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Speaker Oliver, Minority Leader DeCroce and Members, on behalf of the New Jersey Restaurant Association, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak before you today. Despite the uncertainty of times, our members have expressed a feeling of encouragement with the bi-partisan spirit that seems to be present in Trenton, especially since the swearing in of our new Governor. Today's meeting seems keeping with that spirit of bi-partisanship which clearly will be necessary as we face the daunting budget process.

Of immediate concern to the $12 billion foodservice industry is the insolvency of the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. Given the exhaustive toll the economy has taken on our businesses and citizens, it is our immediate interest to see policies enacted in New Jersey that will stimulate economic growth and development in order for our private sector to create jobs. However, the looming threat of increases in the Unemployment payroll tax premium by $300-$1000 per employee effective July of this year is of dire concern. This will mean job losses in New Jersey.

This issue is especially critical to the labor intensive service industry- restaurants and tourism related businesses. 25,000 eating and drinking businesses employ over 300,000 people in New Jersey. A brief questionnaire posed last week to our members in order to encourage them to focus on this looming threat and to help them calculate the impact on their businesses resulted in panic.

A restaurant generating $1 million in annual sales requires 40 to 60 people to operate. And, the net profit of that million dollar business is just 3 percent- $30,000 if they are lucky. A million dollar restaurant struggling to stay in business cannot afford a $12,000, $20,000, $30,000, or $40,000 increase in Unemployment Insurance depending on their experience rating.

One member reported they have a weekly payroll of 350 people off-season, 550 during the peak season, but a total of 1200 W-2's throughout the year because of heavy turnover and the seasonality of his business. At minimum his business is facing a potential $360,000 increase. Again, this means job losses at a time when we are working towards a policy of job creation.

This is a crisis that we realize requires remedy in many ways in order to fix the present problem and prevent it from happening in the future. We also realize it is an inherited problem for our new Governor, and we know that New Jersey is not alone in facing this crisis with dozens of states across the nation on the cusp of these increases. New Jersey must push for a short term, midterm and long term solution to ensuring that the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund is solvent.

In the immediate term the NJ Restaurant Association strongly urges this body to pass an Assembly Joint Resolution urging Congress to use stimulus funds to forgive the State obligation which otherwise will trigger this $300 to $1000 per employee increase this year. As a small business association, through our members, we will work with you to lift the sense of urgency before Congress of this situation.
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Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony as to how you, the legislative body of New Jersey, can improve the quality of my life in this State.

January 2001, my husband and I permanently moved in to our home in the ungated Common Interest Community, Greenbriar II, in Brick Township, County of Ocean. By the end of that year we became aware that the volunteer Board of Trustees were dictatorial and unreasonable. A widespread situation well documented in the Assembly Task Force Findings issued in early 1997.

February 2002, I joined the Common-Interest Homeowner's Coalition for the purpose of effecting change by advancing legislation. I maintain my membership even though so far it has proved fruitless. I also maintain an expensive membership in the Community Association Institute (CAI) and have paid enormous amounts to educate myself through that organization.

From 1995 through this January several bills have been filed to protect owners in common interest communities but nothing has been enacted. This must end.

We pay your salaries and for your benefits which are better than we have. Bills must be acted upon within a reasonable amount of time. If by the end of a Legislation session they have not, they should be the first order of business in the next Legislation session.

It is an affront to us taxpayers for you to allow them to “die on the vine”. To date this year which is less than a month old more than 1,000 unique bills have been pre/filed in the Assembly almost all have companion Senate bills. The majority indicate they had been filed in the previous Legislation Session. This is a waste of valuable employee time and a waste of paper. Change it!

Since moving from Brooklyn, New York to New Jersey I have been very involved in the governance of my town, county, state and country. I have learned that the information on your website as to how a bill becomes a law has a “sin” of omission. It does not mention how one person or group kills a bill.

Again, I am so pleased that you are starting this session on the right foot with this hearing. All Legislators should be mandated to hold Town Hall meetings at least twice a year, preferably quarterly. My New Jersey Legislators have been the same people since before I moved here but have never held a forum.

Our two Congressional Senators did not hold any meetings to discuss Health INSURANCE reform. This is a disgrace. To the best of my knowledge your oath of office is not to satisfy the desires of your particular constituents, but to act in the best interest of the citizens of New
Jersey. How can any of you determine what is in our best interest if you fail to hold a dialogue with us?

We need term limits. The idea of "vote them out" is not doable. The power is in the hands of the party leaders. You know that and I know that.

