
Commission Meeting

of

NEW JERSEY COMMISSION ON CAPITAL BUDGETING AND PLANNING

LOCATION: Committee Room 16
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: September 17, 2010
10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

B. Carol Molnar, Chair
Anthony F. Annese, Vice Chair
Senator Steven V. Oroho
Assemblyman David W. Wolfe
Beth Schermerhorn
Steven M. Sutkin



ALSO PRESENT:

James Vari
Executive Director

Meeting Recorded and Transcribed by
The Office of Legislative Services, Public Information Office,
Hearing Unit, State House Annex, PO 068, Trenton, New Jersey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Alfred Murray Assistant Secretary New Jersey Department of Agriculture	3
Carl P. Schulze Jr. Director Division of Plant Industry New Jersey Department of Agriculture	11
Michael Weiss President WorkingBuildings, LLC.	14
Nancy Halpern, DVM State Veterinarian, and Director Division of Animal Health New Jersey Department of Agriculture	16
Eric Anderson Chief Financial Officer Division of Administration New Jersey Department of State	23
Rosanne Fairbanks Director Administration Juvenile Justice Commission Office of the Attorney General New Jersey Department of Law and Public Safety	30
David Eschert Representing Juvenile Justice Commission Office of the Attorney General New Jersey Department of Law and Public Safety	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX

	<u>Page</u>
Testimony submitted by Rosanne Fairbanks	1x
rs: 1-41	

B. CAROL MOLNAR (Chair): I'd like to call the meeting to order.

In accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law, the Commission has provided adequate notice of this meeting by giving written notice of the time, date and location. The notice of the meeting has been filed at least 48 hours in advance by mail and/or fax to the Trenton *Times* and the *Star-Ledger*, and filed with the Office of the Secretary of State.

We will now take a roll call.

MR. VARI (Executive Director): Senator Sarlo. (no response)

Senator Oroho.

SENATOR OROHO: Here.

MR. VARI: Assemblywoman Pou. (no response)

Assemblyman Wolfe.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Here.

MR. VARI: Mr. Sutkin.

MR. SUTKIN: Here.

MR. VARI: Mr. Stridick. (no response)

Ms. Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Here.

MR. VARI: Ms. Cimiluca. (no response)

Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Here.

MR. VARI: Ms. Molnar.

MS. MOLNAR: Here.

MR. VARI: Madam Chair, you have six members present.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay. Since we do not have a quorum, we will have to postpone items four, five, and six until the next meeting.

And we do have an Executive Director's Report.

MR. VARI: Thank you, and good morning, everyone.

First, I'd like to provide a brief review of the Commission on Capital Budgeting and Planning's Recommendations and the Appropriations Act for Fiscal 2011.

The Commission recommended \$1.192 billion for capital construction, of which \$1.087 billion was for programs funded by dedicated revenue. The balance of \$105 million was for discretionary capital funding; and of that amount, \$78 million was for the Building Authority, leaving only \$27 million for capital construction projects from the State departments.

The Appropriations Act totaled nearly \$1.122 billion, of which \$1.079 billion was for dedicated funding. Of the \$42.5 million in discretionary funds, \$10 million was for energy efficiency projects; \$6.5 million was for HR6 funding, which is the State match to Federal funding; and \$26 million was for the Building Authority.

We do have appropriations language to fund roof replacements at \$5 million, and those revenues are derived from the sale of real property. Tom and I have spent this summer looking at, reviewing, and visiting a number of facilities with roofs with the most emergent needs, and we'll be making our recommendations on that funding.

Just a point of order. Military and Veterans Affairs -- I know they were originally on our list for today. They called us Monday to inform

us that the Adjutant General is going to be out of the country and asked that we postpone their presentation, which we did, until November 19.

Finally, in the OMB analysis that we sent to the departments prior to each meeting, we include discussion points for certain projects. In the past, we would just use that to sort of generate a discussion here at the meeting. We're asking each department to submit written responses to those questions now. And what you can do is just forward them to me by e-mail. I think that's going to help us just keep track of -- help us during our decision-making process.

Madam Chair, that concludes my report.

MS. MOLNAR: Any questions for the Executive Director? (no response)

If not, we'll start with our capital request presentations. I'd like to welcome the Department of Agriculture, Alfred Murray, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

A S S I S T A N T S E C R E T A R Y A L F R E D M U R R A Y :
Good morning.

MS. MOLNAR: Good morning.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: I'm substituting for Secretary Fisher today, who is out of the state. So it's a pleasure to be here.

Before I begin, I just want to introduce the Agriculture staff who is here today, who can help assist in any questions. We have Tom Dorsey, from the Insect Laboratory, our Chief; Director of Plant Industry, Carl Schulze; behind me, Dr. Nancy Halpern, the State Veterinarian and also the Director of Animal Health; Charlie Toleno -- I've only worked with

him 27 years -- from our Budgeting Office; and Lou Bruni, our Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Agriculture.

MR. VARI: Turn on your microphone, please.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: Okay.

Good morning, Chairwoman Molnar and members of the Commission on Capital Budgeting and Planning. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of Agriculture's capital budget request for Fiscal Year 2012.

Our Department works with all segments of the Garden State's agriculture and related industries, a very large and important sector of our State's economy. It is also a part of our economy that we must remain vigilant against pests and diseases that can impact crops, livestock, and other animals, and ultimately New Jersey's residents and our ability to compete in a regional, national, global economy.

I also forgot to introduce Michael Weiss from managing -- building. He's the consultant with the State who is overseeing the Laboratory construction project -- WorkingBuildings company, for the record.

I'm sorry, Michael.

Once again, this year we are focusing our capital requests on the facilities and equipment the Department needs to protect New Jersey against pests and diseases that harm animals and compromise the food system and our natural resources. We are submitting requests for capital funding that are related to health and safety issues.

Our first request of \$3.5 million for Fiscal Year 2012 is for major renovations and upgrades at the Phillip Alampi Beneficial Insect

Laboratory, which we call PABIL, which is part of our Division of Plant Industry. PABIL is a 27-year-old building that requires a controlled environment in which to mass-produce beneficial insects like the Mexican bean beetle, used throughout this state and the northeastern United States to control many different species of pests and weeds.

