | 64:5 |
| dense 53:2,5 | 17:1,4 18:7 | 35:18 44:22 | eighth 52:10 | evaluating 17:16 |
| 60:3 | 38:13 47:3 | 54:24 | Eisenstein 1:19 | 18:16 33:24 |
| department | 52:11 | drop 22:9 24:25 | 10:20 12:11 | evaluation 59:21 |
| 62:15,15 | distances 17:11 | 25:24 30:7,25 | 22:20 | 60:9,24 63:23 |
| depending | 44:19 | 31:4,10 33:6,7 | either 7:24 | EVD 3:9 |
| 52:23 | distinction | 33:12 35:20 | 20:20 26:4,24 | evening 4:24 5:7 |
| describe 11:13 | 40:24 | 41:3 | 50:19 | 7:17,18 75:22 |
| 11:16 | distinguish | dropped 22:9,13 | electrical 43:10 | everybody $74: 5$ |
| DESCRIPTI... | 25:12 | 22:17,17 23:10 | elementary | exactly $74: 10$ |
| 3:9 | dominant 46:17 | 23:22,23,24 | 70:16 | examination |
| design 13:6,7 | 47:12 | 24:1,4,5,6,8,12 | elevation 60:4 | 7:16 15:7 |
| 34:2 48:14 | dominating 47:8 | 25:1,17 27:1 | 64:22 | example 12:22 |
| 49:22 60:25 | door 53:12,21 | 27:17 28:1,8 | ELIZABETH | 13:5 30:11,25 |
| 62:1 63:24 | doors 53:8 | 29:25 30:1 | 1:13 | 31:13,14 32:5 |
| 64:13 69:20,23 | Dose 41:6 | 31:21 32:13,16 | emergency | 42:9 46:22 |
| designed 48:6 | double-check | 32:22 33:2,9 | 28:21 | 59:22 60:14,18 |
| designing 54:23 | 10:24 | 33:14,15,16 | employee 76:10 | 62:25 |
| desired 59:13,15 | DP 59:3 | 35:11,16 36:8 | 76:12 | examples 18:4 |


| excel 25:2 26:7 | 41:20 49:18 | 76:13 | Fox 1:18 4:17 | 38:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26:12,14,19 | 60:2,9 65:25 | find 23:16,18 | Frances 3:4 6:13 | glad 11:9 |
| 27:15 45:15 | factor 9:15,17 | 71:12 | 6:16 7:24 8:16 | Glen 20:20 35:2 |
| exclusively | 10:2 | finding 23:2 | 11:13 21:10 | 55:13 60:19 |
| 15:16 60:17 | factors 34:8 | fine 38:21 | 53:9 57:8 | 62:19,24 63:2 |
| 61:5 | fading 34:4 | finish 4:19 36:5 | 69:17 75:4 | 63:5,21 64:11 |
| exhibit 9:19 | fails 28:13,13 | 39:5 42:7 | frankly 6:20 | 64:14 65:6 |
| 26:15 27:21 | failure 31:3 41:1 | 54:21 | freezing 28:12 | 67:16 68:2,13 |
| 35:5 51:10 | failures 28:1,2 | fire 62:15 | frequencies | 69:6 |
| 58:24 59:20 | fair 5:25 28:21 | first 4:5 14:2 | 41:15,22,25 | go 4:5 10:18 |
| 60:11 | 28:23 30:13 | 45:14 60:23 | 42:11 43:1,2 | 14:3 17:10 |
| exhibits 3:10 | 31:25 50:22 | five 18:9 65:2,12 | frequency 38:15 | 20:4 24:1,2 |
| 16:3 19:15,25 | 51:9 52:25 | 65:24 66:7,14 | 38:16 | 27:12 30:15 |
| 36:4 39:22 | 56:18 71:18,19 | 66:15,17 | front 53:7,8,12 | 32:23 36:6 |
| 60:11 | 73:11 | FLANAGAN | 53:21 | 39:12 |
| existence 19:22 | fairness 65:12 | 1:11 4:1,21,25 | further 33:16,17 | goes 21:3 30:9 |
| existing 19:18 | familiar 57:23 | 5:3,5,12,24 6:7 | 38:10,23 41:25 | 30:11 |
| 43:7,11,14 | 64:8 | 7:4,9 8:14 11:6 | 59:18 64:5 | going 4:4, 7, 8, 18 |
