

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

TOWN BOARD COUNTY OF ALBANY

TOWN OF COLONIE

PUBLIC COMMENT

THE STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES of the above entitled matter by NANCY L. STRANG, a Shorthand Reporter commencing on November 21, 2019 at 7:08 p.m. at Memorial Town Hall, 534 New Loudon Road, Latham, New York

BOARD MEMBERS:

- PAULA MAHAN, SUPERVISOR
- LINDA MURPHY, DEPUTY SUPERVISOR
- DAVID GREEN
- MELISSA JEFFERS-VONDOLLEN
- PAUL ROSANO
- CHRISTOPHER CAREY
- JENNIFER WHALEN

ALSO PRESENT:

- Michael C. Magguilli, Esq, Town Attorney
- Julie Gansle, Town Clerk
- P. Christopher Kelsey, Acting Comptroller
- Susan Quine Laurilliard
- Susan Weber
- Gloria Knorr

1 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: We will have public comment,
2 if anyone has public comment. Please come up and state
3 your name.

4 MS. LAURILLIARD: Good evening. Susan Quine
5 Laurilliard, as you know. I'm here tonight to comment on
6 the proposed Resolution number 506 that's on tonight's
7 Town Board agenda.

8 The Resolution - I will just read it for the
9 record. Proposing to rescind an open development area
10 and the minor subdivision approved at 34 Denison Road
11 by Resolution No. 314 for 2018. Be it resolved that
12 the open development area approved by Resolution No.
13 314 for 2018 is hereby rescinded and that the minor
14 subdivision located at 34 Denison Road and known as
15 36, 37 and 38 Denison Road be returned and
16 consolidated into the parcel at 34 Denison Road.

17 Before the Board proceeds with its
18 consideration of this Resolution, I wanted to point
19 out the following: first, tonight's Resolution
20 incorrectly reverts to Resolution 314 for 2018. The
21 Town Board tabled this Resolution on July 26, 2018 and
22 voted for Resolution number 333 that was amended by
23 Councilman David Green on August 9, 2018. So,
24 tonight's Resolution needs to be amended to reflect
25 the correct Resolution references.

1 MR. GREEN: We did that upstairs.

2 MS. LAURILLIARD: Also tonight's Resolution
3 refers to the fact the Town Board's 2018 approval
4 Resolution approved a minor subdivision at 34 Denison
5 Road. This is not accurate. The Town Board's 2018
6 approval was only for an open development area at 34
7 Denison Road that was contingent upon further review by
8 the Town's departments as part of a three-lot minor
9 subdivision application. Therefore, the wording of
10 tonight's Resolution is confusing and not accurate.

11 I'm going to provide these comments to you
12 after I'm done.

13 Tonight's Resolution also refers to a minor
14 subdivision at 34 Denison Road known as 36, 37 and 38
15 Denison Road. I took a look at the Town's final tax
16 assessment rolls for 2019 and the Town maintained real
17 property report that you have on the Assessor's
18 website. Neither the assessment roll nor the report
19 has a 36, 37 or 38 Denison Road listed as separate
20 lots. So, the Resolution needs to be looked at as far
21 as that being misleading that they're actually three
22 lots 36, 37 and 38 Denison Road.

23 Furthermore, there is no filed subdivision
24 map in the Albany County Clerk's office. It is a minor
25 subdivision and there is no filed deed easement which

1 restricts access via the driveway they were proposing
2 as part of the ODA to the remaining acreage at 34
3 Denison Road. *The Town Board, prior to voting this
4 evening, must conduct its due diligence and request
5 the author of tonight's Resolution to address the
6 current status of 34 Denison Road. When was the
7 three-lot minor subdivision approved? I think that
8 should be on the record - public record for this.

9 Also prior to taking a vote, the Town Board
10 must confirm whether the procedures and the New York
11 State Town Law 280-a Section 190-133 in the Town Code
12 must be followed when the Town Board takes action to
13 rescind an ODA approval. When an ODA is adopted,
14 public notice, referral to the Planning Board for
15 recommendation and public hearing was required. Are
16 the same procedures required now in order to rescind
17 the ODA? So, I would ask the Town Board to ask for an
18 opinion from the legal office as to the proper
19 procedure to follow resending this.

