

1 STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF ALBANY

2 TOWN OF COLONIE

3 *****

4 CAPITAL REGION BOCES

5 925 WATERVLIET SHAKER ROAD

6 CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW

7 *****

8 THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled
9 matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter
10 commencing on July 21, 2020 at 6:29 p.m. at
11 Memorial Town Hall 534 New Loudon Road, Latham,
12 New York.

13

14 BOARD MEMBERS:

15 PETER STUTO, CHAIRMAN

16 CRAIG SHAMLIAN

17 PAUL ROSANO

18 SUSAN MILSTEIN

19 STEVEN HEIDER

20 LOUIS MION

21 FREDERICK ASHWORTH

22

23 ALSO PRESENT:

24 KATHLEEN MARINELLI, ESQ. COUNSEL TO THE BOARD

25 SEAN MAGUIRE, AICP, CEcD, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT
OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1 (cont.)
2 ZACHERY HARRISON, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC
3 DEVELOPMENT
4 DANIEL HERSHBERG, PE, HERSHBERG AND HERSHBERG
5 LAURA WEED, CONSERVATION ADVISORY COUNSEL
6 JOANNA BATMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SHAKER
7 HERITAGE SOCIETY
8 CHARLES VOSS, PE, BARTON AND LOGUIDICE
9 BRANDON STABLER, BBL

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CHAIRMAN STUTO: The next item on the
2 agenda is 925 Watervliet Shaker Road, Rossetti
3 office/commercial subdivision. This is a
4 concept plan review for a three-lot subdivision
5 with the anticipated construction of two
6 buildings for Capital Region Boces totaling
7 206,000 square feet with 475 parking spaces.
8 This site is zoned commercial/office.

9 Sean, do you have any introductory
10 remarks, or should we turn it over to the
11 applicant

12 MR. MAGUIRE: We saw this a few months
13 ago, I think. I can't remember if you saw it in
14 person, or online. We are here to take a look
15 at this again for concept. There have been
16 elements that have come up and I'm sure that
17 the applicant will discuss those.

18 There was communication from SHPO
19 regarding the sensitivity of the Shaker
20 development. I believe the developer and the
21 Shaker Heritage Society have worked through
22 some of those concerns.

23 I will let Mr. Hershberg present this.

24 Just for the presenters -- and for
25 everybody, use the microphones because the

1 masks - we really are going to be on top of
2 the microphone.

3 MR. HERSHBERG: Good evening, members of
4 the Planning Board. I am here tonight to
5 discuss the 925 Watervliet Shaker Road known as
6 the Boces project, but it is more than that. It
7 is a three-lot subdivision. Rossetti is going
8 to maintain lots one and two; the front portion
9 - the one with the wetland and the one west of
10 the road. In order to analyze the site and not
11 be guilty of segmentation, we have to assume
12 some development on the other site. We had
13 prepared a plan before and we determined that
14 the plan was so speculative, what we did is we
15 figured what the maximum potential zone could
16 be on the site and it turns out we could fit
17 330,000 square feet of commercial development
18 on a 3,000 square foot retail. This is
19 basically what we showed before. When the FEAF,
20 the Full Environmental Assessment Form - we
21 prepared analyzes the entire site assuming that
22 would be developed at a future time.

23 Some of the revisions were made in
24 response to the Shaker Heritage Society and
25 SHPO comments. The roadway stayed the same

1 as we showed last time. The site changed
2 somewhat because there are some wetlands
3 that adjoin us between us and the West
4 Shaker Apartments. Some of them are known as
5 isolated, but in this day and age because
6 there is a lawsuit pending with regard to
7 the definition of wetlands, we determined
8 that it's easier for us to avoid disturbing
9 the wetlands at all. So, the Army Corps of
10 Engineers will not be involved at all at
11 this stage of the project.

12 So, that's what we did there. Those
13 wetlands up at the top - the wetlands along
14 the top will be preserved. No fill will take
15 place there at all. The vegetation will stay
16 in those wetland areas.

17 This is a blow-up of the postseason
18 area (Indicating). We did add to the
19 stormwater detention basins at the bottom.
20 There is nice Colonie sand at the top for my
21 porous pavement and it turns out the grades
22 do not work. We have to excavate out all
23 that nice sandy material and we are down to
24 the clay material.