Term limits hit you in the pocketbook. Not having them hits us harder in our meager purses. We cannot afford you to be in office for a lifetime. It is arrogant of some who feel that in the entire population of this state there are not others who may have better ideas and deserve an opportunity to present them.

All the talking heads on radio, cable and other media cannot speak for us. They cannot comprehend how disaffected we are. We have no voice and it is causing unrest similar to that experienced by our Founding Fathers.

Yes, it is time for change – change we seek not change thrust upon us.

Thank you for taking the time to hear me.

Nan C
CS NOTES/OTHERS
RETIRED TEACHER, COUNSELOR, PRINCIPAL - CHATHAM AREA, SPARTA AREA
7 DEGREES CERTIFICATES
35 YRS. HANDS ON RESEARCH - STRONG

BROAD STATEMENT: PRESIDENTIAL COMM. MENTAL HEALTH “IN SHAMBLES”.

A. NJ PROBLEMS: TAXPAYERS PAYING 100-500 YEARLY FOR HOUSING MENTAL
PATIENTS
ANCORA, GREYSTONE, ESSEX COUNTY
146,000 TO 200,000 YEARLY PER YEAR HOUSED

DRUGS WITH 30-2700 SIDE EFFECTS- FORCED DRUG ADDICTS
CAUSE PARANOIA, MANIC DEPRESSION ETC.
FORCED OR NEEDLES
OFF DRUGS, CRASH, COME BACK
LIVER DAMAGE-----1 SYSTEMS DETERIORATE
BURSTING VEINS, DEATH

VIOLENCE

CAN BE HOSPITALIZED UP TO 25+ YEARS AT OUR TAX EXPENSE
1-50X AT HAGADORN - EO GEN.
1-58X
RECORDS OF 1, 75.0MG A MO. NO TITRATION AND OUT - CRASHED 5 TIMES/AT
HAGADORN
MOM, CONGESTIVE, 23X - HOSP. CLOSED
CHARITY CARE, MEDICAID, MEDICARE MONEYS

WASTED LIVES

B. CAUSES: MAN TO MOON, BIG BUSINESS: PHAR. MEDICAL, GOVT.

MAYO CLINIC, 34% EFFECTIVE, PSYCH. WORST: NO BRAIN, BLOOD OR ANYTHING
ELSE TESTS
DRUGS MAIN LINE TO DETERIORATE AND KEEP THEM IN SYSTEM FOR LIFE
IN, HOW? HNERY, 5 MONTHS MORPINE, FRIEND, PERCOSET

C. SOLUTIONS/ BEST SOLUTIONS
FEDERAL LEVEL/STATE: MINIMIZE HOSPITALIZATIONS, PATIENT/FAMILY INPUT
BOARDING HOUSES-----$7,200 TO 14,400 YEARLY COMPARED TO 146 AND 200
50-55% NJ LAND UNDERDEVELOPED/UNDEVELOPED

HAVE COMPREHENSIVE, INTEGRATIVE/NATURAL/ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS
BRAIN TESTS, PATH WELLNESS, DR. ERIC BRAVERMAN, NYC
ST. BARNABUS OUTPATIENT SERVICES, SIEGAL CENTER, LIVINGSTON,
PRINCETON LONGEVITY CENTER, PRINCETON
ALTERNATIVE/INTEGRATIVE CENTER, PARAMUS, 201-251-2500
ASS. OF INTEGRATIVE MEDICINE, SUMMIT AND WARREN, NJ 908-608-1000
JACK DREYFUS, DREYFUS FUND, NYC., A REMARKABLE MEDICINE HAS BEEN
OVERLOOKED
CITIZENS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS INTERNATIONAL, 323 467-4242
NATUROPATHIC DR. KUZNIAR, ND, 201-757-5558
FR: CARMELA SILVESTRI

CS NOTES/ AND FOR OTHERS BASED ON 35 YEARS OF RESEARCH
RE: IMMEDIATE CHANGES NEEDED TO SAVE HEALTH, LIVES OF SO CALLED MENTALLY ILL
RETIRED TEACHER, COUNSELOR, PRINCIPAL, 7 DEGREES/CERTIFICATES

BROAD STATEMENT-PRESIDENTIAL COMM. ON MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEM: "IN SHAMBLES."