| 47:5 54:16 | Famous 72:25 | 11:10 70:8,10 | 74:19,25 76:9 | 5:15 6:21,24 |
| 55:16 | far 12:18 16:22 | 70:14 71:1,10 |  | 11:14,15 12:16 |
| expect 4:5 73:9 | 44:4 53:6 | 71:18 72:23 | G | 14:1 20:20 |
| experience | fault 30:1,2,3,4 | 73:5,15 74:21 | G 2:3,11 | 27:14 32:25 |
| 54:22 71:16 | 30:11,12 | 74:24 75:8,13 | gain 11:25 44:17 | 34:9 38:7,8 |
| 73:8 | faulty 43:16,18 | 75:15,20 | gap 8:21 42:5 | 39:2,9 41:13 |
| expert 64:17 | Fawnhill 65:8 | flood 57:13 | 46:6,13 57:5 | 42:12,22 43:1 |
| extend 17:18 | feasible 74:12 | floor 7:10 | 57:14 62:5,6 | 43:6 44:5,16 |
| 50:19 51:7 | Featherbed | fluctuations | gaps 39:3 | 44:24 45:3 |
| 52:8 59:18 | 18:16 | 34:11 | Gary 4:20,21 | 54:17 55:1,25 |
| extended 5:14 | February 1:7 | focused 62:12 | Gate 67:9,19 | 61:2 66:12 |
| 18:10 | 8:9,18,22 15:8 | focusing 62:7 | generally 11:17 | 72:1 73:6,25 |
| extends 29:3 | feet 12:12 17:19 | foliage $9: 15,17$ | geographic | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { g o o d }} 7: 17,18$ |
| 63:21 | 17:20 18:1,9 | 10:2 12:6 56:1 | 36:11 38:2 | 21:18 27:2 |
| extension 75:1 | 18:10,24 19:10 | folks 28:19 | 47:9 | 65:16 |
| extensions 74:19 | 20:12,14,14 | follow-up 22:3 | geographical | Google 14:23,24 |
| extent 15:15 | 21:3,5,7,8,10 | following 69:10 | 34:25 35:3 | 14:25 15:3 |
| 18:25 23:18 | 21:22,24 22:3 | follows 7:15 | 36:25 40:4 | great 7:21 75:8 |
| extra 44:3 68:15 | 22:7 39:16 | football 54:4 | 47:13 | 75:13 |
|  | 50:21,22 52:24 | footprint 39:16 | GEORGE 1:14 | greater 53:18 |
| F | 53:18,21 54:4 | 56:24 60:7 | getting 67:7,8,9 | 54:10 |
| F 2:87:14 76:1 | 54:10 71:9,17 | foregoing 76:5 | 67:9,10,10 | green 12:18,23 |
| facilities 34:15 | fell 72:15 | forest 53:2 | 74:14 | 13:4,13 16:3,8 |
| 34:16 35:23 | fewer 21:4 | forget 22:25 | Ginarti 4:7 | 47:7 66:2 |
| 43:7 | field 54:4 | forgot 71:4 | Ginsu 67:8 | GREENBAUM |
| facility 11:23 | figure 47:17 | formally 48:16 | give 13:17 18:3 | 2:2 |
| 55:22 | 68:21 74:10 | 49:1,6,8 | 30:24 44:3,5 | ground 60:4 |
| facing 46:24 | figured 64:16 | forth 26:15 76:8 | 47:15 71:24 | Gruel 4:24 5:1 |
| fact 13:22 19:4 | filed 49:1 | four 63:6 65:1 | given 65:12 | guess 21:4,9 |
| 24:19 32:20 | finally $4: 8$ | 65:12 66:6,10 | 72:19 | 22:11 27:2 |
| 38:4 40:24 | financially | 70:12 | gives 16:18 36:8 | 29:6 31:4 |


| 39:21 43:8,21 | heights 56:13 helpful 35:8 helps 16:20 hereinbefore 76:8 <br> HEROLD 2:7 | I | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { indicated 9:14 } \\ \text { 18:21 22:21 } \\ \text { indicating 12:11 } \end{array}$ | involvement 69:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44:22 45:14 |  | ID 46:4,10 |  |  |