While the building itself is structurally sound, serious control problems and inefficiencies in the HVAC system have severely impacted insect-rearing capabilities. Uncontrollable humidity in some rooms has created indoor rain events leading to slippery floors, mold, and hazardous work conditions for our employees. Ceilings in some rearing labs have collapsed due to water damage. Diffuser vents have completely rusted and the main piping in the utility penthouse is rusting through.

An engineering study requested by the Department of the Treasury in 2006 recommended demolition and removal of the penthouse heat exchangers, main supply and return fans, all heating and cooling coils, and humidifier units. The report also called for installation of new HVAC equipment, ductwork, and piping installation of a building automation system, and upgrading the electrical system to meet current codes.

Nearly five years later, these improvements have yet to be undertaken. We understand the incredibly tough economic times that have resulted in putting off these upgrades. But we also know they will, in the long run, help cut State costs. Taken together, these upgrades would add at least 25 more years to the useful life of this building.

The work at PABIL is critical to preventing pests and diseases from damaging native vegetation and agricultural crops, while also greatly reducing the amount of pesticides used by farmers and nurserymen, and the

environmental and economic costs associated with these pesticides. In recent years, PABIL's programs eliminated the need for the private and public sectors to apply as much as \$101 million worth of pesticides and herbicides annually.

As one of only three such laboratories in the nation, PABIL supplies beneficial insects throughout the Northeast. The rearing of insects for sales to other states also helps bring another \$350,000 to \$500,000 annually, helping PABIL to be partially self-sufficient.

Our second request is for \$3 million for a tissue digester at the Public Health, Environmental, and Agricultural Laboratory. This was part of the original design of the Agricultural Laboratory but was deleted due to budgetary constraints. When Secretary Fisher took office, he reviewed that issue and determined that the digester is essential to the effective and efficient operations of the Department of Agriculture, Division of Animal Health diagnostic laboratory.

Tissue digestion is one of the most cost-effective and, most importantly, medically secure methods of carcass disposal. Utilizing a rendering service costs about \$825 per average-sized animal, which we're estimating to be 1,500 pounds, where as a digester can accomplish the same task for \$150 per same-sized animal. Most importantly, an infected animal does not have to be moved from the lab premises when employing a digester versus contracting with a renderer, which of course increases the risk of disease spread.

Inclusion of the digester would also increase the Department's ability to offer necropsy services -- and some other data we have on that -- resulting in \$35,000 in fees. But I should also point out that given that

incineration is increasingly becoming scarce for us to use because they're going to be eliminating that, as well as landfills that are going to stop accepting carcasses-- There are only two digesters that we're aware of in the area: one at Cornell and one at Tennessee. So we think that these fees coming to the State could increase even upwards past \$350,000.

In conjunction with the digester, the Department is seeking \$240,000 for areas at the Agricultural Laboratory to store sick animals awaiting diagnosis and dead animals awaiting necropsy, including equipment to properly move the animals and address biosecurity.

Routine Federal animal diagnostic testing protocols require these areas in order for the lab to meet its accreditation requirements. These elements were in the original design for the Agricultural Laboratory but also were eliminated due to funding restrictions. Again, Secretary Fisher's review of the project determined that they should be restored.

Also related to the Agricultural Laboratory, the Department seeks \$51,000 for infrastructure improvements at the new lab that are needed to incorporate a mobile laboratory that currently is temporarily housed at the United States Department of Agriculture's APHIS Veterinary Services offices in Robbinsville. The infrastructure upgrade would allow the mobile lab to be incorporated into the main lab for daily use, while still keeping it available to be mobilized in any response to any mission or emergency that requires it.

The Department further seeks \$61,000 for equipping of a greenhouse at the Agricultural Laboratory. Since the existing greenhouse at the Health and Agriculture building is currently unused, the equipment in that area has grown to disrepair over the years and is unsalvageable. The

construction of a new greenhouse at the Ag Lab was added to the existing construction of the Agriculture facility. The greenhouse will serve numerous purposes, including a facility for addressing plant diseases, for isolating and identifying soil-borne fungi nematodes, and for propagating plant material for use at the Alampi Insect Laboratory.

In all, our Department's capital budget requests total \$6.582 million, all of which centers on projects designed to ensure the health of animals and plants, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that public health and welfare are secured.

And finally, while not part of our individual capital request, I would like to note our unequivocal support for the joint request made by the Department of Health and Senior Services and the New Jersey Department of Agriculture for renovations to our current main office building at John Fitch Plaza, here in Trenton. Renovations requested include an upgrade to CAT wiring, caulking of windows, and new carpeting in certain areas where carpet has not been replaced in more than 30 years. We believe these renovations can result in many more years of usefulness to that facility.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the Fiscal Year 2012 capital budget requests. We'd be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Any questions or comments?

Senator.

SENATOR OROHO: First of all, thank you very much for the analysis. With the priority numbering here -- the one through five -- is that

the Department's-- Does it really mean that the first priority is the Laboratory, and then the next one is -- it would be the health lab, and then the tissue digester? It goes in that order?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: We were asked to put it in a priority format.

SENATOR OROHO: Right.

SECRETARY MURRAY: Quite frankly, they're all so close that any one of them could have been number one, number two, or number three. But resulting to (*sic*) the format that was provided to us, that's how we listed them.

SENATOR OROHO: I'm going to ask this question of every department, whether they-- What is the process that you go through to look at -- in a priority sense -- what is the most important? Because one thing I noticed, and it's of most of the departments -- that when I look at the operating impact, a lot of times it will say, "none." And the first thing -- and I'm reading the commentary -- you can see that there is some operating impacts on that. But my first question is: If there's no operating impact, why would we-- And I know there are some safety issues and whatnot. But if there's no operating impact, why would we do it? And if there's a -- and I see particularly on the Lab where we see there's a significant reduction in the use and cost of pesticides. So in some respects, there's a payback. And when the operating impacts -- if we put in there, say, "Okay, we have a payback on this, and it's going to save costs over *X* number of years," or whatever-- I think in some of that analysis it is important. And I just--

My general question is: How do-- What did the Department use for their determination of the prioritization?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: I know our key thing with this is certainly the health, welfare, and safety of the citizens of the state-- All the services that we provide, that we offer-- As you said, \$101 million -- that translates to about 60 million pounds -- 60,000 pounds of pesticides that aren't going into our environment because of being able to provide these services.

