

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 \*\*\*\*\*  
4 WATERWALK CORPORATE LIVING FACILITY  
5 7 METRO PARK ROAD  
6 APPLICATION FOR SEQR DETERMINATION  
7 \*\*\*\*\*

8 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled  
9 matter by NANCY STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter,  
10 commencing on January 12, 2016 at 7:42 p.m. at The  
11 Public Operations Center, 347 Old Niskayuna Road,  
12 Latham, New York

13 BOARD MEMBERS:  
14 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN  
15 CRAIG SHAMLIAN  
16 TIMOTHY LANE  
17 LOU MION  
18 SUSAN MILSTEIN  
19 KATHY DALTON

20 ALSO PRESENT:

21 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq. Counsel to the Planning Board

22 Joseph LaCivita, Director, Planning and Economic  
23 Development

24 Daniel Hershberg, PE, Hershberg and Hershberg

25 Peter Lilholt, PE, CHA

Terresa Bakner, Esq., Whiteman Osterman & Hanna

Bill Mafrici, PE, Hershberg & Hershberg

Michael Tengeler, Planning and Economic Development

Lisa Barron

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Mitola Dental Office.

2 Joe?

3 MR. LACIVITA: The applicant has asked that we  
4 postpone due to conflicts with his engineer for  
5 tonight.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, next on our agenda is  
7 Waterwalk Corporate Living Facility, 7 Metro Park  
8 Road. This is an application for SEQRA, which is the  
9 environmental determination. This is for a two  
10 four-story extended stay hotel buildings totally 138  
11 units.

12 MR. LACIVITA: We're here tonight for SEQRA  
13 determination. We heard from the Planning Board on  
14 December 15, 2015 and prior to that it was in front of  
15 our DCC - the Coordination Committee meeting.

16 The applicant is here tonight to kind of go  
17 over where they are and get to a SEQRA determination  
18 in order for them to get to the Zoning Board and I'll  
19 turn it over to Terresa.

20 MR. BAKNER: Thank you. I'm Terresa Bakner and  
21 I'm with Whiteman Osterman and Hanna. Thank you for  
22 allowing us to be here tonight.

23 At the end of the last meeting we talked about  
24 the fact that we're next going to the Zoning Board of  
25 Appeals to request an area variance. Because this is

1 a Type I action under SEQRA and the Planning Board is  
2 the lead agency, that's the reason why we're here.  
3 The procedure, if you will, is a little bit different  
4 than what you typically do. We have provided to the  
5 Town and to the TDE a lot of information regarding the  
6 environmental conditions on the site.

7 This site is 7 Metro Park Road. It's a lot  
8 that's been in existence for some time. It's directly  
9 across from and existing extended stay hotel, Home2  
10 Suites. This property is owned by Wolf Road Park, LLC  
11 and the buyer and the developer is Waterfront  
12 Development.

13 This is a 4.10 acre lot. We are not proposing  
14 to subdivide the lot; just to be clear. Initially, we  
15 had come in with a proposal to subdivide it in order  
16 to leave the road with Wolf Road Park, LLC. We have  
17 decided to give them an easement and to maintain the  
18 lot in its existing format and characteristics. The  
19 lot, which I'm sure that you're all familiar with, is  
20 surrounded by Metro Park Road and Aviation Drive and  
21 it also has on the other sides National Grid, fee  
22 owned property. It looks like an electric  
23 transmission line corridor right away and that's what  
24 it is, but it's owned in fee by National Grid. We  
25 provided a letter demonstrating that there are no

1 wetlands on the site. You had asked us last time to  
2 put together a tree survey. We did the tree survey  
3 and we are proposing to save some of the trees on the  
4 site.

5 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do we have that in our  
6 packets?

7 MR. BAKNER: It was submitted on December 22nd,  
8 I believe, from Hershberg and Hershberg. So, you  
9 should have that in your packet.

10 The other thing that we did because it's in an  
11 archaeologically sensitive area is we had an  
12 archeological analysis. They didn't find anything.  
13 The report was sent to the Office of Parks Recreation  
14 and Historic Preservation and they have given us a  
15 sign-off letter. So, that came in after Christmas.

16 In addition to that, there was soil test pits  
17 done and that report was also submitted on December  
18 22nd. Those soil test pits back up the current design  
19 of the stormwater management facility.