20 In addition, want to say that as this Town
21 Board already knows, there's been a considerable
22 history with respect to 34 and 33 Denison Road. During
23 the 2018 ODA hearing, Shelco, who I believe is the
24 applicant for this rescission, and its representatives
25 stated that they needed an ODA approval because three

1 family members wanted to live side-by-side and
2 consolidation of three separate parcel driveways into
3 one driveway would save trees. Before and after
4 hearing my neighborhood specifically requested that
5 the applicant and Town administrative staff, Town
6 Planning Board and development staff confirm whether
7 there were additional development plans for 34 Denison
8 Road. These plans are not disclosed by the applicant
9 or Town Planning.

10 In recognition of my neighborhood's concerns,
11 the Town Board conditioned its ODA approval on the
12 driveway not being a connection for development on the
13 remaining parcel and any further subdivision of 34
14 Denison Road would require Planning Board approval.
15 Even the wording of tonight's Town Board Resolution is
16 only reasonable if the applicant and Town Planning
17 officials disclose what plans are under consideration
18 for the 34 Denison Road parcel. In fact, the
19 Resolution states that they're rescinding it in order
20 for them to proceed with other development plans. So,
21 I would ask that should be a point of inquiry.

22 In addition, these plans are directly
23 relevant to the Town's open space planning. During a
24 recent Comprehensive Plan update process, Town
25 residents unsuccessfully advocated for the Town to

1 include private and public lands in the open space
2 inventory map that was included in the Comp Plan
3 update. Private lands were never included on the map.
4 The parcel at 34 Denison Road is the last large parcel
5 of undeveloped land in the western part of the Town
6 exclusive of the Pine Bush inventory of 103 acres. The
7 Town Board now has an opportunity to require that the
8 Town Planning review to assess the impact of
9 development on this parcel at 34 Denison Road and what
10 impact it will have on the remaining open space lands
11 in the Town of Colonie.

12 It is my understanding that recently elected
13 Town Board Member Jill Penn resides on the other side
14 of 34 Denison Road. During her campaign, I had an
15 opportunity to speak to her about the need for a park
16 in our neighborhood and my concerns with how the 34
17 Denison Road parcel will be developed. During our
18 conversation, she agreed with me that a suitable park
19 for neighborhood residents is something that is
20 missing in our neighborhoods.

21 Supervisor Mahan, you too in the past
22 recognized that the Vly/Denison Road neighborhood
23 needs a park and not one that is located next to water
24 tanks. You specifically directed that the Airport GIS
25 recreation mitigation fees be set aside for that

1 purpose. I hope that the Town seriously will evaluate
2 how best to ensure that there is a viable park at 34
3 Denison Road. A park that is also required by the
4 Airport Area GIS.

5 In addition, I hope this Town Board will make
6 certain that the Vly/Denison Road residents and
7 neighborhood Association will be included early on in
8 the development of 34 Denison Road. My hope is that
9 whether the developer is, they will take seriously the
10 need for neighborhood input and they will assure that
11 the development proposal fits within the neighborhood
12 character and within the parameters of the
13 conservation overlay district.

14 Perhaps the current developer will follow
15 Jack Faddegon's lead and create a development proposal
16 that is more about the outside and not all about the
17 inside of the homes.

18 In summary, I urge the Town Board to table
19 this Resolution this evening until such time as the
20 questions that I have raised are adequately addressed
21 by Town legal and administrative staff. Thank you for
22 your time this evening. I look forward to the Planning
23 and Economic Development reaching out to my
24 neighborhood and the neighbors in the Vly/Denison Road
25 area for our active role and input as the development

1 which looks like it's going to happen 434 Denison Road
2 is under review.

3 I promise that I will be back to continue to
4 update this Town Board regarding 34 Denison Road. I
5 hope the Town Board will take an active interest in
6 any development proposal that is put forth for 34
7 Denison Road. Thank you for your time.

8 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Just for the Town Board's
9 knowledge, the park land that Mrs. Lauillard is
10 referring to - when I came in 2008 there was a certain
11 amount of money that was set aside for a passive park
12 and what they called Phase IV, if Phase IV ever came to
13 fruition. I discussed that with our Comptroller's office
14 back then. I requested that amount of money stay in that
15 line and that it is reserved when and if Phase IV was
16 ever completed. That money has been set aside. That
17 money has always been set aside. It has never been
18 touched.

19 Chris, correct me if I'm wrong.

20 MR. KELSEY: It is still there, correct.

21 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: That was something that I
22 took care of in 2008. You may not know that.