For the operating impact, I'll ask Carl Schulze, the Director of Plant Industry, if he has any comments he'd like to add to that particular part. But the short answer is: We were looking at the health, safety, and welfare. And given these economic times, we realize we're trying to do our mission the best we can in terms of how we can best protect the citizens of the state.

SENATOR OROHO: Because I just-- Just as a general comment for all the departments: Sometimes when somebody is reviewing something, and you see that there's a payback and there's-- Obviously, there are estimates made as to what kind of payback period there would be, and cost savings, or whatnot. And you will take a look and see that if it's a payback of three years -- where we talk about the extension and the useful life of the building to 25 years -- that's measurable. That's certainly understandable. And with the cost of new construction, obviously extending the life of a building -- or use of 25 years -- is important.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: Sure. And as I think we stated, and as I think we estimated, another 27 years -- or 25 years it is.

SENATOR OROHO: Twenty-five, yes.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: We've put this request in for a number of years, because the situation just-- That building is deteriorating as the years progress.

And, Carl, I don't know if you have anything you want to add to that.

CARL P. SCHULZE JR.: Thank you for your comments and your picking up on that key point. We'll sharpen our pens and pencils next time around.

The Division of Property Management has also made some substantial energy investments in that building by replacing the boilers and the heating system with much more energy-efficient boilers. They expect a payback on that in three years. So, again, it's the HVAC system that's the limiting factor. And it's actually bringing a number of our insect-rearing rooms out of -- off-line, so we can't use them.

As we have opportunity to apply for additional Federal cooperative moneys to bring new projects on, we find that we're facility-limited. So that's sort of hard to quantify, because it's missed opportunities as well. But certainly we will try and come up with some good numbers to defend that in the future.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Any other questions or comments?

Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Yes. I'd like to thank you also. This is a rather complicated process that we're talking about. And I'm not really familiar with all of the work you do. But I have some questions specifically--

Your first priority is \$500,000 more than your previous request for the same issue. What is the reason for the additional cost? Actually, it's \$600,000 more.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: We've noted that too.

MR. SCHULZE: I looked at that, and I believe that we requested \$3.5 million for the last couple of years. I think the 2.9 figure goes a number of years back, when we looked at the original consultant's report. Then when we worked with Treasury, they said that we neglected to use the -- to add in the management costs and some of the other materials that they traditionally put in their building things. So we brought our line up to the same number that Treasury had.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay. Very good.

Now, in your description of the Alampi Insect Rearing Lab you indicate indoor rain events causing slippery floors, mold, hazardous work conditions, etc. Are those affecting the health and safety of the employees who work there?

MR. SCHULZE: Yes. When we're raising these insects, sometimes you have fairly tight environmental conditions. Some of them require high humidity. And when these antiquated pneumatic controls go out of whack, you wind up with 100 percent humidity in that room, and it literally starts to rain. And we've got some-- We've got photos that show the appalling conditions in those rooms -- that we just close them, so we don't use those rooms anymore.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: You close them because they're--

MR. SCHULZE: Because of the safety concern, and they're not reliable.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: So it's not a health concern, it's a safety concern?

MR. SCHULZE: Well, it's a health concern when it's still breeding mold in that building that travels through the duct work. So it's--

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: All right. Thank you.

I have a really -- you may think it's a silly question, but what goes into the tissue digester? What kind of animals are we talking about? Any animal: cows, pigs?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: Cows, pigs, whatever they're working on at that particular time. I know there's an opportunity -- they can put deer in there, any kind of road pickup or anything like that. It actually takes the animal and liquefies it into an environmentally--

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay. It's very interesting.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: I think the mob invented it. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: I just have two more quick questions. Could any of these projects be offset by Federal funding? Are there Federal moneys available for these requests that you have?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: I know we remain vigilant all the time for any kind of Federal opportunities that come up. And I know a vast majority of our Department is funded through Federal grants, and cooperative agreements, and such.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: And I'm not aware of any at this time. Dr. Halpern might add to that.

And I know Mr. Weiss wanted to mention something about the digester.

Did you want to just touch on it?

M I C H A E L W E I S S: Yes. I just wanted to, first, set the record straight. You did say something in your opening, and I just want to correct it. It was the University of Pennsylvania, not the University of Tennessee -- just for the record -- on the location.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: Okay.

MR. WEISS: The tissue digester, however, is a very important aspect of the facility, in that the Laboratory has to ensure that all resources that come into the facility go out cleaner than they came in to protect the community. This facility-- That means that water entering the facility, samples entering the facility have to be decontaminated before they're released back into the environment.

This facility will house something called *select agents*, and we'll be testing. Part of a Federal oversight group will be monitoring this facility to ensure compliance. The State of New Jersey is licensed to work with several select agents. They're in order -- certain agents can only be worked with at Plum Island and the U.S.D.A. facility in Iowa. The next level down is another group of agents. And then New Jersey falls in the next categories. And there are two categories below you. You're licensed to work with these agents.

Saying that, you have to comply with Federal mandates of licensing. The facility then has to ensure that whatever is released into the environment is clean. There are several ways to do that. One way is to process those materials. And the facility has a liquid effluent

decontamination system for waste generated in the laboratories and the sinks. But it doesn't have a carcass decontamination process. The carcass decontamination process currently -- without a digester -- you would have to employ either a renderer-- If the animal is known to be infected with a disease, potentially the renderer would not accept it, and then it would have to be transported to a U.S.D.A. facility. Or you dispose of the animal in landfills, or you dispose of the animal in incineration. Incinerations are being closed across the country because of the high cost of maintaining, the fuel costs, and the air-quality issues.

So what we're trying to say here is that the tissue digester is one means which not only will resolve the issue of disposal, but is becoming a very large revenue-generation process. And many states -- and that's where Tennessee is coming in, and Cornell -- are now using these digesters as revenue-generation. Because what has happened -- especially in our agricultural communities -- there are very few centers left that can deal with large animals. There are very few vets, there are very few animal-receiving facilities and diagnostic laboratories. The State now has one. It has one that can deal with animals it's never dealt with before.