25 Consequently, we went to a series of

1 infiltration basins. We are deflecting the
2 water. There is one base up at the top
3 adjoining the West Shaker Apartments. There
4 are two adjoining the county property, which
5 is a little shy of that roadway. Those two
6 basins both have a sedimentation basin on
7 them and an infiltration basin and they are
8 sized to take the entire site without any
9 run-off going off the site. It is all
10 groundwater recharged.

11 The parking has been changed. We
12 originally showed over 500 parking spaces.
13 We now show 475 parking spots, which was the
14 minimum amount that Boces needs to operate
15 these buildings and accommodate their needs.

16 The buildings have been pushed,
17 obviously. The Maywood School, which was one
18 on the left, had to be pushed down to avoid
19 the wetlands and so did the CTA building.

20 These are the proposed site specifics.
21 The proposed Lot 1 is 37.9 green. There is
22 pavement and the building takes up 18%.

23 This is an elevation of the CTA
24 building - the larger building on the north
25 portion of the site. This is the front view

1 of Maywood School. This is looking from the
2 northeast (Indicating).

3 This is the elevation view of the
4 career and technological education facility.

5 I want to identify the changes that
6 were made to the plan since we were last
7 here.

8 This is as far east on the parcel as
9 possible. This is the topography and the
10 existing wetland. This serves to increase
11 the distance between the roadway and the
12 historic West Shaker family site. We have
13 redesigned the Boces site to avoid
14 disturbance on all wetlands including the
15 isolated wetland on the southwest corner of
16 the site, which could have been filled
17 without a permit. The Army Corp still
18 recognizes isolated wetlands.

19 This is the Boce's building - the CT
20 school is far to the end of the site as
21 possible to minimize the visual impact on
22 the West Family Shaker site. We shifted the
23 shorter building - the Maywood School - as
24 far away from the western and southern
25 property lines as practicable to offer more

1 substantial tree coverage between that and
2 the West Family Shaker Road.

3 Let me talk briefly about the issues
4 that were raised in the Shaker Heritage
5 Society's letter.

6 By the way, we met with them three or
7 four weeks ago. We had a very nice meeting.
8 They asked us to do some things. Some of the
9 things they asked us to do don't affect this
10 site, but they will be taken up when Phase
11 II or Phase III of the site is undertaken.
12 They asked us to maintain a vegetative
13 buffer wherever we can and they asked that
14 we maintain a buffer area between that
15 wetland and road. We will maintain that
16 buffer, although the buffer is not a very
17 substantial of trees but we will maintain
18 them.

19 As we go further into the project, we
20 may recommend in-filling some of it to have
21 more substantial buffer in there. They asked
22 us to maintain the wetlands, which we did.
23 They asked us to maintain all the way
24 between us and West Shaker Road, which we
25 did. They also asked us if we had to grade,

1 could we plan a buffer. So, on that wetland
2 area up at the top of the site we will plant
3 a buffer of trees along that side - probably
4 the white fir. The white fir is particularly
5 good because it takes its shape all the way
6 down and can survive in a variety of
7 conditions and some of these conditions get
8 pretty moist and some of them get really
9 dry. The white fir has a capability of
10 surviving various types of conditions. I am
11 a big fan of them because I have used them a
12 lot and they have a pretty good survival
13 rate. You do have to water them during the
14 period of establishment. As Mr. Marini was
15 saying, if you don't maintain them during
16 the period of establishment, you will lose a
17 lot of them.

18 We took a lot from the Shaker Heritage
19 Society's letter and we adopted it. Some of
20 the issues had to do with maintaining the
21 viewscape of the West Family site from
22 Watervliet Shaker Road. That would be
23 addressed when the next phase comes in. We
24 did work with Rosetti to make sure they were
25 comfortable with the fact that we could

1 relocate buildings and have that happen. We
2 believe that all can be maintained when we
3 get to Phase II and Phase III. Other than
4 that, I'm prepared to answer any questions
5 the Board may have.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I didn't hear everything
7 you had to say, but I did talk to Sean about a
8 visual.