20 The site was also examined for environmental  
21 conditions. None were found. The site is fine and  
22 it's suitable for development from that perspective.  
23 We have also done a traffic analysis and submitted  
24 that. That was prepared by Mazur and in it we also  
25 provided a comparison to an existing facility that's

1 very much -- exactly the same as this facility in  
2 Wichita, Kansas.

3 This, just to refresh your recollection is a  
4 corporate living facility. It's an extended stay  
5 hotel in two buildings and the ground story, as Leslie  
6 Steiner commented last time, contains the amenities  
7 for each of the different living facilities. We  
8 worked with the Town on the characterization of this  
9 as an extended stay hotel and we got confirmation from  
10 the Building Department and the Town Attorney that we  
11 followed the new definition of extended stay hotel.

12 I'm going to turn it over to Bill Mafrici.

13 Bill, you can address anything else I might  
14 have missed?

15 MR. MAFRICI: Thank you, Teresa.

16 My name is Bill Mafrici with Hershberg and  
17 Hershberg. We are the engineers for the site.

18 Since the last time that we presented this  
19 project, we have done a tree survey. It basically  
20 identifies trees on-site that are six inches in  
21 diameter or larger. One of your plans in the package  
22 shows that approximately 47 trees were identified.  
23 Teresa said that some are going to be saved. In  
24 actuality, there are two trees that are going to be  
25 saved. We have relocated the parking area to include

1 a large 16-inch tree. We are also trying to save a  
2 14-inch tree. Other than that, the parking and the  
3 buildings are going to take up a majority of that  
4 treed area on the site.

5 That is really the only change that has been  
6 made from a site plan standpoint from what we have  
7 presented to you.

8 If the Board has any questions, we'll try to  
9 answer them.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I have a few. We'll hear from  
11 our Town Designated Engineer, as well. I do have  
12 questions though.

13 I want to make a couple of comments. Are there  
14 any waivers required on this? Can you go through  
15 those quick?

16 MR. MAFRICI: There are three; parking within  
17 the front yard setback. The location of the building  
18 is not within the front yard setback.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The facing of the front of the  
20 building, because there are two roads?

21 While they are looking for the waivers, what  
22 about the issue with the sewer pump station that the  
23 Town owns? Has that been studied? That's an  
24 environmental issue.

25 MR. LACIVITA: There has been a study there and

1 I know that the Pure Waters Department is actually  
2 doing a Wolf Road corridor study on all of their pump  
3 stations.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What impact is this going to  
5 have?

6 MR. LACIVITA: That's the thing. We have to  
7 get there. I don't know if they have finished the  
8 study as to capacity because I know that this flows to  
9 the Pure Waters Pump Station and we don't know where  
10 that capacity is yet. Those calculations haven't come  
11 out from Pure Waters.

12 Am I correct on that?

13 MR. BAKNER: I was just going to state that we  
14 have attempted to cover that with the TDE on that  
15 issue and you'll look in the language in the SEQRA  
16 documentation that covers it. Basically, the study is  
17 ongoing and we think that there is a strong  
18 possibility that we won't be looking for a certificate  
19 of occupancy until the overall improvements are done  
20 to that pump station. It's really one of those rare  
21 timing situations.

22 The other option that we have that we have  
23 covered in there is changes to the impeller or the  
24 changes to the rate of which the sewage is pumped.

25 You'll have to forgive me. Dan is not here

1           tonight and I don't know if Bill is up on that issue  
2           or not. Dan had done the study and he had talked to  
3           Nick Costa who had done the study for the apartments  
4           across the way. So, really from an environmental  
5           perspective, there is no question that we know that  
6           issue has to be addressed. It's just a question of  
7           timing in this particular application.

8                   MR. LACIVITA: I think that part of that issue  
9           Peter was that when the calculations and the study was  
10          done, we were also looking at the Lazare  
11          redevelopment. That is no longer existing and that  
12          project is off the table. That opened up capacity as  
13          well.

14                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you for your  
15          response on that one.

16                   MR. LACIVITA: If you want to get back to the  
17          waivers for a component, I don't want to speak for  
18          Peter, but I know that we had identified from a  
19          planning perspective in the October 28th DCC that the  
20          building exceeds the 20-foot road setback. There is  
21          parking in the front yard. There was greater than 20  
22          proposed parking spaces for the interior island  
23          landscaping and a parking waiver would be necessary to  
24          have no spaces designed for employee parking. Those  
25          are the four that we have identified from the very

1 beginning.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you, Joe.

