

1 PLANNING BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 RIDGEWOOD SUBDIVISION
5 34 DENNISON ROAD
6 SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

7 *****

8 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter
9 by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter commencing on
10 February 2, 2020 at 7:46 p.m. at Memorial Town Hall,
11 Loudon Road, Newtonville, New York

12 BOARD MEMBERS:
13 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN
14 CRAIG SHAMLIAN
15 STEVEN HEIDER
16 SUSAN MILSTEIN
17 CHIP ASHWORTH
18 LOU MION

19

20 ALSO PRESENT:

21 Kathleen Marinelli, Esq., Counsel to the Planning
22 Board
23 Michael Tengeler, PEDD
24 Dominck Errico, C.T. Male
25 Joseph Grasso, RLA, CHA

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Call up the last item on the
2 agenda. Ridgewood Subdivision, 34 Dennison Road. The
3 proposal is to subdivide a 103-acre site; 40 acres are
4 proposed as open space, 63 acres would be developed with
5 80 residential units, 11 lots for stormwater management
6 and open space.

7 Mike, do you have anything to say before you
8 turn over to the developer?

9 MR. TENGELER: We can turn it over.

10 MR. ERRICO: Good evening. Dominick Errico with
11 C.T. Male representing the developer who is Charlew
12 Builders for 34 Dennison Road. This is an old property
13 that's been around in the Town for a while. It is new to
14 me, but old to the Town. You may even know a little more
15 information and history, but I did bring our local
16 historian with us today, Melissa Currier, who has been
17 involved with this property for probably 20 years or so.

18 So, the property is about 103 acres, as you
19 can see in this white outline on the outside is the
20 perimeter of the property. The interior white line, as
21 you see, are the divisions of the lots. There are 80
22 lots being proposed. Of the 103 acres, 40 of the
23 acres, as you can see in the open area is here and
24 these open areas will be conservation areas. Of the 80
25 lots there's about 60 acres left over that will

1 comprise the 80 lots and of the 60 acres of those,
2 about 46 or 47 acres of that will actually be
3 disturbed. The drawings that I gave you show more of a
4 disturbed area than the actual lots. Those are the
5 properties and developments. Based on a 50-foot
6 setback from the house, the width of the house and
7 trying to average about a 50 foot rear yard per lots -
8 that's where we get the 46 or 47 acres of physical
9 disturbed area which will account to clearing and
10 reclaiming with lawns and other landscaping.

11 We have two access points. One along Dennison
12 Road in this area here and another one on Newport
13 Drive in this area here (Indicating). Newport Drive -
14 there will be a little bit of an improvement extension
15 here to make the road connection.

16 There is a new water tank that was installed
17 years ago here (Indicating) and if you look into this
18 area, there's an actual clearing easement line that
19 goes into the water tank. Most of the roadway we are
20 going to be providing is in that easement and clearing
21 almost saw this area here. This will be all new cut
22 area for right-of-way. The other connection to the
23 water will be over in this area here where there's an
24 easement coming across here, as you can see, to Walnut
25 Lane.

1 Most of the sewer will be collected and
2 gravity fed. Again, it will be discharged. I believe
3 all of it is coming over here (Indicating). We may
4 have another connection point here (Indicating), but
5 that's not been confirmed yet if we would make that
6 with gravity.

7 The history of the property - all the
8 environmental work has been completed to this property
9 today. Wetland delineations are done and confirmed.
10 The archaeology is done. The soil testing is done.
11 Endangered and threatened species is completed and
12 done. It's all done and confirmed with no effect
13 letters or determination letters from whatever agency
14 we were submitting that to.

