

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 \*\*\*\*\*

PRECISION INDUSTRIAL MAINTENANCE

245 MORRIS ROAD

SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

5 \*\*\*\*\*

6 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled  
7 matter by NANCY STRANG-VANDEBOGART, a Shorthand  
8 Reporter, commencing on December 15, 2015 at 7:57 p.m.  
at The Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna  
Road, Latham, New York

9

10 BOARD MEMBERS:  
11 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN  
12 CRAIG SHAMLIAN  
13 TIMOTHY LANE  
14 LOU MION  
15 SUSAN MILSTEIN  
16 KATHY DALTON

17 ALSO PRESENT:

18

19 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning Board

20 Joseph LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic  
21 Development

22

23 Nick Costa, PE, Advanced Engineering and Surveyors

24 Todd Gilburn

25 Neil Gifford, Albany Pine Bush Preserve Commission

Chuck Voss, PE, Barton and Loguidice

26

27

28

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay next on the agenda is  
2 Precision Industrial Maintenance, 235 Morris Road.  
3 This is a sketch plan review. This is a 20,000 square  
4 foot warehouse with a three lot subdivision.

5                   Joe LaCivita, do you have any introductory  
6 remarks on this one?

7                   MR. LACIVITA: No, you covered it pretty well,  
8 Peter. I know that with the other project, Lupe Way  
9 was in the conservation area which is overseen by the  
10 Commission -- I know that Neil is still here so  
11 hopefully we can extend that same courtesy to give him  
12 an opportunity to speak on this project, as well.

13                   Before Nick does speak a little bit about it, I  
14 know that one of the things that Neil also does in the  
15 Pine Bush Commission is controlled burns. He is  
16 really an asset to have here for the Town as well.

17                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: We'd be happy to hear from him  
18 since it's very relevant to this project.

19                   MR. COSTA: Good evening. I'm Nick Costa and we  
20 have prepared a site plan that shows the proposed  
21 development of the site for Precision Industrial  
22 Maintenance.

23                   Just as a little background, Precision  
24 Industrial Maintenance is located in Schenectady where  
25 the casino is being built. So, they're looking for a

1 place to relocate. Todd has asked us to look at this  
2 site, as a potential home for relocation.

3 The size is 27.5 acres. It's bordered by Kings  
4 Road, Morris Road and Curry Road. This parcel right  
5 in front -- I don't know if some of you remember - you  
6 may remember it - the Agway facility was located at  
7 that particular location. It has since been  
8 redeveloped by a local contracting company that's  
9 operating out of the facility. Also, in this area  
10 there was a paintball facility that operated for a  
11 little while.

12 What Precision is proposing to do here is  
13 subdivide the 27.5 acres and develop their facility as  
14 shown on this map with a 20,000 square foot building -  
15 most of the building will be utilized for equipment  
16 storage. They would come in and there would be some  
17 overhead doors in the back and their equipment and  
18 their trucks would access this area right here  
19 (Indicating). There would be some maintenance work  
20 done in that area also and then they would have a  
21 two-story office area right here (Indicating) and then  
22 parking for the employees and also for visitors. We  
23 show the stormwater management facility on the site.  
24 We also show a connection to a sewer main that is  
25 about 2,600 feet away from the site and also connects

1 to the existing water main that's on Morris Road. We  
2 also have the option of maybe doing an on-site septic  
3 system. This facility operates on a on-site septic  
4 system. The sewer being so far away - as we design  
5 that, we'll explore that in more detail. Again, this  
6 would be a relocation for a business to relocate into  
7 the Town -- the site is zone industrial and it's been  
8 for sale for quite a few years, I think.

9 That's pretty much my presentation. If there  
10 are any questions, I'll try to answer them.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Any questions at this point?

12 MR. LANE: Why this site and not a  
13 redevelopment of another site for a warehouse?

14 MR. COSTA: It's not a warehouse. It's their  
15 operation center.

16 MR. LANE: On the plan it says one-story  
17 warehouse.

18 MR. COSTA: They do some storage, but it's  
19 really their operations center.

20 MR. LANE: Why there?

21 MR. COSTA: I think that it's close to 90 and  
22 they do a lot of work throughout the northeast and  
23 it's a real convenient location to get to those  
24 highways.

25 MR. LACIVITA: Did you guys own the land here?

1 MR. GILBURN: We're under contract to purchase.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Has the subdivision occurred  
3 yet?