So farmers in the local area, from New Jersey all the way up, now have a new means to dispose of infected or dead animals which will be less costly to them, if they can get the animal to your site and you can dispose of it, than sending it to the local landfill or paying \$1,500 to dispose of an animal in an incinerator. So you now have an opportunity to generate revenue, which I think is a very important aspect of why a tissue digester should be a high priority for the State. On top of which, it will reduce the cost of the decontamination and rendering fees that you now

have to pay an outside source for the life of the facility. So these are long-term lifecycle costs that we're talking about.

NANCY HALPERN, DVM: If I could just add, in response to your question about Federal funding, one of the components that we're requesting -- the \$240,000 piece -- is required to permit us to continue accreditation, which allows us to get Federal cooperative agreements that greatly supplement our current funding. So that would be eliminated without this remedy.

And in terms of the digester: In addition to what Mr. Weiss just explained, we would be able to increase our presence on the national laboratory network field by, for example, testing for mad cow disease. You've heard about the same disease in deer, of which we have very many deer in the state. We don't have the disease, but we could start testing if we could dispose of it properly. And so we would generate even more funds from the Federal government.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Senator.

SENATOR OROHO: On topic of the tissue digester: Are there-- In the private industry, are there actual laboratories that do this as a business?

MR. WEISS: Typically not as a business. However, all the agricultural vaccine manufacturers and pharma -- anyone who is developing vaccines for infectious disease and has animal models have to have the decontamination process. What has happened -- which has been, I think, a very good thing for the State of New Jersey in some aspects -- is that the pharmaceutical companies are removing animal testing from their facilities,

and they're sending that out to locations across the country now. Because, for public record, testing on animals is not something they want to be associated with. It has to go on, especially in diagnostic facilities, to protect the animal populations. Therefore, you have a very strong likelihood that the pharma that is still in New Jersey can also use this facility, because they are not building any more digesters. But I do have a list of digesters that pharma has.

SENATOR OROHO: So the digester is used for animals that have been tested or research has been done on them?

MR. WEISS: Not necessarily. It will be used for all the animals. You have to dispose of any carcass in one form or fashion. What the digester gives you the ability to do, cost-effectively, is not only dispose of noninfected species of animals, but it also allows you to dispose of animals infected with select or exotic disease agents, which you don't have the capability to do now. It's a win-win.

SENATOR OROHO: It's a silly question, but what happens with all the -- you talked about the deer -- all the deer carcasses along the roads and stuff like this?

DR. HALPERN: Well, currently, DOT is not doing anything about the deer. They eliminated that program some years ago. So each municipality-- It's my understanding that each municipality--

SENATOR OROHO: Each county has their own--

DR. HALPERN: --or county is responsible. So, I mean, that's an excellent example of where we could generate more fees for the State, by providing a very needed service for all of the towns in the state by allowing them to bring those deer in, and we would dispose of them.

SENATOR OROHO: From that point, there are a lot of counties-- I came from a county -- Sussex County that actually had a significantly cheaper price than what was being charged by the State because of -- I think it was, at the time, \$90 per carcass, and we got it for, like, \$45 a carcass, or something like this. But does each one of those carcasses have to be put in through a tissue digester?

DR. HALPERN: It's the most efficient.

SENATOR OROHO: So it's not the only way.

DR. HALPERN: Well, there are very few incinerators in the state that -- none that can accommodate the number of deer we have that are road kill, none.

As Mr. Weiss stated, we do currently permit those carcasses to go to landfills. But they're, again, governed by each landfill. And that is going to go away rapidly. We simply don't have enough room. So this is a problem where we're presenting a remedy before you even know that you have a problem. And we can generate money. I mean, it's a win-win-win.

MR. WEISS: What we have found in other states that we've looked at digesters-- The cost of digesting an animal is basically based per pound or per ton. That's how you price it.

What we have seen in other states -- and I will refer to Tennessee on this one, because they're very aggressive in expanding their capability. They charge-- It costs approximately -- utility and operationally -- about \$0.03 a pound, not including labor -- but \$0.03 a pound to process in a digester. The state of Tennessee, right now, is charging approximately \$0.10 a pound to the public entities -- so DOT or the state Department of Agriculture -- to process their waste. To private -- to farmers and companies

who would want to use that service -- they're charging anywhere from \$0.25 to \$0.50 a pound.

SENATOR OROHO: So on the digester-- I understand the price-per-pound. On the digester here -- when you're all finished -- digested or whatever -- is there a waste product that you now have to get rid of?

MR. WEISS: Yes. It is a noncontaminated waste. It's sterile.

SENATOR OROHO: I understand. But what about weight?

MR. WEISS: It's liquid. You can actually release it to the municipality's water treatment. And certain-- It's nothing more than is in your streams right now. As a matter of fact, it's cleaner than what's in your streams.

The other thing that many institutions are doing -- and I have-- The University of Georgia is one great example.

SENATOR OROHO: I just stopped drinking my cup of coffee.
(laughter)

MR. WEISS: They use it as fertilizer. It is a wonderful fertilizer which you can sell. So many universities have stopped purchasing fertilizers for their properties and used the waste coming out of the digester. And there are numerous articles and publications of this.

SENATOR OROHO: So there's a byproduct use.

MR. WEISS: Yes.

SENATOR OROHO: Interesting.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: It's interesting what you learn.
(laughter)

Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: I'd just like to get back to a statement you made earlier, Mr. Secretary, about selling some of the beneficial insects to other states. Could you tell me if your Department is aggressively marketing those insects: advertising and things like that?

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: I think we use them first for our own purposes in New Jersey. And then any excess that are available are the ones that we put out for sale.

Mr. Schulze is here to further answer that, but I believe that's the way we handle it at this point.

MR. SCHULZE: First and foremost, I just want to say that we're not in a commercial mode. We're not trying to compete with any commercial insectaries.