15 The other aspects of the property which stand
16 out here are the two cul-de-sacs at the end in this
17 area here (Indicating). It was laid out and developed
18 at a higher ridge of the property in order to maintain
19 minimal clearing as far as the lots go. The houses are
20 multiple-use type houses; some will have walkout
21 basements, some will have sideload garages and some
22 will have frontload garage. Charlew Builders has a
23 multitude of different houses, so there won't be just
24 one style. It will be a standard colonial style house
25 - two-story. It will mostly be four-bedrooms. It's a

1 standard residential development. We are considered a
2 conservation subdivision. We did computations for the
3 density, based on area. The density would have
4 accumulated to about 88 units - 88 single-family homes
5 and we have 80. Our additional lots - there are
6 actually about 90 lots altogether. The other are
7 stormwater management lots in the conservation zone,
8 as we show the additional 40 acres.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you over that point again?
10 There are two concepts in our Land Use Law. One is a
11 conservation subdivision, which is an option. The other
12 is conservation overlay. This is in a conservation
13 overlay district. Do you follow what I'm saying?

14 MR. ERRICO: Yes, we determined what the
15 unconstrained land was.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, you went through that
17 analysis.

18 MR. ERRICO: Yes, there are 88 acres based on
19 the calculation and that came out about 89 units that we
20 could put on the property. We have 80.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: There is another concept,
22 which is conservation subdivision, which is essentially
23 cluster development. So, you keep the same number of
24 lots and make it smaller. I want to clarify that.

25 MR. ERRICO: The minimum width of the lot size

1 is going to be 90 feet. The maximum is going to be 140
2 based on layout and subdivision that is presented in
3 front of you right now.

4 The minimum lot sizes are about 11,000 square
5 feet. The largest one is 123,000. One of them is right
6 back here (Indicating). All of the frontages have at
7 least 80 feet. Everything else is 90 feet wide.

8 I'm not really sure what else I can tell you
9 about the land. It's a standard residential
10 single-family development. It is zoned properly. It's
11 in a residential neighborhood.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Did you say some of the lots
13 were under 18,000? You said the smallest lot is what?

14 MR. ERRICO: Is about 11,000.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is this a conventional
16 subdivision? I'm confused.

17 MR. ERRICO: No.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Is it conservation
19 subdivision?

20 MR. ERICO: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And it's also a conservation
22 overlay.

23 MR. ERRICO: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I will have more questions on
25 that point.

1 MR. ERRICO: If there any questions, we can
2 just answer those questions now.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: As with the other project, CHA
4 will be reviewing this. They have started to review this
5 project.

6 Joe Grasso, could you give us your comments
7 so far?

8 MR. GRASSO: I like to start off by saying that
9 I appreciate that you do the layout on the air photo
10 because it's very helpful to understand the context of
11 the development in the surrounding area and the amount
12 of wooded area in the space around the site. You
13 definitely get a different feel for the project when
14 you're looking at it on an air photo. I applaud you for
15 that. I hope you will include a similar drawing when you
16 come back for more review.

17 Just to clarify, the project is within a
18 conservation development overlay zone. So, the
19 conservation development design is required. So, it's
20 not a conventional project. With that, there are
21 certain criteria - one of which 40% of the
22 unconstrained land needs to be permanently protected
23 by a deed restriction or conveyance of space to a
24 public entity which is typically the Town. The overlay
25 zone doesn't fit just the limits of the project site,

1 so one of our comments is when you come in for
2 concept, we would like you to identify the accurate
3 limits of the conservation development overlay zone so
4 that we know a part of the project site it
5 encompasses. Although I will say that most of the
6 site, I think, is within that zone.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you agree that his numbers
8 comply?

9 MR. GRASSO: Generally, yes. I will get into
10 that.

11 One of the first things that you would
12 typically do for development and a conservation
13 development overlay zone is you go through a
14 conservation analysis. Dom had talked about that they
15 have already gone through this in some respects, but
16 it is important that the information in that analysis
17 gets provided to us and the Planning Board so that the
18 Planning Board can start to understand where the
19 constraint plans are and when we get into the
20 protection of open space where are the buffers and
21 where the resources are that you are going to protect
22 because open space can be done for a variety of
23 reasons and we want to know where there are restraints
24 on the site that are worthy of protection. Some of the
25 things we typically see open space provided for would

1 be buffers to adjoining developments, saving mature
2 forested areas, protecting steep slopes, protecting
3 wetlands and protecting archaeologically sensitive
4 areas. All of those things should be identified
5 through a conservation analysis. Then, if there are
6 none, that should be provided to so that the Planning
7 Board is aware of that.