4 MR. COSTA: No, that would be done as part of  
5 the application.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

7 Chuck, do you want to speak or do you want to  
8 hear from the Pine Bush first?

9 MR. LANE: I want to hear from Neil first.

10 MR. VOSS: Yes, let's hear from Neil.

11 MR. GIFFORD: Good evening, Members and  
12 Chairman of the Board. I'm Neil Gifford, Conservation  
13 Director with the Albany Pine Bush Preserve  
14 Commission.

15 In your packet I believe you have an email  
16 correspondence between the Commission and the  
17 applicant. At this point the Commission has only  
18 briefly reviewed the sketch plan and unlike the 8 Lupe  
19 Way project, we don't know nearly as much about this  
20 particular project. However, it is an area, again,  
21 like 8 Lupe Way, if recommended in our management plan  
22 and if we were asked about protection, it's our  
23 preference to see this property protected in its  
24 entirety and be protected in its entirety as we have  
25 tried multiple times to protect this property. We're

1 bound by limitations on what we can pay for property,  
2 but I think that in addition if you look at one of the  
3 things that is second to last page, the maps that are  
4 provided on the back of the packet, you can see how  
5 this property is juxtaposed with other already  
6 protected lands. So, I think that there is a long way  
7 to go in understanding what the potential  
8 environmental impacts are going to be on this project,  
9 not just on the footprint of the property itself but  
10 also on the Commission's ability to manage adjacent  
11 preserved properties.

12 So, again, much like the other project, we look  
13 forward to working with the department, with the  
14 Planning Board and with the applicant to try to figure  
15 out a reasonable solution so that hopefully everyone  
16 can meet their objections and see some important  
17 environmental resources protected that are outlined in  
18 our management plan an outlined in the Town's  
19 Comprehensive Plan's conservation overlay district,  
20 but also of course the applicant has the ability to  
21 utilize the property to the best of their ability.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is this a conservation overlay  
23 analysis that we have to do, Chuck?

24 MR. VOSS: Yes, it is in the conservation  
25 overlay district.

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO:  Where are the most sensitive  
2                   areas here?  We are subdividing it which causes sort  
3                   of a splitting up potentially of environmentally  
4                   sensitive areas, which you usually want to clump  
5                   together, I think.  What is your reading of that, on  
6                   this?

7                   MR. GIFFORD:  Correct, in particular  
8                   subdividing it into three and developing the piece in  
9                   the middle has potential implications.

10                  CHAIRMAN STUTO:  If you want to see development  
11                  looking at the whole parcel, where would you want to  
12                  see the non-development portion?

13                  MR. GIFFORD:  Ideally, it would be clustered in  
14                  the existing road frontage and try and protect it to  
15                  the maximum extent possible the remaining open space  
16                  that is adjoining preserve land on either side.  If you  
17                  look at that map you can see that there are existing  
18                  protected preserve lands and a national natural  
19                  landmark status both east and west of the property as  
20                  well as north.  So, in particular, unlike the 8 Lupe  
21                  Way project, which is predominantly wetland or we  
22                  wouldn't for example be using prescribed fire along  
23                  those lands or adjacent to that property.  Here, this  
24                  is all highly restorable pitch pine oak barrens.  It's  
25                  adjacent to existing new Karner butterfly habitat.

1 The Commission has an interest in the continuity of  
2 this project for restoring barrens and restoring rare  
3 wildlife habitat.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you be more specific? Are  
5 there two roads along this, or is one of them a road  
6 and one of them a NIMO easement? I assume that you  
7 would want to link the two parcel that you own now.

8 MR. GIFFORD: Ideally.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that we would need  
10 more specificity.

11 MR. GIFFORD: As would we, once we have a full  
12 project. At this point, we have a sketch.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But even a schematic -- if you  
14 wanted to keep it as one parcel and concentrate the  
15 development, you'd have to be more specific. To me,  
16 at least, you would.

17 MR. GIFFORD: It would really require looking  
18 at the project in more detail. I can't stand here  
19 tonight based on the sketch and say that we prefer it  
20 to be situated down near Curry Road extension versus  
21 being up near Kings Road. In concept, positioning the  
22 development near existing road frontage and protecting  
23 as much as possible would be what we would ultimately  
24 look to do.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, do you have any

1 thoughts on that whole idea?