23 MS. WHALEN: I have a question procedurally
24 about this. I remember this vividly because we went back
25 and forth - so much about it. I remember the alternative

1 to giving an ODA for this driveway - for this family -
2 was to have three separate driveways onto the road from
3 the single-family homes. It just seems odd to me
4 procedurally that we would just rescind something
5 without referring it first to the Planning Board and
6 have them look at it.

7 Like, the ODA on Hills Road for instance -
8 there is a request for an ODA tonight on Hills Road.
9 So, we are referring that to the Planning Board,
10 right? They will refer their decision back to us for
11 further decision. So, it would seem to me logically
12 that if we are referring something to the Planning
13 Board, and now it wants to do it into an ODA. Now, to
14 rescind it it almost seems like the proper thing
15 procedurally to do would also be to refer it to the
16 planning Board for them to straighten out and see what
17 impact this would have on resending the ODA. Times
18 could have changed since however many years ago - a
19 year and a half or two years ago this was.

20 MR. ROSANO: Let me help you out with that,
21 Jennifer, because you interrupt me a lot of times.

22 First of all, this is a minor subdivision.

23 MS. WHALEN: Are we sure?

24 MR. ROSANO: Yes, we are. It is a three-lot
25 minor subdivision. It's not going to be referred to the

1 Planning Board for future development on 34, 36, 37 and
2 39. These are right on Vly Road. As of 4:30 this
3 afternoon there is no submittal for the 99 acres up on
4 the plateau, as we will call it. So, we have nothing in
5 the Town department to talk about tonight. There's
6 nothing to refer to the Planning Board tonight.

7 The public hearing was held at the Planning
8 Board level on the ODA. We just voted on the
9 recommendation. That's what we voted on. So, the need
10 for a public hearing for a rescission - I've never
11 heard of such a thing. I am dead set against it. I
12 want to vote on this Resolution tonight.

13 MS. WHALEN: Wait, just a minute, also. First
14 of all, I don't interrupt you that much because you
15 don't say very much, Paul. So, I don't really appreciate
16 you saying I interrupt you a lot. You don't even say
17 anything.

18 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Let's just get back on track
19 please. Everybody be respectful to each other. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. MAGGUILLI: I agree with most of what Ms.
22 Laurilliard said this evening. She is correct that no
23 subdivision maps have been filed with the county. In
24 fact what happened in this case is that after we adopted
25 Resolution 333 for 2018 for whatever reason, they

1 decided not to go forward with those plans. So, they
2 never filed the paperwork for either the minor
3 subdivision or for the ODA. So, as we sit here today, no
4 ODA has been legally created at 34 Denison Road.

5 The developer, Shelco - we've been going back
6 and forth on this - didn't even think we needed this
7 Resolution that I put forth tonight. Because of the
8 fact that no ODA was created - no minor subdivision
9 was created. Simply by the fact that they never
10 completed the process, allows them to do whatever they
11 intend to do in the future. I partially agree with
12 that position as well. As I set upstairs, the reason
13 why I thought we should do this Resolution is solely
14 for clarity. As I said upstairs, 10 years from now
15 when somebody's going to the file to see what
16 happened, they will at least be able to find this
17 Resolution showing the ODA, if any, was rescinded.
18 That's all this does. I think that Ms. Lauilliard is
19 correct - that if this had gone through and been
20 completed and all the paperwork was done, in order to
21 rescind it under legislative equivalency, we would
22 have to do that. Under the special facts of this case,
23 for whatever reason, they put the brakes on this
24 project and never completed it. They never created the
25 ODA. Our tax maps are not changed. There has been no

1 change in any of the Town's master plans. Again, this
2 was solely for clarity.

3 MR. GREEN: Would it hurt though to tighten up
4 the language a little bit in the Resolution? I'm not
5 opposed to passing the Resolution, but Susan does raise
6 that clarity might be a little misleading. Maybe if we
7 could table it for two weeks, we could just tighten it
8 up so it tells the story better. There are words thrown
9 around in here that may be our little bit misleading.

10 MR. MAGGUILLI: Like what?

11 MR. GREEN: It is saying that the open
12 development areas approved.

13 MR. MAGGUILLI: It was approved. We approved by
14 Resolution 333. What I'm saying is that it was never
15 created and it never became a legal entity - I guess you
16 could call it.