8 When we're looking at open space areas to be
9 protected, which obviously there is a lot of open
10 space being proposed around the perimeter of the site,
11 they are somewhat fragmented in different parts of the
12 site.

13 One of the things that the Code looks for is
14 open space being interconnected wherever possible to
15 provide some of the screened space. We not only look
16 at open space interconnected within the site, but how
17 it aligns with open space that may occur outside of
18 the project site.

19 Dom handed out - where it shows the other
20 open space areas are wooded areas around the site and
21 it's important to understand how the site fits into a
22 larger open space context.

23 We would recommend that a layout, when you're
24 in the zone, should encourage open space along the
25 entry drives to create a certain setting when you come

1 into this type of conservation development design and
2 avoid long straight sections of road because there are
3 some long space sections currently proposed in the
4 layout.

5 This site is proposing a certain number of
6 road frontage lots where those lots would have
7 frontage on Dennison Road. That something that the
8 Planning Board should consider. Very often when you're
9 looking a conservation development design, you try to
10 make all the lots internal to the development and
11 reduce the number of existing road frontage lots being
12 created. When we look at these large areas of open
13 space that they are proposing, like Dom said, 60% of
14 the site - how that open space is going to be used is
15 something that the Planning Board should consider
16 whether or not walking trails or other amenities is
17 something that should be considered in the site.

18 I know that there is one parcel that they
19 designate as a park area and any more information
20 regarding what the intended use of that park area is
21 and who it is intended to serve is important.

22 I know that in the GIS they talked about
23 getting a minimum of five acres for a park in this
24 general area. So, I think that's got to be interpreted
25 in terms of this parcel size. It is much smaller than

1 five acres. If the unconstrained acreage is confirmed
2 at 88.91 acres, when you do the math it allows a
3 density of two units per acre. So, 177 lots - - they
4 identified 178, but it's actually 177. To that
5 conservation analysis we will be able to confirm if
6 there is any unconstrained lands that will knock that
7 density down. If the 177 lots are proposed, it's
8 important that the Board consider that they are
9 proposing 80 lots. That is less than half than what
10 would be allowed -

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Where are you taking that 40%
12 from?

13 MR. GRASSO: I'm not. This is just to come up
14 with the maximum allowed density permitted on the site.
15 You don't take the 40% out of it. The 40% is set aside
16 and it has to be protected open space. So, you take the
17 total project site, you subtract the constrained lands,
18 which we don't know if there are any yet and you
19 subtract that. Then, you multiply it times the density
20 ratio and the zoning which is two units per acre.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, that is the calculation
22 for number of units.

23 MR. GRASSO: That's right. So, if there are no
24 constrained lands, they would be allowed 177 lots.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But they still have to take

1 that 88.91 acres and they are restricted to 60%. The 40%
2 has to be added to the green space.

3 MR. GRASSO: Exactly.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But the units stay the same

5 MR. GRASSO: That's right.

6 MR. ERRICO: Joe, just to correct you - we did
7 take the constrained lands out. It's not with the open
8 space taken out.

9 MR. GRASSO: Understood.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I understood.

11 MR. GRASSO: So, out of the 89 acres, 40% of
12 that has to be protected open space. That's what they
13 are currently proposing. That will be verified to the
14 process. We want to make sure that the open space is in
15 the right area and it is protected.

16 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Where are the constrained
17 lands because I can't see them.

18 MR. GRASSO: They have not identified them yet.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: But they must know.

20 MR. ERRICO: Actually, they are in there
21 somewhere. There's actually a wetland and drainage
22 corridor that runs down through here (Indicated) so the
23 constrained lands actually really run through here in
24 the back area. A lot of this area is constrained by the
25 wetland and the drainage. There's not a lot of steep

1 grade in there, but that's what most of the area is;
2 constrained land.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: So, where's the other 40%?