| 46:2 47:22 |  | idea 40:21 |  | iPad 24:2 |
| 48:7 |  | identified 14:16 | 28:15,25 36:11 | IRIS 76:3,15 |
|  |  | 4:21 15:5 | 43:16 | issues 52:23 |
|  |  | 2 37:20 | indication 36:8 | 57. |
|  | Heyer 4:24 5:1 | 68:8 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hi 6:16 } \\ & \text { high 37:4 38:2,3 } \end{aligned}$ | identifies 32:4 | industry 22:21 | teration 50: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { half } 52: 1771: 11 \\ 73: 2,12,19 \end{gathered}$ |  | identify $14: 18$ | 2. |  |
| halfway 52:16 |  | 14:20 20:7 | information | J |
| HALL 4:15 hand 4:15 |  | 46:1 | 26:23 47:22 | m |
|  | higher 41:15,22 | identifyin | 48 | 63:10 |
| handdown | 42:11,25 43:2 highlight 72:14 | 15:1546 | initi | January 5:23 |
|  |  | identity 32:3 | initially 16:14 | 6:2,17,18,20 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { highlight 72:14 } \\ & \text { Hill 20:21 35:1 } \end{aligned}$ | IDs 46:14,19 | 45:5 | ersey 76:4 |
| handed 45:1 <br> handoff 43:6 <br> handover 33:11 <br> hang 31:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 13 \text { 60:1 } \\ & \text { 62:18 63:1 } \\ & 64: 24,2565: 5 \end{aligned}$ | ignorant 10:1 | Inki | JOHN 1:18 |
|  |  | 28:6 29:20 | inquire 49:15,20 | ined 4:3 |
|  |  | 33:5 | inside 13:10,23 | joining 5:5 |
| happen 21:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 6,13,14 \\ & 67: 9,1668: 10 \\ & 68: 14 \end{aligned}$ | imagine 73:6 | install 32:21 | jotting 19:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22: 2 \text { 24:23 } \\ & 35: 12 \end{aligned}$ |  | impact 31:17 | 57:15 64:10 | K |
|  |  | important 72:16 | $39 \cdot 23$ 56.15,17 | $\frac{\mathrm{K}}{\text { keep 50:10 }}$ |
| happens 31:7 | hillside 53:16 | 73:13 | 39:23 56:15,17 | keep 50.10 keeps $74: 5$ |
| 32:1 60:5 | hit $31: 6,8$ | improper 42:15 | 58:18 69:19 | kid 24:24 |
| happy 5:9 | holding 30:21 | in-building | 70:19 | kids 24:21 |
| 19:12,12 33:18 | home 25:19 26:1 | $12: 2414: 12$ $16: 437: 15$ | 55:11 56:19 | kind 52:7 71:15 |
| $39: 3 \text { 42:13,22 }$ | $54: 12$ <br> homes $17 \cdot 25$ | 37: | installed 69:14 | knife 67:8 |
| $43: 344: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 3,5,8,13,15 \\ & 53: 25,54: 3,6,9 \end{aligned}$ | in-vehicle 59:23 | installing 58:4 | know 7:6 12: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46: 23 ~ 47: 10 \\ & 49: 1,1850: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  | inadequate 42:4 | instances 45:7 | 12:24 17:13,17 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 53: 2554: 3,6,9 \\ \text { hope } 4: 1472: 11 \end{array}$ | inadequate 42.4 | intend 6:5, | 18:3 21:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 1,1850: 13 \\ & 55: 20 \text { 60:15,18 } \\ & 62: 1465: 23 \\ & 66: 23 \end{aligned}$ | hope 4:14 72:11 hopefully 7:8 hour 73:2 | 20: | 15:22 | 22:19 23:4 |