9 MR. HERSHBERG: From this area here
10 (Indicating) near the West Shaker buildings, we
11 drew a cone in there to say that is the area
12 that we will keep clear of any buildings and
13 obscure the view. We are prepared to address
14 that at a later stage, but we quite honestly
15 were at a slightly inconvenient point here. If
16 someone wants to do 350,000 square feet of
17 office space, they would be hard-pressed right
18 now to do that. Nobody's got the idea that
19 there is not much demand for office space. Who
20 knows what the future brings?

21 I like working from home. I work in the
22 office three or four hours a day working
23 from home. Again, a whole bunch of other
24 people, I think, will come up with that same
25 idea. What we show there is how we could

1 re-adjust the buildings to adjust the view
2 scape. That would work, but I don't want to
3 hold out that is the exact building layout
4 that we have there. That's why it took the
5 buildings so long because the market being
6 what it is, unless there was a major office
7 need by a single-user type thing here, the
8 chance of this building being a 350
9 square-foot office reasonably in the near
10 future is limited. Rosetti owns it. Rosetti
11 has a good plans for commercial properties
12 right next to residential properties and the
13 apartments and it may also support a retail
14 facility. We did show on the plan a small
15 retail facility on the opposite side of the
16 road.

17 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I want to follow up on
18 that. I perceive it as an important issue. My
19 understanding is that the Shaker Heritage
20 Society - they know about this and they support
21 it, right?

22 MR. HERSHBERG: Yes, with these changes, I
23 think they fully support it.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: And if they are here, we
25 would like to hear from them throughout the

1 process. I guess my concern is how do we make
2 sure that doesn't change sometime in the
3 future? Do we get some type of no-block
4 easement or something like that? I thought you
5 would be amenable to that from what I heard
6 from Sean. It sounds like now you are saying
7 you don't want to lock yourself in.

8 MR. HERSHBERG: No, I don't think that we
9 object to it, but unfortunately I would have to
10 check with Chris Falvey who is the leader for
11 the Rosetti Group here. We think we can do it.
12 We think we can make the site work without
13 putting up any building to obscure the view.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I would just say for the
15 record that there is a lot of correspondence
16 here from the Shaker Heritage Society, Parks
17 and Recreation the State and the Preservation
18 League of New York State. It all ties into the
19 environmental review. So, I just want to make
20 sure we have a good record of what we're
21 considering.

22 MR. HERSHBERG: Our goal right now -- and
23 I think depending upon how you want to handle
24 it, we can certainly work with the Rossetti
25 Group and find out how they would like to word

1 it so that the view is protected as our goal
2 would be and it would still meet the Board's
3 needs.

4 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, thank you.

5 Other members of the public or the
6 Shaker Heritage Society or the CAC?

7 If you could come up to this mic, that
8 would be great.

9 MS. WEED: I am Laura Weed from the
10 Conservation Advisory Council. We want to
11 support the Shaker Heritage Society and the
12 Preservation League, with respect to the site.

13 We also wanted to suggest to increase
14 the number of EVA stations and provide more
15 screening and buffering to preserve the
16 natural appearance of the site, consider
17 green roofing or solar paneling and consider
18 the noise level resulting from the nearness
19 to the airport, especially considering that
20 this building is going to be used for
21 children with disabilities. We also wanted
22 you to just reconsider the number of parking
23 spaces. It looks like you have already done
24 that. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Thank you.

1 Are you in a position to address -

2 MR. HERSHBERG: I think I could, although
3 someone from Boces is here. Boces has studied
4 the site from the standpoint of the need - the
5 different needs for the different types of
6 students that they meet and have concluded that
7 the airport noise is not any concern to them.
8 They have shops and things like that in there
9 that are noisy in and of themselves, but they
10 do not think that the airport noise presents
11 any real problem for them and the site works
12 out very well for their needs, being that now
13 they are on a consolidated campus which is the
14 real advantage for this facility.

15 If you place the multiple other
16 buildings on another site which are
17 outliving their useful life right now and
18 unless they make this change now, they would
19 have difficulty maintaining the maintenance
20 bill to try to maintain these buildings.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, she mentioned green
22 roofs and EVA.