4 MR. ERRICO: There's some in here and there are
5 some steep grades that will meet the constrained land
6 property. We do have a map and I don't have it with me.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I am saying out of the 88
8 acres -

9 MR. ERRICO: The 14 acres that we are seeing
10 are constrained is this area. It encompasses all the way
11 down through here and all up in here (Indicating). It
12 wraps around it and comes up through here.

13 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm asking you what
14 unconstrained lands that you are setting aside as part
15 of the green space.

16 MR. ERRICO: It's in that same area in here.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I guess it would be helpful to
18 see a map.

19 MR. ERRICO: As Joe said, we will better
20 identify those areas.

21 MR. SHAMLIAN: So, if I am understanding
22 correctly and I think Pete and I are on the same page
23 here, you've got 13.88 acres of constrained land which
24 leaves 89 acres of unconstrained land. Only 60% of that
25 is buildable.

1 MR. GRASSO: Right.

2 MR. SHAMLIAN: Which leaves about 36 acres of
3 unbuildable and the unconstrained land added to the 14
4 acres of approximately constrained land. There should be
5 50 acres that doesn't have housing on it.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Yes, I agree with Craig's
7 numbers.

8 MR. SHAMLIAN: Just looking at the map, it
9 doesn't look like there's anywhere close to 50 acres
10 that doesn't have a house on it.

11 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, it's almost half, right?

12 MR. ERRICO: The way the map is, it shows 40
13 right now. It shows 40 of open area that does not have a
14 physical lot on it. It shows more than 60 acres and has
15 all the interior lot areas. The rest of it is left over,
16 which is 40. It doesn't take away the constrained land
17 they are talking about.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: No, it should be 50 acres that
19 you can't build on.

20 Joe, are you following our numbers, or not?

21 MR. GRASSO: Yes. I just want to remind the
22 Board that -

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I don't want people to think
24 we're making stuff up.

25 MR. GRASSO: You are exactly right. That's what

1 I said. We have to confirm the amount of unconstrained
2 lands in order to verify the math.

3 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We're just going by the number
4 that he's putting on the record now.

5 MR. GRASSO: Open space doesn't have to be
6 public open space. It's very often where you will
7 establish deed restriction lines within lots so that's
8 why we need to understand -

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I will be on record saying
10 that I'm not favoring that. If we want to amass the land
11 and make it so it's not part of somebody's individual
12 lot -- I want to let the developer know that up front.

13 MR. ERRICO: Understood.

14 MR. GRASSO: So, getting into the lot size - -
15 so, there is a minimum lot size of typically 18,000
16 square feet per lot. That gets waived when you go to a
17 conservation density design.

18 Like Dom said, they are proposing a variety
19 of lot sizes with some lots in the 11,000 to 12,000
20 square foot range and that is something for the
21 Planning Board to consider early. Are you comfortable
22 with lots in that size or do you one other lots down
23 at that size in order to protect more of the open
24 space. That's something for the Planning Board to
25 consider, as to lot size. Very often lot sizes and the

1 surrounding area -- which we assume most of those are
2 based upon the underlying zoning which is 18,000
3 square feet.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Just looking at the map, where
5 do you think the most logical place to conserve land
6 would be for the ecological and environmental?

7 MR. GRASSO: Again, we haven't seen a map yet
8 that identifies where the constrained lands are. Are
9 there extra buffers we want to build around those
10 constraints? We would want to look at: Are there buffers
11 that should be created next to adjoining residential
12 properties that should be protected? When we look at
13 these types of developments we often want them to look
14 like undeveloped open space when you are on the existing
15 road systems so there would be more protected buffers
16 along the road. That's another common area. Again, those
17 are all the things that we really need to go through
18 with the conservation analysis. Sometimes it gets
19 overlooked and we immediately jump into the math. What
20 we want to do is take a step back and make sure the
21 Board is comfortable and are we protecting those things
22 that we should protect with the 40%?