17 MS. WHALEN: It's like that Forts Ferry
18 problem, right? Remember with Forts Ferry a long time
19 ago - the prior administration negotiated and there was
20 a Resolution passed.

21 MR. MAGGUILLI: Exactly.

22 MS. WHALEN: But then the folks in Forts Ferry
23 allegedly never went and sealed the deal by actually
24 doing what they needed to do.

25 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: No, that's not correct.

1 MR. MAGGUILLI: what happened with Forts Ferry
2 is just they never adopted a Resolution clarifying what
3 they did. So, that's what I'm trying to accomplish
4 tonight to try to avoid a similar circumstance in the
5 future. I did put in minor subdivision even though one
6 was never created, so there would be no question in the
7 future that there is nothing there. As a success, it
8 goes back to 34 Denison Road as one parcel.

9 MS. LAURILLIARD: I know this is public
10 comment, but the wording is misleading because you
11 referred to - it is hereby rescinded and that the minor
12 subdivision located at 34 Denison Road - - there is no
13 minor subdivision.

14 MR. MAGGUILLI: Correct.

15 MS. LAUILLIARD: So, that wording implies that
16 there is a minor subdivision.

17 MR. MAGGUILLI: I think it's very clear. It
18 says that we are rescinding it. If you would like to add
19 the terms if any, that's fine too. The whole purpose of
20 this was clarity.

21 MS. WHALEN: I agree with David. Maybe we
22 should table this and just re-frame it a little bit and
23 just say the open development area and minor subdivision
24 that was contemplated and approved by us was never
25 followed through with by these developers and therefore

1 our discussions are now being rescinded.

2 MS. LAUILLIARD: So, the issue about the minor
3 subdivision is the Town Board does not approve a minor
4 subdivision. It is an administrative approval that is
5 done at the Planning and Economic Development
6 Department.

7 MR. ROSANO: No, that's incorrect, Susan. They
8 do not review these. This would be three building
9 permits out of the Building Department.

10 MR. LAUILLIARD: I disagree.

11 MR. ROSANO: You can disagree.

12 MR. MAGGUILLI: Everybody just calm down and
13 let's do this. This is not a debate. It is public
14 comment. You have had your say and whatever the Town
15 Board would like to do is fine with me.

16 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: David, do you have specific
17 language they would like to add to that?

18 MR. GREEN: I think I would have to give it
19 some thought. I want to explore that minor subdivision.
20 Is there any implication in the intent of the developer
21 or the escrow - - if we wait two weeks and just re-tool
22 some of the language?

23 MR. MAGGUILLI: I'm sorry, David?

24 MR. GREEN: Is there any impact if we wait two
25 weeks to retool some of the language, just to make sure

1 that we have a correct?

2 MR. MAGGUILLI: Nothing that I'm aware of
3 because I have no idea what the intent of the
4 developer is. So, it may or it may not, Dave. I know
5 they were very insistent that if we did do something,
6 they wanted it done - - we've been going back and forth
7 on this since September. This isn't anything we just
8 plucked out of the air. I talked to Joe LaCivita, as
9 well. We finally came to the conclusion that the best
10 thing to do, even though nothing was legally created -
11 the final steps were never taken - was to do a
12 Resolution that sometime in the future if this ever came
13 up, people would know what happened and that there is
14 nothing there. That's all this is.

15 MR. GREEN: I would be more comfortable if we
16 spelled that out. You said why we are doing this but the
17 Resolution itself is bare-bones and slightly misleading.
18 I'm going to propose - I'm going to make a motion to
19 table Resolution 506 for a few weeks.

20 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Just one second, Dave. Hold
21 that thought.

22 From what you're hearing, Mike, is there any
23 language that you would add to that right now that
24 would make it more clear?

25 MR. MAGGUILLI: I would just put in the concern

1 that there is the minor subdivision - - just put in the
2 clause if any. That's really all that's needed.

3 MS. WHALEN: Can I ask another question about
4 this? Is there a certain - - it seems odd to me that we
5 would go through all of this with this ODA request that
6 went on for several months. Is there a time limit within
7 which they have to follow up and actually make it -
8 whatever the final piece is that they have to do to make
9 sure that what we voted on actually becomes set in
10 stone? Is there a time limit to do that?

11 MR. ROSANO: It was an 18-month sunset rule.

12 MS. WHALEN: So, say these folks still wanted
13 this - what we originally agreed upon. They have 18
14 months to actually finish the paperwork and then if they
15 don't, what happens? Does it expire?