23 MR. HERSHBERG: Again, I don't think a
24 green roof is really in play here. First, from
25 the standpoint of the applicant - they have a

1 grant and they are working on fairly tight
2 constraints and a green roof, while we would
3 like to use them more, does add a significant
4 expense to the project. I don't think they're
5 prepared to take on green roofs.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we have our Town
7 Designated Engineer. I will ask him to respond
8 as well.

9 I think I went out of order and I think
10 I should have gone to you first, Chuck. Do
11 you want to hear from the neighbors or from
12 the Shaker people?

13 MR. VOSS: We can hear from the public.

14 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay.

15 MS. BATMAN: Hello, I'm Johanna Batman and
16 I'm the current Executive Director of Shaker
17 Heritage Society.

18 So, we have had a few discussions on
19 this project, to date. I'm very glad to see
20 that some of our concerns about parking and
21 buildings and the viewshed have been
22 addressed.

23 We are additionally interested in kind
24 of expanding on the natural relationship
25 between the Boces project and our own

1 educational mission to be undertaking some
2 discussions around programs.

3 Trail connections through the site was
4 also another consideration.

5 I understand that given the nature of
6 the Maywood School that is perhaps a concern
7 for the Boces parcel. I think that also
8 highlights the need to develop a mutual
9 understanding about the other two parcels
10 that are being separated here. Both from the
11 view shed element from the trail connections
12 and also just understanding the concerns
13 that the State Historic Preservation Office
14 has brought forward about the potential
15 jeopardy to the West Family Shaker Site as
16 development encloses it. The nature of the
17 historic district is contingent both on the
18 buildings and also on the landscape and how
19 intact the relationship is between the
20 structures and the buildings and their
21 surrounding environment. So, the laws of the
22 land, while it may not directly impact the
23 site, does potentially have an impact on the
24 status as a national historic district. So,
25 we are trying to work closely with all

1 parties and I do appreciate that everyone
2 here tonight has been really active in
3 keeping the Shaker Heritage Society involved
4 so that we can try to reach the best
5 possible solution.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, anybody have any
7 questions?

8 (There was no response.)

9 Okay, thank you.

10 MR. HERSHBERG: Can I just point out the
11 trail here?

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: We have a question and
13 then we will let you respond.

14 MR. ASHWORTH: What do you think of the
15 architectural elevation?

16 MS. BATMAN: I'm sorry, can you be more
17 specific for me?

18 MR. ASHWORTH: Well, in your letter you
19 talk about having some architectural elements
20 to the elevations.

21 MS. BATMAN: In our preliminary letter, we
22 were laying out just some examples of past
23 concessions and negotiations that we have asked
24 for and in the case of the Shaker West
25 apartment project that we previously

1 negotiated, there were significant discussions
2 about adjusting the architectural plans. In
3 this case I don't think we see that as an
4 essential function. It would be very difficult
5 to make an educational center resemble a Shaker
6 structure architecturally and keep it
7 functional. We are more concerned about making
8 sure it's not visually impacting the site,
9 especially given the elevation of that parcel
10 of land, that it will be possible for
11 vegetative buffers to achieve that.

12 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Do you have something,
13 Lou?

14 MR. MION: Yes. It has to go along with
15 the architect. Is the color scheme going to be
16 the same as it is over on Airline Drive?

17 MR. HERSHBERG: I don't think we have a
18 color scheme determined yet. We can work on
19 that between now and final approval.

20 MR. MION: Were you aware of that?

21 MS. BATMAN: Yes. In our last meeting we
22 did discuss that the colors were not set.

23 MR. MION: If you use the same color
24 scheme that you used over there, it would
25 certainly brighten up the area. It stands out.

1 MS. BATMAN: Shakers, you'd be surprised -
2 - although not on buildings, they did use
3 bright colors in their interiors.

4 MR. MION: Thank you.

5 MS. BATMAN: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anybody else on this
7 topic?

8 MR. HEIDER: We don't have an
9 architectural review in Town, but I know the
10 Boces building across the street has a very
11 industrialized look. I just don't know if
12 that's what we want to see here. Especially
13 considering that this is the first building of
14 the build-out of the whole area. I would just
15 like us to be very careful and cognizant to
16 make these buildings look better so that when
17 the Rossetti group goes in, going down the
18 street, we have some say in keeping some form
19 of Shaker Heritage. This will be a very
20 industrialized look, just looking at the
21 building over on Airline Drive and if we
22 approve something that is that industrial
23 looking, we are hard-pressed to approve
24 anything for Rossetti for the next two
25 buildings down the road. I think we just need

1 to be careful.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Anyone else have any
3 questions?