|  |  | include 28: | intended 58:25 | 25:9 26:9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hours 4:6,11 } \\ & 70: 1173: 3,11 \end{aligned}$ | included 28. | 63:22 65:1 | 28:13 30:1,10 |
| Harding's 57:23 |  | 63:2 | 66:23 | 31:19,22,24 |
| Harsh 2:8 | 73:16,19 | includes | intendin | 32:14 33:14 |
| head 18:18 | house 53:17 housekeeping 4:2 | includes | 6 | 36:4,15,17,19 |
| 27:12 67:1 |  | 24:10 | intention 72:10 | 38:6 39:11,13 |
| 73:1 |  | cluding 19:11 |  | 40:14,16,22 |
| headquarters 20:1 | houses $17: 1,12$ <br> 17.21 18.11 | luding 19:11 | interested 76:13 | 41:20 42:21 |
|  |  |  | interferenc | 45:7,13,14,18 |
| hear 4:4,7,8 | $67: 13$ | e 6:2 | 28:11 45:8,10 | 48:2 50:1 |
| $7: 19,20,21$ $51: 1$ | housing 18:23 |  | internal 30:17 | 52:21 53:9,11 |
| 51:1 |  | increase 29:1 | 30:20 | 53:23 54:2,11 |
| heard 5:13 73:7 | human 30:10 | increase $29: 1$ | intersect | 54:15,19 57:19 |
| 74:3 75:23 | hypothetical59:17 |  | 63:10 | 58:7,22 61:20 |
| hearing 5:23 8:4 |  | $22: 11,1627: 19$ | investigated | 61:22 62: |
| $\begin{gathered} 70: 1672: 12 \\ 75: 11,24 \\ \text { height } 21: 6,22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { hypothetically } \\ 59: 1460: 16 \end{gathered}$ |  | 46:2 | 64:3 65:12 |
|  |  |  |  | 66:10 67:15 |
|  |  |  | 69:19,24 | 69:16,18,20 |
|  |  | ate 37:2 |  | 70:3,4,6,6 |


| 71:11 73:11,13 | 6:25 42:25 | 44:1,1 45:24 | 47:6 | 10:6 15:12,19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73:24 | line 34:23 40:6 | 55:9,16 61:4,5 | March 8:5 29:12 | 18:13 22:23 |
| knowing 40:20 | 60:3 68:23 | looking 18:19 | 74:20,24 75:7 | 34:23,25 37:1 |
| knows 48:20 | line-of-site | 27:22 51:15 | margin 13:9,16 | 53:15 59:24 |
| Koeneke 2:9 | 52:23 | 52:6,13 53:23 | 34:3,3,10 | 70:15 |
|  | linear 17:25 | 54:6 60:14 | Marino 18:7 | meters 12:12 |
| L | 21:5 50:21,21 | 63:19 64:7,16 | mark 23:12 | Michael 1:15 |
| L 7:14 | link 13:16 | 68:21 | marked 3:10 | 2:9 |
| LA 76:3,15 | little 4:6,10 5:7 | looks 66:1 74:23 | market 44:2 | mics 71:25 |
| $\boldsymbol{l a g} 28: 15$ | 29:20 39:23 | Lori 1:17 74:22 | MASELLI 1:12 | Mike 1:11 4:22 |
| Lane 18:16 | 55:15 66:12 | lose 21:5 | material 6:5 | mile 38:14,15,17 |
| large 60:7 | 70:11 | losing 28:8 | math 41:7,12 | 44:19 50:20,21 |