16 MR. ROSANO: Yes.

17 MS. WHALEN: Wait, I'm asking Mike. Mike is the
18 lawyer.

19 MR. MAGGILLI: Not necessarily. It doesn't
20 work automatically. The way your phrasing it makes it
21 sound as if 18 months - it automatically just
22 disappears. No, I think it gives the Town the right to
23 move to have it rescinded. What we have here is again a
24 Resolution that just attempts to put something in
25 writing so that in the future people will know what

1 happened. That's all. The operative and the important
2 words are is that it is rescinded and there is no
3 question that there is no minor subdivision and that
4 there is no ODA. Even at the end of the process - sorry,
5 I did mean to interrupt you.

6 MS. WHALEN: Even if it is rescinded, it will
7 turn back to what again?

8 MR. MAGGUILLI: It will just go back to 34
9 Denison - what it was before.

10 MS. WHALEN: It's not three lots. It's three
11 single-family lots.

12 MR. MAGGUILLI: In fact, it's 34 Denison now
13 because there's no minor subdivision, as Ms. Lauilliard
14 pointed out.

15 MS. WHALEN: Which is the big piece - 101
16 acres.

17 MR. MAGGUILLI: And the 12 years I've been
18 here, I don't think I've ever seen someone go through
19 all this time and trouble and then rescind it. It's
20 crazy to me - or seek to rescind it. They were very
21 adamant that they didn't need to do anything because
22 they never finished what was required. The other point
23 is this: if we do this, the end result is going to be
24 the same anyway.

25 MS. WHALEN: I agree with David and Susan that

1 that there should be a little bit more clarification,
2 just so that you want the record to look complete and
3 has a good explanation. I think it might need a little
4 work

5 MR. MAGGUILLI: Most likely the result would be
6 the same. I don't think it needs an explanation. It just
7 needs to know that it's rescinded.

8 MS. WHALEN: Because it was never effectuated
9 either. It was never effectuated and now it's rescinded.

10 MR. MAGGUILLI: What I'm trying to do is make
11 the record clear.

12 MS. WHALEN: You can't rescind something that's
13 never been effectuated.

14 MR. MAGGUILLI: That was their point. That's
15 exactly what they argued.

16 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Mike, correct me if I'm
17 thinking about this the wrong way but we had situations
18 in the past of some proposals that have gone through
19 discussion and everything and people think that that
20 it's actually come to fruition and it happened and then
21 when we look for clarification in the paperwork it comes
22 down to - - on either the Town side or the developer
23 side - the owner side, and it never happened. It just
24 never followed through. That's the point in having the
25 Resolution so that somewhere down the road if somebody

1 is looking at this, they know that nothing was actually
2 built there. They never followed through. They basically
3 said we're not going to do this, I guess. So, now you
4 don't want to go looking and trying to figure out how to
5 put the puzzle together as to what happened.

6 MS. WEBER: Excuse me, I like to make a
7 suggestion here. My name is Susan Weber. I have been
8 following this development for a while. I think it might
9 be useful for you to learn from Planning and Economic
10 Development about what discussions have been underway
11 with the developer because it's clear to me at least and
12 to anybody looking at this from a distance that this
13 developer has something going on. It's not necessarily a
14 bad thing. I don't mean it in a negative way. They have
15 something they have in mind. This is a large parcel of
16 undeveloped open green space that is left. Perhaps it's
17 the last one in this area of the Town. They have brought
18 one little piece of it to you guys for approval way back
19 when and that is in many people's minds segmentation
20 which is against the rules. So, now they're asking to
21 have whatever you guys or everybody approved before set
22 aside and it's done in a way that it's not altogether
23 clear - to two of you at at least and us as well. I
24 think it would behoove you to delve into this a little
25 more deeper and find out what's really going on. It

1 would appear that there is no rush. Who is pushing this?
2 If somebody's pushing this, why are they pushing us? I
3 suggest you find out from your Planning and Economic
4 Development Department. Thank you for your time.

5 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Mike, I think Joe said they
6 had no proposal and nothing there. So, we do know that.

7 MR. MAGGUILLI: What they intend to do with the
8 parcel is a question for another day. What we are doing
9 tonight is rescinding, as Jennifer said, something that
10 is not there. That was actually their argument. What do
11 you mean we need to rescind it? There's nothing there to
12 resend. I told them that I wanted to do it so there was
13 a record. The only thing we're trying to accomplish here
14 is to have a record shown of what was done in approved
15 in 2018 by Resolution 333 is no longer effective - no
16 longer in force or effect. Somebody can come back and
17 apply for a building permit for three houses in a row.