What we are in this facility is, in the truest sense of the word, an *incubator* facility, where we work with products that have come out of the research community -- largely products that have been -- that are funded either by the U.S. Forest Service, or the U.S.D.A. Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, or the Agricultural Research Service. And we'll start off with maybe a dozen or a hundred individuals, and we'll rear up enough to do field trials to see if these things have any promise. If they show some real beneficial activity in controlling the insect or weed that we're working on, then we'll try, with our Federal partners, to find a private laboratory that likes to take that on and do the technology transfer. We've done that with the University of Tennessee and a few other places. If there is not a real good commercial market for the things that we do, but there's a lot of

environmental benefit, then we'll continue to rear them as long as we're getting support.

Anything above what we produce to meet our commitments under our grants and cooperative agreements -- those are the things that we sell to the public. So there are a couple of other programs that we don't have Federal support for, but that industry has not chosen to step up and take on -- like the Mexican bean beetle program, where we do get support from check-off moneys and different things like that.

But we're not a commercial facility. And what we're selling are things that we rear over and above our commitments for our funders, whether it's DEP, whether it's the Federal government, and what have you. But we do advertise that product, and we send scale to an increasing number of organic farmers -- some of these predators, rather, to an increasing number of organic farmers across the country. But, again, we're trying very hard to not compete with the private sector on this, because of the fact that we would be viewed as either State-subsidized or Federally subsidized. So I just want to try to explain that we're an incubator facility rather than a commercial laboratory, if that helps you.

MR. ANNESE: All right. Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Mr. Vari.

MR. VARI: In terms of the Beneficial Insect Lab, is that building's roof in decent shape or would it need to be replaced? And if so, what would be the approximate cost?

MR. SCHULZE: I would have to defer to the Division of Property Management on that. I'm not sure.

MR. VARI: All right.

MR. SCHULZE: I know that it was on their list, but I don't know where--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: It's the original roof.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: It's the original roof, we've been told.

MR. VARI: It's the original roof, so it's at the end of its lifecycle.

And have you been in contact with the Office of Energy Efficiency in terms of-- They can sometimes help you figure out what the operating impact would be and the savings, if there are any. Have they commented on this project?

MR. SCHULZE: I don't know that they have. I know that in the past we've worked pretty close with John Geniesse, and I think that--

MR. VARI: John Rhodes? (phonetic spelling)

MR. SCHULZE: John Geniesse, in DPMC. We worked very closely with them on opportunities for the Beneficial Insect Laboratory, but we haven't reached out directly.

MR. VARI: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Can I send some Canadian geese to this tissue digester? (laughter)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: You might have to get in line. (laughter)

MS. MOLNAR: Any other questions or comments? (no response)

If not, I want to thank you for your presentation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY MURRAY: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Our next department is the Department of State. I'd like to welcome Eric Anderson, Chief Financial Officer.

ERIC ANDERSON: Good morning.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Good morning.

MR. ANDERSON: With me today is Eric Carlsson, in charge of our Department's budget.

Good morning, Madam Chairwoman and members of the Capital Planning Commission.

MS. MOLNAR: Could you turn your speaker on? (referring to PA microphone)

MR. ANDERSON: I'll start over.

Good morning, Madam Chairwoman and members of the Capital Planning Commission.

On behalf of the Secretary of State, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to be here today and for the privilege of presenting the Department of State's capital budget request for Fiscal Year 2012.

The Department's request is a total of \$285,000 to fund essential upgrades to the Museum Auditorium: \$200,000 for the replacement of the faulty lighting system and failing electrical panel, and \$85,000 for the replacement of the main stage curtain and wooden partition.

Although the Department of State fully understands the difficult budgetary times, we are working in and committed to achieving the fiscal priorities of our great state. I would like you-- I hope you will agree that these projects represent safety needs that must be addressed.

Since the reopening of the State Museum's main building, the need for an updated electrical panel and lighting system for the Auditorium has become more evident than ever before. The electrical panel, wiring, and lighting system in the New Jersey State Museum Auditorium are all original, dating back to the actual completion of the building 45 years ago. Extremely outdated, unreliable, and potentially dangerous, the system continually overloads, overheats, causes electrical shorts, and has to be closely monitored. As such, the Department of State is requesting \$200,000 for the renovation and replacement of the State Museum Auditorium's electrical panels, wiring, and lighting.

Every year, the Auditorium supports multiple events, programs for school children, film screenings, various teacher workshops, and annual festivals. As school districts, local communities, and even major corporations are all looking to do more with less, public demand for the programs the Auditorium offers have increased over the past few years; all relying on operational functionality of the Auditorium's electrical panel and lighting system.

Utilizing this outdated electrical system to meet the needs of today's Auditorium programs has uncovered and exposed a technology gap so significant that it inhibits program operations and causes safety concerns for its operators. Quite simply, the current electrical panel and wiring cannot adequately shoulder the demands of this exponentially expanding schedule.

The electrical panel continually overheats; the electrical system constantly overloads; microphones shut off during use; and, when functioning, the outdated electrical system only allows for a maximum 20

percent utilization of the entire lighting system, leaving 80 percent of the system turned off or else running the risk of overload. In addition, many elements of the control panel are inoperable, with a good number of the lighting fixtures and controls broken beyond repair.

In conjunction with the faulty lighting system and failing electrical panel, the Department of State would like to request \$85,000 for the replacement of the malfunctioning front stage curtain and wooden mid-stage partition in the State Museum Auditorium. The faulty tracking system and damaged wooden partition not only pose significant constraints to the Museum's ability to offer programs and events, but it represents a potential health and safety hazard to staff as well.

When operating the front stage curtain, the cable continually disconnects from the motorized pulley system and often locks into place. This causes the motor to continue turning without stopping -- oftentimes smoking -- and thus becoming a potential fire hazard and possible life-safety hazard. In addition to the malfunctioning front stage curtain, the wooden mid-stage partition does not close, is not connected to the tracking system, and has been damaged in multiple locations.

The current front stage curtain and mid-stage wooden partition pose significant constraints on the Museum's ability to offer programs and events that would otherwise be ideal for this venue. Without the use of a functioning front stage curtain and wooden partition, the Museum is unable to offer quality programs that require a fully functional stage.