| late 4:3 | Livio 2:10 | 30:10 | 67:1 68:20 | 51:7,8,12,13 |
| latency 28:15 | LLC 2:8 | loss 11:25 28:14 | matter 1:3 74:18 | 51:17 52:3,4 |
| latest 26:16 | LLP 2:2 | lost 25:5,15,24 | 75:6,22 | 52:10,10,16,17 |
| latitude 36:17 | local 20:15,18 | 28:15 | matters 7:7 73:8 | Mill 20:21 55:13 |
| 36:25 40:2,17 | located 16:8 | Lot 1:6 | McKinley 5:6 | 60:18 62:18,24 |
| 40:19 | 44:10 | low 31:16 38:3 | McKittrick 2:10 | 63:3,6,10,20 |
| LAW 2:7 | location 15:9,22 | 38:15,21 43:7 | mean 9:8 12:23 | 63:21 64:10,12 |
| leave 32:25 | 33:19,22 34:17 | 60:2 | 15:4 33:22,24 | 64:14,21 67:16 |
| led 26:19 | 34:18 35:3 | lower 21:22 22:6 | 39:18 52:3 | 68:1,9,14 69:6 |
| Lees 20:21 35:1 | 36:18 37:1 | 41:15,18,25 | 53:13 60:10 | Millbrook 1:5 |
| 55:13 62:18 | 38:2 46:7,14 | LTE 12:13 | 67:20 68:20 | 18:14 20:21 |
| 64:23,25 65:4 | 56:4,5 63:16 | 25:23 33:6 | meaning 12:9 | 55:14 66:8,18 |
| 65:6,13,14 | locations 15:11 | 37:15 59:7 | measured 18:4 | 67:17 |
| 67:16 68:9,14 | 15:12 37:20 |  | meeting 6:2,3,20 | minimal 55:19 |
| left 70:13 | 40:2 47:13 | M | 10:7 19:9 | minor 67:18 |
| left-hand 50:17 | 50:22 57:4 | M 2:10 | 23:21 26:4,5 | missed 51:2 |
| legal 58:20 | long 12:14 17:18 | Ma'am 29:2 | 63:9,11,14 | missing 67:12 |
| let's 9:23 25:21 | 17:20 49:24 | macro 10:13 | 72:18,20 73:20 | misspoke 65:9 |
| 28:10 31:11 | 51:22 60:1 | 11:23 59:1 | 73:21,22,24 | Mlenak 2:3 4:16 |
| 33:7 42:10 | 63:1 67:9,22 | 63:22 64:25 | 74:3,4,14,15 | 4:20 6:10,23 |
| 43:10 44:12,21 | 70:7 72:23 | 65:14 | 74:20 75:21 | 7:3 |
| 44:21 50:16 | 73:8 | main 17:19,21 | meetings 6:12 | modular 32:3 |
| $53: 755: 11,13$ $59: 1460: 15$ | longitude 36:18 | 20:19 53:25 | meets 12:24 | moment 6:15 |
| 59:14 60:15 | 37:1 40:2,17 | 54:2 67:3 68:7 | 14:12 60:19 | 22:25 71:24 |
| 67:16,24 74:14 | 40:19 | maintain 36:13 | megahertz | Monday 71:4 |
| 74:22 | look 12:15 19:4 | 40:25 41:1 | 19:10 20:13 | month $72: 5,6,8$ |
| level 9:7,11,12 | 24:15 27:14 | major 62:12,13 | 21:2,21 38:9,9 | 72:10 73:25 |
| 13:7 34:10 | 29:11,13 34:22 | 62:17 67:25 | 42:11,13,18,21 | 74:16 75:16,23 |
| 38:7 | 35:25,25 39:14 | 68:3 | 42:23 | month's 72:12 |
| levels 16:16 36:1 | 39:15 47:1,9 | majority 26:25 | member 4:24 | months 39:1 |
| 36:2 44:6,18 | 51:19 59:21 | 54:3,9,13 | 5:1 52:2 74:23 | Morristown |
| 45:12 46:18,20 | 63:24 65:7 | making 19:5 | members 1:10 | 19:12 42:9,17 |
| 59:22 60:12 | 67:22 69:25 | 30:8 35:22 | 3:15 71:21 | 44:12 47:10 |
| life 24:22 | 73:25 74:22 | manner 15:9 | memory 32:13 | Mountain 69:13 |
| light 52:13 | looked 16:25 | map 15:3 47:14 | mental 19:5 | move 7:8 12:16 |