4 (There was no response.)

5 Is there anyone else who is going to
6 speak on this?

7 MR. MAGUIRE: I think Dan was going to
8 mention about the trail.

9 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, go ahead. Then
10 we'll let you talk about the preservation
11 aspect.

12 MR. HERSHBERG: We do show a trail
13 connection at the beginning of West Shaker
14 Park. We were considerate of that request.

15 And regarding architecture, we are
16 certainly willing to modify it and one goal
17 here was as you get into any working
18 drawings is to meet with the Shaker Heritage
19 Society as many times as necessary to be
20 certain they are pleased with what we do.
21 Unfortunately, building this size is not
22 going to look like a Shaker home or even
23 barn because of the size of it. We can
24 certainly work with them to try to
25 incorporate whatever color changes or

1 feature changes on the building.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, Chuck, we will turn
3 it over to you. I don't know if you want to hit
4 the topic were talking about now of
5 preservation and Shaker Heritage and CAC.

6 MR. VOSS: I will touch on that,
7 certainly.

8 The Board should have in their packets
9 our letter dated May 14, 2020. This is
10 actually the second concept letter we issued
11 for the project, because it's really kind of
12 a site review that the Board is now looking
13 at. Really, let me just go over some of the
14 additional items that have certainly changed
15 since we saw this last. I think some of the
16 key points that we are hearing tonight --
17 one of them that Dan did not touch on that I
18 would like to just touch on is the fact that
19 they have been working with the Albany
20 County Department of Public Works - Jim
21 Merkel of the county for access.

22 One of the important pieces of this
23 site that I know Dan had in his presentation
24 just briefly was a new access road coming in
25 off of Albany Shaker Road. Right now it is

1 proposed to extend all the way to the rear
2 of the parcel to where the CTE site is,
3 which we certainly think is appropriate.
4 It's more of a meandering road. It's not a
5 direct line of sight road that goes back in
6 so it does help to avoid the wetland areas
7 that are in that area right now and also it
8 helps to soften the visual impact of the
9 road. Also significantly is the fact that a
10 new signalized intersection will be proposed
11 just opposite South Family Drive where this
12 new driveway will come in. We think that is
13 certainly appropriate and I know they have
14 been working with the County Engineer to get
15 that online and going forward and I believe
16 Dan, correct me if I am wrong, the county is
17 supportive of that amenity and that new
18 location.

19 Some of the other things that Dan has
20 been working on and I know that the
21 applicant has working on as well is
22 coordination with the FAA in terms of
23 building placement and location. As the
24 Board knows, the Albany Airport radar ray is
25 just to the east of the site. Although this

1 site will not impact that facility at all,
2 there are some important issues that they
3 have to go through to deal with that.

4 More significantly is that we have been
5 hearing communication with the Shaker
6 Heritage Society. Since we last wrote our
7 letter, several meetings have taken place
8 between the applicant and the Shaker
9 Heritage Society. We are certainly pleased
10 to see that it sounds like there is some
11 consensus and agreement that have been
12 developed now between the two that certainly
13 will satisfy the Shaker Heritage Society.
14 They are a critical piece to this puzzle as
15 this project moves forward.

16 Also as the Board knows, we were the
17 TDE's for the Afrim's site which is now
18 constructed and operational. We are also the
19 TDE's for the adjacent West Shaker site
20 apartments that are just to the west of the
21 site. So, we're very well familiar with the
22 utilities, the infrastructure, the new
23 infrastructure that's in that area, the
24 sewer mains, the water mains and those types
25 of things. As the project really develops,

1 we will have a really keen sense of what
2 will work well up there and what won't work
3 well.

4 As Dan mentioned, stormwater could also
5 be another concern. Those are more just kind
6 of the nuts and bolts engineering things
7 that we see out there. The site, certainly
8 from a utility standpoint, is very viable.
9 As Dan mentioned, they do have some soil
10 issues that they're going to have to deal
11 with particularly by the CTE site.