Completing this project would provide a code-compliant electrical system that would upgrade the current lighting/wiring system; and provide a new, operable, front stage curtain/mid-stage partition that meets

the needs of the programs, maximizing the Museum's ability to generate rental income. Most importantly though, funding this project would eliminate any health and safety concerns associated with this faulty equipment, and enhance the Museum's ability to offer a great variety of Museum-sponsored programs, events, and rentals.

Again, I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to discuss the Department of State's request here with you today. I hope you will be in agreement that the safety needs of the State Museum Auditorium are paramount and thus should qualify for funding under Treasury's FY'12 capital budget.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I welcome any questions at this time.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Any questions or comments?

Beth Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: I just wanted to get into a little bit about the use of the Auditorium. How many days is the Auditorium in use -- week, year?

MR. ANDERSON: We'd have to get back to you with the actual usage. It's open throughout the year for any schools or any private or public -- anyone who wants to rent it. But for the actual time period -- actual days, I'd have to get back to you.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: You do rent it?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, we do rent it.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Does everybody pay something who uses it?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, unless it's an agreement between another State agency. But generally -- even other State agencies -- we charge.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Do you have examples of groups you've had to turn away, or is it mostly they don't even ask?

MR. ANDERSON: I can get you examples. But we do turn away other agencies that want to rent it due to the -- mostly due to the lighting.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Lastly, do you have a marketing campaign, or do you plan one, so you would get what you needed?

MR. ANDERSON: We do have a marketing campaign. We advertise on the web and also in print.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Good. Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Senator.

SENATOR OROHO: I'm going to make a bit of the same comment as before. In the analysis, it says, "Operating impact: none." I was listening to Beth's comments about-- Because my questions would have also focused on: Does the Auditorium make money? And I understand there's the rental -- that everybody pays something or there's some agreement. So there is an operating impact.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, there is.

SENATOR OROHO: (indiscernible) the opportunity, I would suggest we go back and look at: What really is the operating impact of not being able to rent it? Does the Auditorium make money? Is there a payback on these kinds of investments? The electrical -- the lighting and whatnot. Are there electrical efficiencies that we would gain by doing this

investment, where we would save energy costs? Obviously the Auditorium, apparently, would be more usable to additional groups where we might get additional rental income.

And my other comment would be: Are these really two different-- Do they really go hand-in-hand, or is the electrical one project and the curtain another -- or the curtain and the wooden mid-stage partition a separate project? If we said, "Okay, we can only fund one of these," which one would you pick? You can come back with an answer later, because my point being: Are these really -- are these two separate issues, or if you knew that, for some reason, we couldn't fund them both, and we said that-- As I said, which one would you say is the most important?

And I also think it is critically important to say if there are operating impacts, what do those operating impacts happen to be; and focusing on payback, efficiency, rental. Making money is not a -- is a good thing.

Anyway, thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: All right, Senator.

MS. MOLNAR: Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Good morning.

Could you flush out for me a little bit about the problem with the electrical system? I'm having a hard time understanding why, for argument's sake, at one point in time 100 lights worked, and now today only 20 lights worked. Was there extra added equipment that you added onto the system that burns things out? What's going on here?

MR. ANDERSON: Without getting too technical -- as a finance-- The system was in place in 1965, and it's the original system. So imagine a circuit panel put in existence in 1965. The wiring has asbestos wiring on it -- some of it. The Department of the Treasury has been in there replacing circuit breakers as they go -- makeshift -- not makeshift, but replacing any things that break -- the circuit breakers. The lights are the theatrical stage lights. They're up in the ceiling pointing down at the stage, along with drop spots, flood lights. The theatrical lights are meant to be slowly turned on and off with the dimmer or with a lighting panel. That original lighting panel has ceased to work, so we use the circuit breakers to turn on, turn off. By using that, it burns out those original stage lights. A lot of the productions, even some of the public people, need to have those stage lights present, and obviously we can't accommodate those needs at this time. It is very old.

MR. ANNESE: So what you're saying is that certain maintenance things that should have been done weren't done over the years.

MR. ANDERSON: We did attempt an upgrade 15 years ago, but it did not work.

MR. ANNESE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Thanks.

MS. MOLNAR: Any other questions or comments? (no response)

If not, I want to thank you for coming today.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Our next and last department is Juvenile Justice. I'd like to welcome Rosanne Fairbanks, Director of Administration.

ROSANNE FAIRBANKS: Hi, good morning.

I'd like to introduce to you, to my right, Dave Eschert and Phil Everett from my facility's staff. I also have with me today our CFO, Sal Marcello, in the audience; and Phil Saglombeni, one of our other facility's staff members.

Good morning, Madam Chairperson, members of the Commission, and Executive Director Vari. Thank you for this opportunity to present the Juvenile Justice Commission's Fiscal Year '12 capital budget initiatives.

By way of introduction: As you know, I'm Rosanne Fairbanks, the Director of Administration for the Juvenile Justice Commission. I'm come to you today as a representative of Executive Director Veleria Lawson, as well as the young people under our care in statewide residential, day, and secure-care programs. I also speak to you on behalf of the JJC's dedicated employees who work in the Commission as teachers, correction officers, youth workers, parole officers, social workers, and administrative support staff.

I believe that most of the committee members are already familiar with the work and the mission of the JJC in providing the security, structure, and rehabilitative services that our troubled youth need in order to return home as productive members in our communities. We have come to you many times before with our capital requests to improve the physical environments for vocational training, academic education, social and life-skills training, drug rehabilitation, counseling, and job readiness programs.

The Juvenile Justice Commission would like to thank the members of the Capital Commission for your generous support of our projects in Fiscal Year 2011. As you may be aware, the Capital Commission recommended \$1 million for our capital repairs for Fiscal '11. We will ensure these funds are used on projects that are crucial to our continued operation.

The safety and security of our residents and staff housed in buildings that are outdated, that do not meet building code standards, and have accumulated various health and safety code violations over the past years provides the basis for our requests. The projects we outline for you today reflect only our most urgent needs.