3 Just one more line of questions, but it may  
4 involve a couple of questions which is: You're going  
5 to ask the ZBA for an increase in density?

6 MR. BAKNER: The actual number - and let me  
7 just read them off, so I don't mess them up. The base  
8 density in this area is 18,000 square feet per acre.  
9 We are seeking a variance of 11,626 square feet per  
10 acre.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You're asking for an extra  
12 11,000.

13 MR. BAKNER: That is correct. Some of the  
14 numbers in the DCC comments were based on the  
15 subdivided lot as opposed to the 4.01 acre lot. So,  
16 that's why there is a light change and the number came  
17 down. The Home2 Suites across the way also requested  
18 and obtained an area variance on the density. The  
19 basic issue here is that we exceed the greenspace  
20 requirement. We're at 48.79 and we are required to  
21 have 35% greenspace. We are far shorter than the  
22 tallest building can be in this area. I think that  
23 it's on the order of 75 feet and we're down at 55  
24 feet. So, it really is the arrangement of the space  
25 on the site.

1           This is a beautiful site for this particular  
2 project and we think that it's a real asset to the  
3 area. Otherwise, we would not be going to the Zoning  
4 Board of Appeals and asking for the increased density.  
5 As a prototype - as an example of what this wants to  
6 be, this is two specific types of housing on one site  
7 for operational convenience where people can come and  
8 live for six months or three months while they are  
9 taking a new job in the area, while they are coming out  
10 the area for training, while they are in the area for  
11 doing sort of the specialized construction that they  
12 do at the chip fab plants and everything else. We  
13 also have a vast increase in the number of people  
14 coming to the area who are from foreign countries.  
15 Those generally, people don't want to buy and they  
16 don't want to rent for a long time. They don't want to  
17 sign up for a year lease. So, that's the concept  
18 behind this.

19           Waterwalk feels strongly that they will be  
20 successful. They use the two-building approach because  
21 the amenities on the ground floor and because they are  
22 offering different benefits in each different  
23 building.

24           CHAIRMAN STUTO: Before we go to the TDE, I do  
25 want to give my perception of this before the TDE

1 comments.

2 You're asking for a 50% or 60% increase in  
3 density which is not our decision. It's the Zoning  
4 Board of Appeals decision. I personally think that it  
5 puts a strain on the lot. I don't think that the lot  
6 is big enough for what you are trying to do,  
7 particularly given the level of development that is  
8 over in that area. I think that you need a bigger  
9 lot, and you're wiping out all the trees, and there  
10 are some unanswered questions on the sewer system.

11 We've been studying it for quite a while and as  
12 of right now, unless the TDE tells me something  
13 different, I'm not ready to vote on environmental  
14 tonight, myself. Those are my comments and I'll turn  
15 it over to the TDE for their comments.

16 MR. LILHOLT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name  
17 again is Peter Lilholt and I'm with Clough Harbor and  
18 Associates, Town Designated Engineer for the project.  
19 As pointed out by Terresa and Bill, the applicant has  
20 submitted significant amount of information which we  
21 spent a good deal of time going through and  
22 evaluating. They were last before the Board on  
23 December 15th for sketch plan review. They're on  
24 tonight for a SEQRA determination and with the desire  
25 to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for that area

1 variance that was discussed.

2 With regard to the area variance, as Terresa  
3 noted, the allowable density - base density of 18,000  
4 square foot per acre for a 4.01 acre parcel would be  
5 approximately 72,180 square feet. What is proposed is  
6 approximately 118,800 square feet on that same 4.01  
7 acre parcel. So, we are looking at approximately  
8 29,626 square feet per acre, as proposed.

9 To put it in kind of a different context, if  
10 they were to procure a parcel large enough to  
11 accommodate the size of the project as proposed, you  
12 would need about a 6.6 acre parcel of land would be  
13 the equivalent.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is this size?

15 MR. LILHOLT: It's a 4.01 acre parcel.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you. We have a  
17 provision in our law, don't we, for increasing  
18 density? I think that its 190-27.