12 Other than that, I think we are very
13 pleased to see the building shift from the
14 original plan. They are now avoiding a
15 couple of wetland areas which we are very
16 happy to see. There's been some potential
17 opportunities for some buffering. They also
18 have reduced parking which we think is
19 certainly appropriate.

20 Dan, as you know, the Board always
21 likes to know if there are future
22 opportunities to reduce the parking more
23 like banking spaces. That is something just
24 to consider as the project develops. I know
25 we are very early in the stages but there

1 may be opportunities to look at that.

2 Also in terms of the viewshed and the
3 preservation of the viewshed, we have seen -
4 and we were at the meeting last week when
5 the applicants brought that up. The Planning
6 staff will certainly concur that is an
7 important piece. I think whether or not we
8 tag the viewshed to the intersection, or we
9 tag the viewshed to maybe some other
10 location along Watervliet Shaker Road, I
11 think certainly it's something that we need
12 to look at and the applicant sounds very
13 willing to do. We will work with them to try
14 to figure that out as best we can.

15 In addition, just so the Board knows,
16 it is a Type I action for SEQRA, given the
17 proximity and the location to a historic
18 district and also the scale. The benefit
19 here is that the fact that the entire site
20 is covered by the airport area GEIS, which
21 in itself has already helped to classify the
22 action and also help us mitigate the
23 environmental impacts that could potentially
24 be there; traffic, and utilities are usually
25 the big one.

1 At this point, it sounds like the
2 project is moving in the correct direction.
3 We are certainly pleased to see the changes
4 and we think it will have a substantially
5 impact to improve the project.

6 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Okay, we will turn it
7 back over to the Board.

8 Paul?

9 MR. ROSANO: I'm all set, Peter.

10 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Craig?

11 MR. SHAMLIAN: Following up on the CTE -
12 how many EV spots are there, Dan?

13 MR. HERSHBERG: We have 475 parking spots.

14 MR. SHAMLIAN: And how many for electric
15 cars?

16 MR. HERSHBERG: I think we only have five.

17 MR. SHAMLIAN: Yes, it looks like just a
18 couple. I don't know how many is an appropriate
19 number, but I guess at the very least I would
20 encourage that some of the infrastructure-
21 clearly down the road you will need more than
22 five. I certainly wouldn't want to see on a
23 project like this have to dig things up two
24 years from now. So, I would encourage you to
25 put in the infrastructure for that.

1 MR. HERSHBERG: We normally put some
2 conduits in for six or eight spots. Conduits
3 are very inexpensive to put in the ground and
4 it goes to one control point. Then, you can add
5 them as you need them later.

6 MR. SHAMLIAN: I am in favor of the
7 project. I do want to point out that this
8 project kind of epitomizes one of the things -
9 especially on virgin ground that bothers me a
10 little bit. That is there is virtually no green
11 space other than the wetlands and infiltration
12 basins. I don't know how much green space is on
13 the road as part of this lot -- if this
14 property were up against the road, then we
15 would not be sitting here saying okay, this
16 project is okay. It doesn't have green space
17 around the building. I am in favor of the
18 project, but I just wanted to raise that point.

19 When you come before us to develop the
20 other parcels, speaking for myself, I'm
21 going to be looking for a lot of green space
22 between a neighboring building and whatever
23 gets developed next to it as an example.

24 MR. HERSHBERG: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Susan.

1 MS. MILSTEIN: I don't have anything.

2 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chief?

3 MR. HEIDER: My only concern -- Dan, are
4 the parking spaces that you're showing here
5 based on what they currently have and use, or
6 based on the calculations of square footage?

7 MR. HERSHBERG: It's based on a couple
8 issues. It is the number of staff and it also
9 has a variety of different uses. There are
10 people there at night for one program or people
11 during the day and there is a time where they
12 overlap where they're coming and going and
13 their spaces that you have to provide for.