| lights 55:12 | 18:4,15 29:9 | mapping 46:3,9 | mention 21:14 | 19:7 22:8 38:8 |
| limited 1:4 5:22 | 29:10 43:23,24 | maps 16:15 47:5 | mentioned 4:16 | 48:5 58:23 |
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| 67:2 68:4 | text 4:17 24:6 | tilts 43:24 44:16 | transmitter | understood |
| tall 71:5,14 | texts 25:9 | 44:16 | 10:13 | 27:23 69:11 |
| Ted 2:11 | thank 4:21 5:5,9 | time 6:9 22:23 | transmitting | undertook 15:7 |
| telecommunic... | 5:10 7:11,21 | 26:11 28:16 | 35:21 | updated 35:18 |
| 57:25 | 8:2,14 11:10 | 30:19,20 32:12 | transpired | updates 32:21 |
| telephone 54:16 | 11:11 12:15 | 37:25 41:13 | 69:21 | usable 55:2 |
| 55:10 71:12,14 | 19:24 21:11 | 67:22 73:14 | tree 34:7 60:2 | USB 25:21 |
| tell 37:18 42:16 | 23:19 36:7 | 75:18 76:7 | trees 53:5,17 | use 26:22 69:6 |
| 54:22 59:19 | 61:15 70:14,24 | times 8:4,13 | 60:3 | user 28:9 30:14 |
| telling 60:20,23 | 71:2,19,20 | 23:3 29:17 | triangle 35:1 | 30:19,24 |
| ten 64:20 68:1 | 72:2,3 75:13 | 38:25 | 40:10 44:9 | user's 30:1,4 |
| 68:18 | 75:16,17,19,20 | today 5:1 48:23 | 65:6,7 | users 29:19,21 |
| terminate 31:9 | Thanks 4:20 | tonight 4:4 6:6 | tries 33:7 | uses 34:1 |
| termination | 75:17 | 15:14 75:18 | true 58:4 69:17 | utility 54:23 |
| 31:9 | thing 71:12 | tool 26:22 | 76:5 | utilized 63:14 |
| terms 6:4 14:24 | things 31:2 | top 9:13 18:18 | try 59:11 | utilizing 11:22 |
| 17:3 24:19 | think 4:1,16 6:1 | 50:17 73:1 | trying 6:10 | 11:24 54:16 |
| 43:2 47:21 | 6:17 15:4 19:8 | topography | $13: 1930: 13$ | V |
| 56:19 57:2 61:11 64:23 | 20:8 21:17 | $65: 12$ | 31:1 44:8 |  |
| 61:11 64:23 | 23:20 33:1,16 | torch 4:15 | 50:11 53:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Valley } 61: 23 \\ & 67: 10,1969: 8 \end{aligned}$ |


| Van 61:23 67:11 | wanted 8:11 | 21:14 57:9 | Zone 1:6 | 47:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 69:7 | 47:7,13 60:16 | 69:18 71:7,15 | zoom 1:8 25:14 | $3032: 14$ |
| vary 53:13 | 68:23 | word 70:23 | 0 | 300 54:4,10 |
| vehicle 9:13 | wasn't 36:21 | words 9:9 21:4 | 0 | 30XI 76:16 |
| vehicular 67:20 | 43:17 63:12 | 30:5,7 72:25 | 00162800 76:16 | 32 69:14 70:1 |
| verified 28:4 | 69:18 | worked 69:12 | 1 | 33 71:8 |
| verify 27:25 | waste 41:13 | working 49:22 | - 11.6 | $33.571: 9$ |
| 31:19 | watt 10:12,14 | 49:24,24 | 11:6 | 35 68:2,6,25 |
| Verizon 1:5 4:5 | way 14:20 17:14 | worse 46:18 | 1,320 50:21 | 71:16 |
| 4:9,19 8:21 | 31:22 38:15 | wouldn't 61:11 | 10 13:23 | 360 47:1 |
| 19:18 20:1 | 52:3,4 57:22 | write 14:19 | 100 9:23 10:24 | 3G 33:8 |