19 MR. LACIVITA: Under the dimensional  
20 requirement density incentives it's Article 5, 190-24.  
21 I think that this is where we spoke about it on  
22 another project where it had the criteria as to what  
23 they -

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: How much are they allowed to  
25 increase density under that? There is a maximum.

1 Doesn't it go from 18 to 24,000?

2 MR. LACIVITA: Yes, 18 to 24,000 is the maximum  
3 that you have on it.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I assume that the applicant is  
5 going to say that's not enough or they would have done  
6 that. You're going to be allowed to speak. I'm not  
7 saying that you're not.

8 MR. BAKNER: It actually appears to be tied to  
9 greenspace - that provision. In this case, we don't  
10 need additional greenspace. We provide for more  
11 greenspace than what is required. So, that's why we  
12 went for the area variance just from a legal  
13 standpoint.

14 MR. LACIVITA: Under the incentive standards,  
15 Peter, under D of that section, item 4 it says  
16 "commercial density shall not exceed 24,000 square  
17 feet per acre."

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Right. I think that it's more  
19 than just the greenspace. It's the whole square  
20 footage and I can stand corrected. I don't have the  
21 thing in front of me.

22 MR. BAKNER: We looked at it closely because -

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, yet you want 29,000  
24 square feet.

25 MR. BAKNER: Peter, if we wanted 24,000 I would

1 tell my client to get an area variance because that  
2 provision is keyed specifically to greenspace.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I appreciate and respect your  
4 opinion.

5 Peter, thanks.

6 MR. LILHOLT: To continue with our review on  
7 behalf of the Town, we reviewed the FEAF Part I which  
8 was submitted by the applicant. Again, this is a type  
9 I SEQRA action, according to the Town Attorney. We  
10 also have prepared Part II which is to identify  
11 potential resources that could be effected by the  
12 project. There were a number that were pulled out and  
13 identified in the Part II and further elaborated in a  
14 Part III which we prepared. In the Part III we  
15 described the potential impacts and the associated  
16 mitigations that are proposed.

17 Based on our review, we prepared a draft  
18 negative declaration for the Planning Board's  
19 consideration and if you'd like, I can elaborate on  
20 each one of those Part III items or touch on some of  
21 the more significant ones, some of which have already  
22 been mentioned.

23 Do you want me to go through the entire Part  
24 III?

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Let's see how the Board wants

1 to handle this.

2 Does the Board have any opinion on where this  
3 is headed? I'm also concerned about the trees. I  
4 think that this is a great project and a great market  
5 for this product. I do. I'm not trying to discourage  
6 it in that way, but I think that this is too impactful  
7 for that small of a lot, especially given the context  
8 in terms of where we are in the development of our  
9 Town and we sometimes have developers come in and they  
10 ask for a lot - an awful lot, and I'm not saying  
11 anything about you in particular and then they accept  
12 something a little bit smaller.

13 MR. BAKNER: Just to be clear, they looked for  
14 lots in appropriate locations in the Town for this  
15 particular project. They were unable to find any  
16 other lot like this. It's not that it's unique, it's  
17 just that it's uniquely suited for this purpose.

18 Don't forget here that we also have substantial  
19 property around there that's encumbered by the right  
20 of way. It's not like we're not having additional  
21 lands around it. If you look at what's occupied by  
22 the right of way and what's occupied around it, you  
23 would see that I think that it really does fit in this  
24 location.

25 Just to be clear, and I know that you hear this

1 all the time, hopefully you don't hear this very often  
2 from me. This is their prototype. This is what they  
3 want to build and they have a very good reason for  
4 wanting to build it in terms of the type of  
5 development and the amenities that they can provide.  
6 So, what we are asking for is the opportunity to make  
7 our case to the Zoning Board of Appeals for this  
8 project. We cannot do that. We cannot move forward  
9 without a negative declaration on this project from  
10 this Board and that's just because it's a Type I  
11 action. So, it's not the typical situation where you  
12 go first to the ZBA and the ZBA makes its  
13 determination with respect to density which is what  
14 happened with the project across the street. So,  
15 understanding that and understanding your concerns,  
16 you're not giving us concept approval, but we do need  
17 to find out if the Zoning Board of Appeals is willing  
18 to grant us an area variance for this site. If they  
19 are not, then we're finished. So, we really need to  
20 move forward.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I understand that and A has to  
22 come before B and C.