14 Brandon?

15 MR. STABLER: Hi, Brandon Stabler,
16 representing BBL.

17 I'm helping out on the development of
18 this project. So, to answer the question
19 about parking - when we were working with
20 Boces on this facility, part of the issue on
21 the two existing sites that they have is not
22 just that the buildings are old and in
23 disrepair, it is that they don't have enough
24 parking currently for what their current
25 program is. What Boces' intention is with

1 this consolidation is to be able to have the
2 capacity to expand a couple of other
3 programs that they intend to implement. So,
4 what we are showing here is what Boces has
5 told us that they absolutely need in order
6 to make the site function. It wasn't that we
7 just maximized the number of parking spaces
8 on the site.

9 MR. HEIDER: My other point is to go along
10 with what Craig said, there being virtually no
11 landscaping -- don't get me wrong, the typical
12 school does not have a whole lot of landscaping
13 and they don't really plan for beauty. Going
14 towards the future, as Craig said, we should
15 really look for a lot of buffer there.

16 This is very far back from the road. By
17 the time you put in the other two buildings,
18 you won't even see the buildings. That was
19 the only thing in favor of the less
20 landscaping. Coming forward in the future,
21 we're going to have to look at that closer.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou?

23 MR. MION: I'm good.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Chip?

25 MR. ASHWORTH: I agree with regard to the

1 parking because you have one for every four
2 students. How many bike racks are you going to
3 put in the front?

4 MR. HERSHBERG: Again, we can show some
5 bike racks there but you realize that most of
6 the students that arrive here, arrive on buses.
7 I don't think they would be allowed here
8 because they come from different places. If
9 employees wanted to, we can provide some bike
10 racks for them. The question is how many and we
11 can come back with a logical number that we
12 would need.

13 There's also some students at night.
14 Those are older students and maybe some of
15 those will be bike riders.

16 MR. STABLER: Along those lines, I think
17 one of the things that we talked about 10C
18 Airline Drive was a lot of us when we think
19 about school, we think about traditional
20 schools. We have to keep in mind that Boces -
21 these are not traditional schools. Boces is
22 comprised of 24 member districts and so every
23 student that arrives at this campus every day,
24 other than the adult learners, are coming on
25 buses from 24 different members districts a

1 couple of times a day. There will be some
2 locally, but they will arrive on buses. So, it
3 doesn't function like a normal school does.
4 There aren't big athletic events that night.
5 There aren't a lot of people riding bikes.

6 Another kind of related point that I
7 think is important that the Board may want
8 to hear is that we have met with CDTA. I
9 shouldn't say me. We spoke on the phone
10 about bus service to the facility, both for
11 staff and other employees and teachers. We
12 are going to work with CDTA to ensure that
13 there is some sort of a bus service. It
14 looks now -- I don't want to speak out of
15 turn, but after initial discussions, it
16 looks like CDTA is actually going to have
17 some buses - smaller buses that will
18 actually come right up onto the campus. So,
19 we did think about public transportation in
20 the design of this, as well.

21 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I think that's everybody.
22 Do you have anything else?

23 MR. HERSHBERG: No.

24 CHAIRMAN STUTO: I'm not going to repeat
25 everything that everybody said. I think we are

1 working together well. We are here for concept
2 tonight, I think. This is a pretty major
3 project and there are issues that have to be
4 worked out, particularly around the Shaker site
5 and that family complex, the CAC and the
6 Preservation League and the Department of Parks
7 and Rec. I assume those discussions will be
8 ongoing and open-minded. I'm thinking that it
9 might be appropriate to come back before final
10 to let us know how you're doing. I will leave
11 that to Sean. Communicate with Sean on that.
12 It's a possibility that you could come back and
13 give us a report on how things are doing before
14 we get to final.

15 Anybody else have anything before we
16 take a motion?

17 (There was no response.)

18 Do we have a motion for concept
19 acceptance?

20 MR. MION: I make a motion.

21 MR. HEIDER: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN STUTO: Lou and Chief seconds it.

23 Any discussion?

24 (There was no response.)

25 All those in favor, say aye.

1 (Ayes were recited.)
2 All those opposed, say nay.
3 (There were none opposed.)
4 The ayes have it. Thank you.
5 (Where's the above entitled proceeding
6 was concluded at 7:00 PM)

7
8
9
10
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 CERTIFIES 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.

Date: _____

Nancy L. Strang
Legal Transcription
2420 Troy Schenectady Road
Niskayuna, NY 12309

- 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