| 25:3,18 26:8 | 64:14 70:2 | writing 33:19 | $\begin{gathered} 36: 12 \text { 46:19 } \\ \mathbf{1 0 5 3 6 : 1 2 ~ 5 9 : 1 6 ~} \end{gathered}$ | 3rd 8:6 |
| 27:20 28:7,24 | ways $14: 2134: 1$ | written 23:5 | 59:23 60:5,8 | 4 |
| 29:16 36:22 | we'll 11:9 74:10 | wrong $31: 7,8$ | $60: 21,2161: 10$ |  |
| 47:23 48:6,10 | 75:9,22 | wrote 10:7 | $60: 21,2161: 10$ $106 \text { 36:20 }$ | 40 44:23 68:25 |
| 48:15,16 49:15 | we're 4:4 5:8 |  |  | 45 68:16 |
| 55:18 59:6 | 11:21 20:12 | X | $11036: 21$ | 4G 33:3,7 |
| 62:1,12 67:4 | 48:18 59:18 | X 1:6 3:1,7 | 120 19:10 20:12 | 4GLTE 10:9 |
| 69:14 75:22 | 62:18 65:24 | Y | 20:14 39:16 | 12:8 |
| Verizon's 32:5 | 66:10,19 67:2 | yard 21:7,21 | 46:23 | 5 |
| vers | 73:19 | 35:6 53:7 | 14th 8:9,18,22 | 500 17:19,25 |
| 40:20,22,23 | weak 33:10 | yeah 66:3,15 | 15:8 | 18:24 52:24 |
| 54:17 | 37:8 45:12 | 69:3 73:15 | 1500 52:24 | 53:18,21 |
| viable 70:21 | 46:18,20 | 74:25 | 171:6 | 6 |
| vicinity 13:3 | weaken 30:18 | year 8:9 28:19 | 17-18 1:4 $181: 7$ | 600 18:9 |
| 37:5 | weaker 36:2,10 | $29: 14,18$ years $24: 23$ | $\text { 18th } 74: 20,24$ | 642-4299 1:24 |
| Videoconfere... $1: 8$ | $37: 638: 11$ $39: 1944: 6$ | years 24:23 <br> York 1:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18th 74:20,24 } \\ & 75: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 652-4299 50:20 |
| view 16:18 | 59:22 60:12 | Z | 2 | 7 |
| Village 18:10 | welcome 4:13,13 | Z-13 48:6,7,15 | 2 19:12,12 44:21 | 73:4 9:17 |
| 20:21 35:2 | went 14:5 20:6 | Z-13 50:3,14,16,18 | 46:23 47:10 | 7:30 74:20 |
| 55:14 62:20,21 | weren't 38:20 | 51:9,15 52:7 | 20 13:23 32:14 | 7:40 1:8 |
| 65:18,19,19,20 | wetlands 57:13 | 54:14 58:24 | 68:15 | 700 19:10 20:13 |
| 65:21 67:17 | width 47:3 |  | 2019 29:9,10,18 | 21:1,21 38:9,9 |
| 68:12,13 | width-wise | 61:13,16 62:25 | 2020 8:6,9,18,23 | 7dB 9:24 10:2 |
| visual 75:10 | 50:20 |  | $15: 8 \quad 29: 7,12$ | 12:6 |
| VOGEL 2:5 | Wildife 18:8,8 | $66: 21$ | $29: 14$ |  |
| voice 24:6,9,10 | 18:13 | Z-14 48:6,7,15 | $20211: 7$ | 8 |
| 24:13,17,20 | Winter 9:16 | 50:3,14 51:9 | 2100 42:11,13 | $81: 5$ |
| 25:7 40:20,25 | wireless 1:5 |  | $42: 18,21,23$ | 80 20:14 21:3,7 |
| VOLTE 24:9 | 19:18 25:19,21 | $61: 13,1766: 21$ | 21st 5:23 | 21:8,10,22,24 |
| W | 9:21 34:15,16 | Z-3 8:25 9:10,19 | 240 44:23 | 22:3,7 |
| want 4:10,17,22 | 57:25 62:12 | 9:22 12:17,22 | 25 58:24 66:22 | 9 |
| 8:2 23:4 27:12 | withdrawn | 13:5 16:9 19:9 | 67:1,2,25 | 9:49 75:25 |
| 39:5 42:7 | 48:17,19,21 | 19:15,24 | 68:15,17 71:16 | 908 1:24 |
| 47:20 69:5 | 49:6 | $19: 9.16 .24$ | 3 | 93 9:24 |
| 70:22 72:14 | WITNESS 3:2 | zero 52:15 | 3 19:12 44:12 | $9512: 24$ 13:6 |