23 I'm not ready to vote positively on this on the  
24 environmental. The trees are all gone. On a bigger  
25 lot some could have been saved. I don't know if I

1 have an adequate answer on sewer. That's just my  
2 opinion. If everybody wants to read thorough the  
3 environmental and vote on it, we can or we can maybe  
4 try to get better answers at a subsequent meeting.

5 MS. DALTON: Since I'm the one who is usually  
6 concerned about the density and trees, far be it for  
7 me to disrespect what Peter is reluctant. So, I'm  
8 going to agree with Peter.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not trying to dictate what  
10 the Board does.

11 MS. DALTON: No, I understand what you're  
12 saying, but you know that I'm usually the one to say  
13 what you're saying tonight.

14 I'm not inclined to vote for it. I understand  
15 what you are saying about wanting to send it -- I wish  
16 it was different. If there was a legal parameter that  
17 we could use to let it go through with no  
18 recommendation or something, I would be willing to  
19 find another way for you to get in front of the ZBA  
20 but -

21 MR. BAKNER: Remember that this decision is not  
22 a conceptual approval by the Planning Board. It's  
23 just a determination that there is no potential for  
24 significant adverse environmental impacts.

25 MR. LANE: That encompasses a lot.

1 MS. DALTON: I don't think that certainly not  
2 Peter and pretty much not me - I'm not prepared to say  
3 that there is not an environmental impact. I'm not  
4 happy with the trees and I'm not happy with the  
5 density. I'm not happy with the sewer situation.

6 MR. BAKNER: Just so you know, as well, the  
7 site is currently at least half cleared and is being  
8 used for the construction of the apartment across the  
9 street. We don't necessarily have a lot of options in  
10 that regard. A lot of it has already been cleared. We  
11 can certainly look in the future to see if it's  
12 possible to save or re-use more of the trees and that  
13 can certainly be part of the Board's conceptual  
14 review, but merely removing trees, particularly trees  
15 that don't have any value as a threatened or  
16 endangered species, is not generally considered to be  
17 a significant environmental impact requiring an  
18 environmental impact statement. That's the difference  
19 between what you would be looking at tonight. Do you  
20 think that it's necessary to have an environmental  
21 impact statement for a project like this or where we  
22 are using an existing lot across from an existing  
23 hotel? There are no issues on the site in terms of  
24 wetlands, habitat or anything else of an environmental  
25 nature. That's really the question.

1           MR. LACIVITA: Were those trees identified  
2 either as native or invasive? Do you know if we've  
3 gone that far into the research? There is no listing.

4           MR. LILHOLT: Joe, I might be able to speak a  
5 little bit to this. Joe Grasso and I walked this  
6 site. It's right across the street from our office  
7 and we took a look and for the purposes of this is  
8 discussion, I'll call it north. It's kind of at an  
9 angle, but north is parallel to Aviation Road to the  
10 top of the page and I'll call Metro Park east/west for  
11 reference purposes, even though that's not precisely  
12 correct.

13           Predominantly the stand of mature vegetation is  
14 only southeast corner of the parcel up against  
15 Aviation and the National Grid power lines. Those  
16 trees were located and we did get survey from the  
17 surveyor and they located trees larger than six  
18 inches. Many of the mature trees were not what you  
19 would typically consider to be high quality trees.  
20 They are poplars and box elders and such. So, it is  
21 true that there are a stand of mature trees in that  
22 southeast corner of the property that they would be  
23 removed as part of the development and as Bill pointed  
24 out, they're trying to preserve a couple of them. The  
25 two that they pointed out were red oaks which were a

1 higher quality deciduous tree. Other trees that will  
2 be preserved are the street trees that are Crimson  
3 King Red Maple trees along Metro Park road. There are  
4 several there that are going to be preserved as well.  
5 The balance of the site is grass, but it's not heavily  
6 wooded beside that corner of the parcel. They may be  
7 able to try to save and cut out another one here or  
8 there, but we are not talking about large quantities  
9 of trees that are worth, in our estimation, worth  
10 saving.