23 When we go through that exercise, there are
24 always concerns about the trees that we are taking
25 down. Part of that analysis should be the size of the

1 trees and the condition of the trees. There are parts
2 in the Code that say you've got to do a tree survey.
3 That is something that should be considered based on
4 what we learn from the conservation analysis. There
5 may be additional surveys warranted for a portion of
6 the project site, or the whole project site based on
7 what we find when we get into the conservation
8 analysis. Given a project site of this size and a
9 heavily wooded site, it's not something that we would
10 recommend at this time because it can be timely and
11 exhaustive and not serve any beneficial purpose. When
12 we start to learn more and more about the site, we
13 should not forget to look at those areas.

14 That's where we are with our review.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chief?

16 MR. HEIDER: I have a couple things. I'm a
17 little concerned about the density even though it's less
18 dense than what they could possibly build. I think the
19 smaller lot sizes on the south end - - I'm not too sure
20 you have to do that on the site.

21 I'm concerned about the drainage because it
22 appears that you are building the road on top of that
23 ridge and that's one hell of a ridge. These are very
24 non-permeable soils. You can't even get a shovel in
25 there. I'm really concerned about the water on the

1 east side of that road. That directly impacts Dennison
2 Road. I understand that it goes in the manholes in it
3 goes in the drains, but there are 30 houses on Walnut
4 and I would love to know where that water is going to
5 go other than draining it right down into that wood
6 line and right into the backyards.

7 MR. ERRICO: Do you want to know my intent now
8 of how we are handling that?

9 MR. HEIDER: I'm just giving you my reaction.

10 MR. ERRICO: We have already considered all of
11 that.

12 MR. HEIDER: I bet that you have. I'm just
13 saying that is a concern.

14 As far as the 18,000 square feet, I think the
15 smaller ones can go up a little bit and the big ones
16 can come down a little bit. I think it's the perfect
17 area not to have houses with density. The traffic on
18 Vly and Dennison is very heavy. You have the
19 elementary school right down the road. I'm not saying
20 it can't be built or won't be built, but I just think
21 the less curb cuts on Dennison Road would be better.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

23 Craig?

24 MR. SHAMLIAN: I agree with all the comments
25 that the Chief made.

1 Just to reiterate, I think there are too many
2 lots. I'm not sure as I think about whether this is a
3 conservation or conservation overlay -- I'm not sure
4 it's either right now. The intent of small lots to
5 give more open space isn't just to use up space.
6 Again, we don't have a map that shows the
7 descriptions, but it almost sounds like some of the
8 open space - you couldn't build on it anyway because
9 you're going to need to cross wetlands to get at some
10 of the -

11 MR. ERRICO: The slopes.

12 MR. SHAMLIAN: Or the slopes. I'm not sure what
13 kind of development it is. I don't love what I'm seeing
14 right now.

15 MS. MILSTEIN: I don't have a problem with the
16 lot size because some people may want small and some may
17 want large.

18 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

19 MR. MION: My comment is that I'm a little bit
20 concerned about the curb cuts on Dennison. I agree with
21 the Chief about the possibility of not building their
22 and having the actual houses where you can't see them up
23 on the top. It's a safety point.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chip?

25 MR. ASHWORTH: I have a question about the curb

1 cuts - one right after the other on Dennison. The other
2 thing is that the park that's 1.91 - that's 38% of five
3 acres and it seems to me it should be more centrally
4 located instead out in Timbuktu. You couldn't get any
5 farther away from the center part of this development.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I agree with Chief Heider's
7 statements and Craig's as well. We need to know where
8 the unconstrained lands are to really make an
9 intelligent type of an analysis about that.

10 I don't agree with any curb cuts on the main
11 road there. I doubt I'm going to support that in the
12 end. We've been through this before with other
13 developments. You can keep putting them back in your
14 renditions but if it were today, I wouldn't vote for
15 any curb cuts on that road.