In keeping with the statewide mission of reducing our leased space, we continue to work with Treasury Property Management staff to consolidate our leased sites where term leases have expired. This year, we have closed out leases in Burlington County, formerly known as our Burlington Day Program; and in Mercer County, at the Capital Transition Program. We are continuing to work with Treasury staff in an effort to find suitable locations for lease consolidations in our Camden area.

We have worked with the Capital Commission members for several years now to obtain funds to improve the infrastructure of our largest facility, the New Jersey Training School, in Middlesex County. Although together we have made much progress with fire protection, heating, electrical, and security upgrades, our task of fully updating this aging infrastructure to prevent catastrophic breakdown and provide cost savings is far from complete. One significant upgrade for this year has been the new water tower installation, which has put an end to our ongoing

problem with low water pressure, and clearing the way for our remaining fire sprinkler installations.

As in the past several years, and out of true necessity, the JJC comes to the Capital Commission once again for your support. In our 2011 budget appropriation, it reflected a \$10 million reduction in our operating costs, in part due to some changes that we've made in our secure care operations.

On our Johnstone Campus in Burlington County, we have consolidated wings of the Juvenile Medium Secure Facility, one of our oldest and most outdated buildings, to now only house two wings of special populations. We also utilize this building for classroom space of both academic and vocational. Also on this campus, our former reception center is now utilized to house our most challenging population, as this building offers a newer design and affords better sight lines for custody supervision.

At our New Jersey Training School in Monroe Township, Middlesex County, the JRU -- which is our Juvenile Reception Unit building -- has been completely refurbished thanks to much of your support in the past. And this provides a reception center for males entering the Commission. Additionally, three of our housing units on this campus are in the process of being converted to include a hybrid of both civilian and custody supervision, focusing more closely on a rehabilitative atmosphere for those youth who cannot continue on to a community program due to the nature of their charges. With that, the use of the Training School campus is a very critical piece of our financial savings, and key in the efficient use of our available physical space. Our capital request is reflective of these changes in our operations.

I'm only going to highlight-- You have our statement, so I'm only going to highlight a few of our requests.

Once again, critical repairs are our number one priority. These capital funds allow us to address small projects, and some larger projects, that are essential to abate health and safety, fire code violations, and provide for the continued safe operation of our facilities. We maintain over 80 buildings statewide, with many built in the 1930s. The Training School, Johnstone Campus, Albert Elias -- which is the old Lindbergh estate -- and Voorhees residential, in Clinton, New Jersey, are either eligible for or on the national and State registers of historic places. And it is our responsibility to maintain those sites.

Our request for \$2.5 million includes top priority projects from previous fiscal years that were deferred due to the State budget cutbacks in capital moneys: \$100,000 for the continued replacement of fire doors and emergency egress lighting at the Training School; \$40,000 to repair the fire alarm panels at our Fresh Start Program; and \$150,000 to replace leaking windows and doors at the Tramburg Building on Johnstone campus, to prevent water infiltration and provide for energy savings. These are just representative examples of some of our projects that we utilize capital -- critical repair funds for.

Suicide safety, of course, remains one of our top priorities and is our number two request this year, for \$1 million. The JJC compliance monitoring staff has completed suicide-resistance inspections at all of our housing units, and their reports outline many potential hazards that require correction. These funds will be used to complete the initiatives started at

our Behavior Management Unit at the Training School, and to begin to work on Housing Units 6 and 10 at the Training School.

Fire suppression projects throughout the JJC is our third request this year. As it stands now, the JJC has a total of five buildings remaining that are required to have five fire sprinkler systems that are not complete.

This fiscal year -- \$2 million to fire suppress Albert Elias and the hospital building at the Training School. Albert Elias has been funded through the design process but does not have the funding required to construct the project at the completion of design. The hospital has a dormitory that is used to isolate our residents who become ill. Creating safe environments at these two locations is critical.

Our Juvenile Medium Security building is one of the most secure buildings of our JJC facilities, as in it houses our most troubled populations. In order to maintain the level of safety commensurate with our other buildings, additional security enhancement is our number four priority, and it's in the form a man-down duress alarm system. The estimated cost to complete this request is \$250,000. The outdated design of this building leaves a number of our areas that do not have good sight lines where some incidents can occur. CCTV cameras have recently been installed, and a man-down alarm will increase the safety of staff as well as residents. All of the JJC secure sites will have equal surveillance and security protection with the completion of this initiative.

Another ongoing request is that -- our fifth priority -- is Phase 3 of our boiler installations at the Training School. With the support of the Capital Commission, and funds from the Office of Energy Savings, three

buildings -- JRU, BMU, and Housing Unit 2 -- are running their heat and boiler systems independent of our power house. The Social Services building, our Guidance Unit, the chapel, the hospital, and Housing Units 6 and 25 are going out for bid next week. Independent boiler operation in these six buildings will allow the closure of one complete steam-line loop, placing decentralization of the power house at approximately 50 percent complete.

We wish to continue this initiative with \$1.4 million in capital funds to install new heating systems in Housing Units 7 and 8. These two dorm-style buildings are the farthest buildings on the steam line, and will allow this portion of the steam loop to be shut down. Again, the energy saving cost estimates for these two buildings alone will equal about \$81,000 per year.

Renovations to our Hospital Building -- number six -- has been requested numerous times. We recently installed a roof, dormers, and gutter system, and have addressed many of the roof leaks and have improved the overall appearance of the building. We need to continue the work on the exterior of this building and address brick repointing, new windows, new doors, and ADA accommodations for entry into the building and second floor access. It is essential that a hospital building be ADA accessible. This will complete the exterior envelope and provide energy efficiencies in heating costs. The windows are original to the building that was built in the 1930s, and in many instances, for safety purposes, they were replaced with Plexiglas. So we're looking for about \$1.5 million to fund that particular project.

On behalf of the JJC and the Attorney General's Office, I would like to extend our heartfelt thanks to the Capital Commission members for difficult decisions that you must make during these times. We're proud of our accomplishments. And, as always, we extend an invitation to any of the Capital Commission members to tour our facilities and to see the work that has been completed through your support.

My staff and I are available now to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. MOLNAR: Any questions or comments?

Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Yes. I just have two questions. The first is priority two: suicide-resistant improvements. What kind of suicide hazards would you be correcting?