18 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: The fact is if somebody
19 comes back with something different, they have to go
20 through the entire process just as they would any time.

21 MR. MAGGUILLI: That's what I mean by saying
22 that's the question for another day.

23 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: I think just to be clear,
24 it's great space because it's not developed but a
25 private owner owns that so it's land that is there. I

1 don't want people to mix it up that it's open space -
2 the Town's open space or anything like that. This is
3 privately owned.

4 Nobody seems to have any language to change
5 it.

6 MR. GREEN: I would like some more time to
7 think about it. I've already made a motion to table it.

8 MS. GANSLE: We do have a motion on the table.

9 MS. WHALEN: I second that motion.

10 MS. GANSLE: All in favor?

11 MS. MURPHY: It doesn't hurt to reword it so
12 that it's more understandable and clear to people.

13 MR. CAREY: I am in favor of tabling it. I
14 don't think it's a rush. We've already got the
15 Resolution mixed up to begin with, but I think we could
16 just tighten the language up a little bit. I don't think
17 it's a rush. I would vote to table it.

18 MS. JEFFERS-VONDOLLEN: I feel the same way as
19 everybody else who has spoken. I'm fine with tabling it
20 as long as there is no harm done to anyone on either
21 side.

22 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: There's no rush for
23 anything. To my knowledge, there's nothing other than
24 they did and complete the project. They had no
25 intention, I guess, at this point. So, there is no rush.

1 MR. MAGGUILLI: I have no position one way or
2 the other.

3 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: I don't really have a
4 position either way. If everybody wants to wait and
5 table it - - just come up with the language that
6 everyone is clear on. The amendment from - I think it
7 was 314 to 333. It was done upstairs. So, we are clear
8 on that.

9 MR. MAGGUILLI: They are already mad at me
10 anyway. They think I've been dragging my feet on this
11 since September. So, any more time - they can't get any
12 more angry and when to do.

13 MS. WHALEN: They're not even here. So, is
14 anyone here from this Shelco? Are the representatives
15 even here to discuss this with us? I don't think so.
16 This isn't going to hurt anything - just so we can make
17 sure that it's not another Forts Ferry confusion
18 disaster.

19 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: If I can make a suggestion
20 so it doesn't get more confusing. It seems very simple,
21 but it's apparently not clear.

22 David, if we could have you take at the
23 language and Mike?

24 MR. GREEN: Yes. I'll come in. Is Mike here
25 tomorrow?

1 MR. MAGGUILLI: I'm not sure.

2 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Take a look at the language
3 together and come to a consensus as to whatever you can
4 add to make it more clear and then we can bring it back.
5 How does that sound?

6 MR. GREEN: Good.

7 MR. MAGGUILLI: When we adjourn it to the next
8 meeting?

9 MR. CAREY: Do we have to continue with the
10 vote?

11 MS. GANSLE: So, David moved and Jennifer had
12 seconded in terms of tabling to the next Town Board
13 meeting which will be Thursday, December 5.

14 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: All in favor?
15 (Ayes were recited.)

16 MS. GANSLE: Any opposed?

17 (There were none opposed.)

18 The Resolution is adjourned.

19 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: It will be tabled until
20 December 5.

21 If I can just say one more thing for the
22 record so this doesn't come back in any way and gets
23 confused.

24 Going back to - Jennifer had the question
25 about Forts Ferry Road. There was no Resolution. There

1 was no Local Law. That was the problem. That was why -
2 at the time the Supreme Court - that's why we lost the
3 case when we went to fight for the residents. There
4 was no Local Law. The fact is that there was
5 discussion of the buffer I believe at meetings, but it
6 was never followed through on with the Town Attorney's
7 office or the Supervisor's approval at that time.

8 Just so we are all clear on that in the
9 record is clear. There was no Resolution and there was
10 no Local Law.

11 MS. WHALEN: While it's different, I can see
12 why Mike is wanting to make this all very concise. It's
13 a good idea. We just have to fix it a bit, so it's clear
14 for the future.

15 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: It's very difficult to go
16 back and try to find things from years ago and there's
17 no paperwork. It's like looking for a needle in a
18 haystack. It's just very difficult.