16 I also think the density may be too much. I
17 think you should consider squeezing things down and
18 maybe reducing the number of lots and having
19 significant contiguous green space. I guess I'll just
20 say it like that. My initial reaction was -- what we
21 consider more of what's called a conservation
22 subdivision and not conservation overlay.

23 This isn't a conservation subdivision, Joe, I
24 don't think. A conservation overlay allows you to go
25 to smaller lots. A conservation subdivision is more

1 like a cluster subdivision. We can talk about it later
2 to clarify. The point that I'm making is the initial
3 thought was to have medium or smaller lots and put
4 them closer to one area and shorten the road and maybe
5 a couple of cul-de-sacs. I don't know if there is
6 another layout that you would consider along those
7 lines to preserve more green space.

8 MR. ERRICO: The lot sizes - you're correct,
9 the ones to the left or to the south are smaller lots.
10 They were developed on purpose to give that more of a
11 cluster and let the rest be more conventional lot sizes
12 where there were larger lots. It was a mixture of the
13 density of getting the density of larger lots and having
14 the smaller lots and one size where there are 90-foot
15 frontage lots. That's not a bad size lot. You look at
16 the other stuff on Dennison Road at the lower point down
17 and here (Indicating) and they're all 70 and 80-foot
18 lots. It's not a bad size lot. That was the intent to
19 have the smaller lot and the larger lot that would
20 identify both style of home. The home size won't be that
21 much different in size, but lot size to the south would
22 be more -

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Understood. I mean, that's the
24 way it's laid out. You are obviously constrained by the
25 narrowness of the property.

1 MR. ERRICO: We are trying to utilizing the
2 existing cut - - we have to put the road in this area
3 here (Indicating). We had no choice than to put the road
4 there because that's the way the plan is and it's
5 mandated, but it's where the Highway Department wants
6 the right-of-way. This part of the road has to be there.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Well, we still made our
8 comments.

9 MR. ERRICO: Understood.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The connection on the
11 left-hand side - what does that go into? The next
12 neighborhood?

13 MR. ERRICO: Yes.

14 MR. GRASSO: The air photo shows it.

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I wanted to say that because
16 we talked earlier about there being some type of utility
17 road up near there. It was unclear. I talked to somebody
18 about that. I just wanted to be clear about that.

19 MR. ERRICO: That's it right here (Indicating).

20 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And that comes right down to
21 Dennison.

22 MR. ERRICO: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN STUTO: On the south border.

24 MR. ERRICO: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I just wanted to clarify that.

1 I know we're not prepared to address this
2 today, Joe, - and anybody who wants to chime in - the
3 water pressure issue general in that area - - I'm
4 thinking and assuming that you're going to have
5 adequate water and adequate water pressure and that
6 we're going to try to bring John Frazier here on one
7 of the evenings. He's the Director of - he runs the
8 water system here.

9 MR. ERRICO: We can connect on Dennison Road.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: What is your water source; one
11 of those towers there?

12 MR. ERRICO: The second tower that was put in
13 over here has done that increase in pressure
14 (Indicating).

15 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Are you accessing those two
16 towers, or no?

17 MR. ERRICO: I believe this one (Indicating).
18 They are connected in some way.

19 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Can you educate yourself on
20 that and the future connections to the Town and we're
21 going to ask John Frazier to come and talk about it.

22 MR. ERRICO: In my meetings with John, that's
23 what he wants us to do.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Understood, but there's going
25 to be neighbors here that are going to ask about the

1 water pressure. We are going to asked John Frazier at
2 some point early in the process to talk about it.

3 That's all I have.

4 Anybody else?

5 Joe, do you have any finishing comments?

6 MR. GRASSO: No.

7 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Hopefully you have heard us.

8 MR. ERRICO: Thank you.

9 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
10 concluded at 8:05 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATION

I, NANCY L. 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.

Dated: _____

NANCY L. STRANG
LEGAL TRANSCRIPTION
2420 TROY SCHENECTADY RD.
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