2 MR. VOSS: Yes, and again we're just at sketch  
3 review, but the first take of the overall parcel  
4 really -- what stands out when you look at the larger  
5 picture and you can zoom in on this on some of the GIS  
6 mapping software, the larger conservation easement  
7 parcel to the west of the site. It's a huge dedicated  
8 parcel, part of the Pine Bush Preserve, which really  
9 kind of caps that end. You can see, when you look at  
10 the elevation, you have a preserve management plan and  
11 the overall goal of trying to recapture some of this  
12 area for open space resource uses. There are a  
13 significant amount of wetlands on the site and there  
14 are some topographic issues. Overall, when you  
15 typically look at our conservation overlays, as we  
16 were discussing with Neil, you want to try and  
17 concentrate the development if it's going to occur in  
18 certain areas - to kind of direct that. The proposed  
19 layout as we kind of see it now doesn't necessarily go  
20 to those goals. I would certainly want to maybe work  
21 with the applicant or have them at least look at those  
22 overall issues and maybe discuss with Neil and have  
23 Neil take a closer look at these plans and maybe come  
24 up with a better site location in terms of how the  
25 overall site -

1           MR. LANE: I was thinking along those lines.  
2           It's a fairly standard project that I don't see why it  
3           couldn't fit in somewhere.

4           MR. VOSS: There are wetlands kind of sprinkled  
5           across it, so it may prevent some locations.

6           MR. LACIVITA: On the other side of that though  
7           - I thought - and not to disagree with Chuck. I'm  
8           thinking what this does is it has cluster development  
9           with the buildings within the center allowing the  
10          wetlands to be that area where animals can traverse  
11          across to get to the connection to the back that you  
12          guys own. I was thinking that it was heading down  
13          that path.

14          CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not trying to be  
15          argumentative. If they're going to do a subdivision  
16          and two is the middle parcel - the way mine reads.  
17          So, they get to develop that and then they get to  
18          develop one and they get to develop three. So,  
19          they're really not keeping all the environmentally  
20          sensitive areas together. They're breaking it up. I  
21          would say leave three alone and develop one and two  
22          more densely with access from somewhere on that road.  
23          Something along those lines. I'm surprised that no  
24          one can make that kind of suggestion for us.

25          MR. GIFFORD: We'd be happy to work with the

1 applicant to get through those kinds of concepts. At  
2 this point we simply do not have enough information of  
3 what is on the ground and the various pieces to be  
4 able to speak intelligently about what would be a  
5 better scenario. We look forward to working with you  
6 all to do that.

7 MR. LACIVITA: As we move forward in the  
8 process, can you articulate why we got the development  
9 where it is, as we move forward together?

10 MR. COSTA: One of the reasons was because it  
11 was behind that existing developed parcel. It was  
12 already developed. This is a wetland. This is an  
13 isolated wetland. These are jurisdictional wetlands.  
14 So, this area - we would be impacting wetlands if we  
15 were to do anything on this site. Back here, we're  
16 not doing that. That's also an area where there is  
17 some area available for an on-site septic system.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What percentage of the 27  
19 acres and how many acres are you supposed to leave  
20 conserved?

21 MR. COSTA: That would be 40%.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I guess I'm suggesting to put  
23 the 40% north.

24 MR. LANE: It would be better off some place  
25 else.

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: But they are allowed to  
2 develop the property.

3                   MS. DALTON: That's arguable.

4                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not sure about that.

5                   MS. DALTON: Exactly, Peter. I'm not sure  
6 about that and I would say that it's arguable. My  
7 question is: What exactly is going to be happening in  
8 that building? From what we've been given, it's  
9 called a warehouse and let me just say that when you  
10 look at the letter from the Army Corp of Engineers,  
11 they're kind of very specific that they don't want  
12 certain kinds of run-off because the water table there  
13 and the wetlands are very sensitive. So, if you're  
14 doing any kind of precision maintenance, if you're  
15 doing maintenance, you're at a risk of run-off, if  
16 it's vehicle maintenance.

17                  MR. LACIVITA: It's industrial maintenance.  
18 That's the key word.

19                  MS. DALTON: What is industrial maintenance?

20                  MR. GILBURN: We're an environmental  
21 contractor. We do work for customers like GE. So, we  
22 store trucks and we store equipment, we move that  
23 equipment to sites where we do the work and then we  
24 bring it back at the end of the day.

25                  MR. COSTA: And they want to have that in a

1 secure location.