19 I thank you for thinking of doing that. *Any
20 other public comment?

21 Gloria, you've been patient.

22 MS. KNORR: My heart is broken because two
23 people on the Town Board - Paul Rosano and Chris Carey,
24 a Democrat and a Republican who worked very hard and I
25 know because I have attended many of these meetings. I

1 know how hard they worked. They voted for the residents
2 and the citizens of Colonie. They put us first and not
3 party. Citizens are so tired of this division. This has
4 not happened when I came here. You're voting and you're
5 working together.

6 My daughter thinks I'm ready for assisted
7 living. She is a lawyer. My son would like me to come
8 maybe to Baptist Nursing Home.

9 I want to stay where I'm living, but I have
10 neglected where I'm living. I'm paying taxes at 7
11 Saybrook Drive and 230 Old Niskayuna Road.

12 I have wanted to help veterans. I want to
13 help - I want it to be rental. We need workforce
14 housing. I want housing vouchers, so that people have
15 a chance.

16 This is a great Town. Why is it a great Town?
17 The citizens and residents have worked hard. From
18 Paul's family, my family and even to get Shaker High
19 School built - I'm glad to see Shaker students here. I
20 was in the first graduating class in 1959. Do you know
21 how hard it was for our families to get Shaker built?

22 My house is in West Albany but my mother
23 worked for North Colonie, so I went to Shaker.

24 Paula, the saving thing for me - during the
25 debate - hands down. I was there in front of you to

1 give you support with Tim's picture. All of you on the
2 Board - Tim's picture, rosary beads around it because
3 I am an emotional person. I know how terrible dirty
4 this campaign was.

5 Paula, you are going to carry on and I want
6 to say since Charlene Robbins got the award, I never
7 knew you went to Schenectady city schools. I never
8 knew until then. What I said to you before the debate
9 - Schenectady strong.

10 What I'm going to be working on - I'm going
11 to read this book. You listen to many of my poems. The
12 one poem I have - I love Walt Whitman and he wrote in
13 my heart, all my soldiers, my veterans, my heart gives
14 you love.

15 So now I am going to be working - - I belong
16 to the American Legion which Sarah's husband is our
17 commander of the American Legion 1610. I happen to be
18 at China Beach where he was awarded to be the veteran
19 of the year. I love his history, although I never
20 liked history because I didn't want to learn about
21 wars. I never wanted to know what Industrial
22 Revolution wars. Now, I love what he writes.

23 MR. MAGGUILLI: Gloria, the other speaker went
24 over a bit from the three minutes, but if we could just
25 keep it down to a minute more. Thank you. I'm sorry.

1 MS. KNORR: So, this book is - it shouldn't be
2 this hard to serve your country. This is a physician and
3 not a veteran was the ninth secretary of Veterans
4 Affairs. On a tweet, he was let go. This is a position
5 who is working hard for preventing 22 suicides a day.
6 Now, they say it might be down to 20.

7 I will do everything with my Legislators for
8 working for American Legion because the American
9 Legion - one of their missions was to prevent
10 homelessness with veterans. I am going to do this and
11 Paula you have no idea - - it took so long. The agony
12 for me from the fifth - - that was a hard day until
13 the 19th. Thank you.

14 Thank you, Paul. Thank you, Chris.

15 Chris, I would like a recommendation from you
16 to go visit veterans in the jail. If I need a
17 recommendation -

18 MR. CAREY: Yes, I will give you
19 recommendation.

20 MS. KNORR: Paul, your advice to me to get a
21 lawyer -

22 MR. ROSANO: Competent lawyer. There's a lot of
23 lawyers out there, Gloria. You need to get a competent
24 one.

25 MS. KNORR: I called my lawyer today and he

1 does work in Colonie.

2 MR. MAGGILLI: Gloria, we have to move the
3 meeting along a little bit.

4 MR. ROSANO: We'll talk on the way home.

5 MS. KNORR: Yes, Paul. Thank you.

6 SUPERVISOR MAHAN: Gloria, I do want to say
7 thank you very much for recognizing what went on. Thank
8 you also for all your kind words. We have two great Town
9 Board Members. Thank you for being so respectful. It's
10 very much appreciated. Thank you.

11 Anyone else?

12 (There was no response.)

13 All right.

14 (Whereas the above entitled proceeding was
15 concluded at 7:40 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 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