MS. FAIRBANKS: Dave, do you want to answer some of those questions?

DAVID ESCHERT: Most incarcerated suicides take place by way of hanging, 98 percent of them. Anything that someone can tie a piece of cloth around -- because you can't put an inmate in a cell without some cloth, because they have to wear clothes and have linens. Anything they can tie a piece of cloth around can serve as an anchor point. And the old style metal beds that we have in there, the old registers for heating and air conditioning with the large holes in them, the old-style sprinkler heads that hang down that you can tie something around all present anchor points that kids could potentially tie a piece of cloth around. And in addition to that, the research that the compliance monitoring people have done has shown that there have been a number of incidents where people have actually

attempted -- and I believe in one case actually committed suicide -- by tying it around something that was low to the floor and rolling themselves over. I think that's part of national research. It's shown that you could even potentially hang yourself from something that's relatively low to the floor. So it's essentially sprinkler heads, registers, beds. There's a special kind of toilet that goes in there. Anything that you can tie something around is a potential anchor point.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: The second question I had is on priority four. You're talking about the Juvenile Medium Security facility in Bordentown, which houses juveniles who are most likely of our residents to cause injury to themselves or others. Number one: How do you know who is likely to do that? And what are some of the characteristics you look for to identify them?

MS. FAIRBANKS: In terms of the youth-- When they are committed to us, and they come through our reception unit, they're evaluated through a number of screening tools where they are -- look for potential youth that have either a violent history -- they might be convicted of a violent crime, they might have been involved in a violent crime. Their educational level abilities are looked at as well. Their drug use history is looked at. Mental health -- we have a number of mental health youth that have committed crimes and are committed to us as well. So all of that is decided when the youth enters our facilities. Then we classify them through a classification tool. And that would then put them in that particular facility. And at the Juvenile Medium Security facility -- our H wing houses our level three youth. And our level three youth are considered

our most severely mental-health challenged youth who have behavioral problems additionally that are very difficult to control.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Of all your facilities, what would be -- what would you say the age range of the incarcerated juveniles is?

MS. FAIRBANKS: Our average age is 17.5, but we have kids as young as 13 and as old as 23 in our facilities.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: And then how long do they stay there? I mean, what happens when they get to be 24?

MS. FAIRBANKS: Well, depending on the length of their sentence, they could actually stay with us after the age of 23. We actually had one or two who have, in the past, stayed longer than that. We do have the option, when they turn 18 -- if they are not progressing, we do have the option of waiving them to the adult system.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Now, this I has nothing to do with your presentation, but have you done studies on recidivism of these?

MS. FAIRBANKS: Yes, I believe a study was recently done -- recidivism. And those results are going to be published shortly.

ASSEMBLYMAN WOLFE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Senator.

SENATOR OROHO: Thank you very much.

And similar to the Assemblyman's questions regarding the suicide resistance improvements-- When I tour the jails and juvenile detention centers, I'm amazed at some of the things that -- not only the weaponry that they come up with, but also the suicide resistance that they have to go to--

Now, would the issue of the beds, the lockers, the toilets, the vents, and so on-- Is that an issue -- and the windows -- is that an issue where we need new ones, or are there methodologies where we can make repairs so that they are suicide-resistant?

MS. FAIRBANKS: I think it's a little bit of both. In some facilities we do actually replace the furniture. We go through a company that actually has furniture that's designed for suicide resistance. It's actually flush with the wall. It's actually (indiscernible) to the wall so that there are no -- nothing for them to tie any piece of cloth to. In some other places, it is just a matter of repairing edges and making sure things are sealed appropriately. So it's a little bit of both.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay. One other question I had with respect to the fire suppression system installation -- and at the Albert Elias building.

MS. FAIRBANKS: Yes.

SENATOR OROHO: We mentioned violations in here. Are we paying fines? Are there fines that we're being fined for these violations or anything?

MS. FAIRBANKS: Dave.

MR. ESCHERT: They're not fining us, but they are citing us with violations. They can fine us. I mean, legally, they can fine us any time they want. But because we're another State agency, they understand that we're trying to get the projects done. And, in fact, because we've been working with the Capital Commission, the number of buildings that we have an outstanding violation on has dropped significantly over the years.

SENATOR OROHO: And this is the last building right? I see here -- the last, I thought it was.

MR. ESCHERT: There are five left that have no project in progress or completed.

SENATOR OROHO: Now, in the violations that we have-- So fines are one thing. But is there an issue of risk of closure or anything like that where, if these aren't done-- Well, apparently we've been on a program where we have been installing them throughout all the buildings. So this is part of our ongoing program to get that done.

The other question I have-- And (indiscernible) you do -- and I will compliment you. There are operating impacts. You've heard my other questions with--

MS. FAIRBANKS: There are always operating impacts.

SENATOR OROHO: Yes. I believe so as well.

MS. FAIRBANKS: Always.

SENATOR OROHO: And the commentary about the operating impacts-- And you actually quantify some in here, and I imagine they're always on a per-year basis.

MS. FAIRBANKS: Always on a fiscal year basis.

SENATOR OROHO: Fiscal year.

MS. FAIRBANKS: Yes.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay. I know I had one other-- Oh, on the duress alarm system-- Is that-- When I look at that-- Is that mostly for-- So that one would be mostly for employee safety. Is that--

MS. FAIRBANKS: Officers, yes.

SENATOR OROHO: Officer safety.

MS. FAIRBANKS: Yes.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay. All right.

Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Any other questions or comments? (no response)

If not, I want to thank you for coming today.

MS. FAIRBANKS: Thank you very much.

MS. MOLNAR: Is there any other business?

I would like to ask that you circulate the numbers you read today, about the capital that was approved for -- appropriated for the current year, to everyone.

MR. VARI: Sure. No problem. I will send that out as an e-mail.

MS. MOLNAR: Perfect, as an e-mail.

And our next meeting is Friday, October 1. Hopefully we can get some more members so we can vote on the agenda items. Our staff is very aggressive in trying to get people here. So I thank them for that.

Is there any other business to come before the Commission?
(no response)

If not, meeting adjourned.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)