11 MR. BAKNER: And we are willing to walk the  
12 site with Clough Harbour and tag what trees they would  
13 like us to save. Tim Reiger reminded me that we also  
14 have some area on the other side of the existing road  
15 where we can relocate some of those trees, as well,  
16 without disturbing the street trees that are currently  
17 along Metro Park. So, there is room there to do some  
18 relocation.

19 MR. MION: We've heard a lot from the  
20 conservation people while we have been developing this  
21 area. One of the biggest concerns is exactly what we  
22 are talking about right now. I'm inclined to agree  
23 with you, Peter. We're losing too much there, I  
24 think.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Here is the suggestion. I

1 don't know how the Board feels about it - that we come  
2 back the next meeting. We get better answers on sewer  
3 and see if anything better and more specific can be  
4 done with the trees. We'll have you back and soon as  
5 we can get all that done.

6 MS. DALTON: I'm fond of the relocation.

7 MR. BAKNER: If we got you the information that  
8 would be your meeting on the 17th?

9 MR. LACIVITA: No, actually it would be the  
10 26th.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have room on the agenda  
12 that day, Joe?

13 MR. LACIVITA: We can make room for it, Peter.  
14 I don't know if that does you any good. We don't have  
15 any in between the ZBA meeting.

16 MR. BAKNER: The problem is the ZBA meeting is  
17 on the 21st and they have already noticed it.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: You can go make a  
19 presentation. That's the only thing that I can say.

20 MR. LACIVITA: I just want to ask if everyone  
21 has the overhead that we provided to see what the  
22 maturity level is on the site and what, in fact, is  
23 lost through the development. As Peter was going  
24 through and walking that site, vegetation was to the  
25 southern part of that parcel where the clump exists.

1                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Right, and we have the tree  
2 survey in front of us as well.

3                   MR. LACIVITA: I just wanted to make sure that  
4 everyone saw it.

5                   CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

6                   MR. SHAMLIAN: One of my primary concerns is  
7 the sewer situation; understanding what that is. I  
8 know that we are close in that area.

9                   MR. BAKNER: Right, and other than the  
10 information that I have given you and Pete, maybe you  
11 can elaborate on that.

12                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, we'll do it at the next  
13 meeting then. I think that's what our consensus is  
14 with the Board. Maybe this is an impetus for the  
15 sewer district.

16                  MR. LACIVITA: They are under a Pure Waters  
17 sewer study now. I don't think that we're going to  
18 have that information back until -- I think that they  
19 are looking at late spring to have all that  
20 information back with any improvements being done  
21 April 16th, going forward.

22                  CHAIRMAN STUTO: Maybe CHA, with the applicant  
23 can give us a more detailed presentation at the next  
24 Board meeting.

25

1 MS. BARRON: I'm Lisa Barron and am part of a  
2 group of Colonie residents who are banding together  
3 after seeing the Aviation Road clear cutting. That  
4 was a great concern to us. We subsequently discovered  
5 that there was a regulation in the Town Law 177, that  
6 protected trees larger than a certain amount. I think  
7 that it was three inches.

8 I'm very happy to see that Mr. Stuto and others  
9 are now looking at the tree situation in the  
10 developments that are being presented and I think that  
11 our group would be very happy to see that trees are  
12 now being considered in the development plan. It  
13 seems to me that this plan has identified 27 trees and  
14 was only prepared to save two of them. I think that  
15 is not sufficient considering what's gone on across  
16 the street with the clear cut area of nine acres and  
17 that was a real devastation. Most people were very  
18 upset about it. Hearing this discussion, I'm really  
19 convinced that there is new attitude from the Planning  
20 Board to look at these trees and preserve the climate  
21 in a habitable state for the rest of the community and  
22 the world. We really have to start saving trees and  
23 I'm happy that they are being talked about now. I'm  
24 hoping that since this project touched so many trees,  
25 perhaps they can find another plot instead of cutting

1 down so many of them. It seems like that's a large  
2 number of trees to cut down and I think that's not  
3 proper.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you for your comments.  
5 Does your group have a name? I think that we have  
6 heard from the Loudonville Association and also Green  
7 Meadows.

8 MS. BARRON: Well, some of Green Meadows are in  
9 our group. It's Save the Trees, Colonie, unless they  
10 changed it. There were several other suggestions.  
11 There are about 10 of us.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

13

14 (Whereas the above proceeding was concluded at  
15 8:10 p.m.)

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 \_\_\_\_\_