2 MS. DALTON: So, it's vehicle storage and  
3 maintenance.

4 MR. GILBURN: We don't maintain anything on the  
5 site. It's just storage for our equipment. That's  
6 just the name of the business. When we do  
7 maintenance, we do industrial cleaning for places like  
8 GE and the SI group; places like that. We don't do  
9 any cleaning at our facility.

10 MS. DALTON: Right, but that means that you're  
11 going to be storing a lot of chemicals there. Given  
12 the sensitivity of the land, I think that's a terrible  
13 idea.

14 MR. GILBURN: We don't actually store a lot of  
15 chemicals there.

16 MS. DALTON: You just said that you have  
17 cleaning supplies.

18 MR. GILBURN: Yes.

19 MS. DALTON: Do you have environmentally safe  
20 chemicals?

21 MR. GILBURN: I guess it depends on what you  
22 would consider a chemical.

23 MS. DALTON: I would say that much of what you  
24 use to clean with is probably toxic unless you're  
25 using all green supplies. Are you using all green

1 supplies?

2 MR. GILBURN: We do not use anything toxic for  
3 cleaning.

4 MS. DALTON: Are you using all green supplies?

5 MR. GILBURN: I don't know what you're  
6 definition is of that.

7 MS. DALTON: I think that the answer is no,  
8 otherwise you would know and it would be something  
9 that would be in your advertising. I'm going to go on  
10 record that I'm not particularly enthusiastic about  
11 this project on this site.

12 MR. LANE: I agree.

13 MR. SHAMLIAN: I'd like to see a little bit  
14 more. I'm not opposed to this project, necessarily,  
15 at this point.

16 MS. DALTON: I would just encourage you to look  
17 closely at what the Corp of Engineers said.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let's talk about that. What  
19 are they saying?

20 MR. LACIVITA: To what Kathy is saying, who has  
21 oversight on your operations; DEC? Are they there  
22 permitting entity?

23 MR. GILBURN: Yes.

24 MR. LACIVITA: Okay, thank you very much.

25 MR. GILBURN: We have a 23-year record here in

1 the capital district. We've been in Schenectady and  
2 Scotia for 23 years now. We can provide you the  
3 information that you want from the overseeing facility  
4 from DEC as to our operations.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Nick, can you summarize the  
6 Army Corps letter?

7 MR. COSTA: Yes, the Army Corps letter  
8 basically calls out what is isolated and what is  
9 jurisdictional. Like I said, these heavier dotted  
10 areas are jurisdictional.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And you have buffer zone  
12 requirements?

13 MR. COSTA: No, that's DEC. DEC would require  
14 a 100-foot buffer. If we were to develop this, the  
15 Corp would want to see a 30 to 50 foot buffer from a  
16 building or a parking lot.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How far down does that squeeze  
18 your building area?

19 MR. COSTA: Right here is already developed  
20 (Indicating).

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Right, I can see that on the  
22 aerial.

23 MR. COSTA: So, this could be at this location.  
24 Again, we chose that area there because if we're  
25 looking for an on-site septic system, I think that we

1 have a better chance of getting something there.  
2 Where here, I think that your groundwater may be a  
3 little bit higher in that particular area. There is a  
4 little higher topography there; not much higher.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not categorically opposed  
6 to it, but I think that we should show where the  
7 building parcels are going to be for the other. I  
8 think that it's a valid concern in this conservation  
9 area with the Pine Bush and what their objectives are  
10 and I think that we want to try and meet that.

11 MR. COSTA: So, you want to see on the other  
12 two lots, where the potential development is.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I do.

14 MR. MION: I would like that, too.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We can try to connect up the  
16 two on the west and the east and protect the  
17 environmentally sensitive area and keep them together  
18 to the extent that you can.

19 MR. COSTA: We can take a look.

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And meet with Neil.

21 MR. COSTA: We will meet with Neil. We've met  
22 before.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chuck, do you have any other  
24 things to say?

25 MR. VOSS: No, not at this point, Peter. We

1 just wanted to point out some of those obvious things.  
2 We'll wait to see what their concept plan is.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

4

5

6 (Whereas the above proceeding was concluded at  
7 8:27 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATION

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I, NANCY STRANG, Shorthand Reporter and Notary  
Public in and for the State of New York, hereby  
CERTIFY that the record taken by me at the time and  
place noted in the heading hereof is a true and  
accurate transcript of same, to the best of my ability  
and belief.

\_\_\_\_\_

NANCY STRANG

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