A. NJ PROBLEMS: TAXPAYERS PAYING $100-500 MILLION YEARLY FOR HOUSING MENTAL PATIENTS: EX. ANCORA, GREYSTONE, ESSEX COUNTY HOSP CENTER @ $146.00 + PER PATIENT. PATIENTS CALLED "SALES!" (GIVEN: SEE REFERENCE USA) DRUGS PRIMARY FORCED TREATMENT. 30-2700 SIDE EFFECTS CAUSING FORCED DRUG ADDICTS WITH PARANOIA/MANIC DEPRESSION, ETC. (GIVEN: SEE COMMON SIDE EFFECTS LIST), HOSPITALIZATIONS, HEALTH DETERIORATION, INSTITUTIONALIZATION, EARLIER DEATHS (100,000+ DIE YEARLY, 5-7 MILLION SINCE WWIL)

VIOLENCE COMMON: DRUG INDUCED OR OTHER - (GIVEN: SEE PICTURES.)

PATIENTS HOSPITALIZED UP TO 25+ YEARS AT TAX EXPENSE: (GIVEN) PATIENTS I KNOW: A) 50X IN. B) 50X C) 60-75,000MG FOR 30 DAYS, NO TITRATION, CRASHED 5X AND TOLD TO BE AT HAGADORN 2 YEARS (GIVEN INFORMATION.) FRAUD INDUCED RECIDIVISM BRINGS IN MEDICAID/MEDICARE/CHARITY CARE MONEYS TO HOSPITAL. (GIVEN INFO FOR H. THAYER.) ORANGE MEMORIAL CLOSED BECAUSE OF THIS FRAUD. FRAUD PREVAILS AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE. WASTED TAXPAYERS' MONEYS AND PATIENTS' LIVES.

B. CAUSES: PATIENTS MADE DESPITE NO BLOOD OR BRAIN TEST VALIDATIONS.
- UNVALIDATED THEORIES/TESTS/DOCTORS' PRESCRIPTIONS GIVEN PERSONS.
- ALSO: BOGUS TESTS AND MEDICAL PRESCRIPTIONS BRING IN NEW PATIENTS.
- DRUGS PRIMARY TREATMENTS. VERY LIMITED FOR HEALING.
HUGE RECIDIVISM.
LESS THAT 34% DOCTOR EFFECTIVENESS: MAYO CLINIC.
- (3 DOCUMENTARIES GIVEN.) BIG BUSINESS FOR MEDICAL, PHARMACEUTICALS AND CERTAIN GOV'T ENTITIES. MORE BUSINESS WANTED WORLDWIDE.

C. SOLUTIONS/BEST SOLUTIONS
1. IMMEDIATE: HAVE COMPREHENSIVE, INTEGRATIVE/NATURAL, ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS. EXAMPLES BELOW.
   - BRAIN TESTS/OTHER ALTERNATIVES, PATH WELLNESS, DR. ERIC BRAVERMAN, Nyc, PHONE: 212#
   - ST. BARNABUS OUTPATIENT/SIRGEL CENTER, LIVINGSTON, NJ, 973-#
   - PRINCETON LONGEVTY CENTER, PRINCETON, 800-#
   - ALTERNATIVE/INTEGRATIVE CENTER, PARAMUS, 201-251-2500
   - ASS. OF INTEGRATIVE MEDICINE, SUMMIT AND WARREN, NJ 908-585-1000
   - JACK DREYFUS, DREYFUS FUND, NYC, 212# - A REMARKABLE DRUG HAS BEEN OVERLOOKED
   - CITIZENS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS INTERNATIONAL, 323-467-4242
   - NATURALPATHIC DR. KUZNIAR, 201-757-5558
   - DR. MICHAEL GOROVICH, ALT. PSYCH, DR., 516-674-9489

2. FEDERAL/STATE/COUNTY LEVELS: MINIMIZE HOSPITALIZATIONS: HAVE PATIENT/FAMILY INPUT PROGRAMS FOR PROGRESS. INTEGRATE #1 SOLUTIONS. BUILD GROUP HOMES. 50-55% NJ LAND UNDER AND UN-DEVELOPED FOR NEW SITES. MANY JOBS CREATED. PATIENTS PAY OUT OF THEIR SOCIAL SECURITY ABOUT $7,200 TO $14,400 YEARLY COMPARED TO $146.00+ FOR EACH PATIENT THRU OUR TAXES. MORE BUSINESSES AND JOBS CREATED STATE-WIDE PER GROUP HOME. OVERDO.
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PRIMER ON THE PROBLEM WITH, AND PUNITIVE NATURE OF, NEW JERSEY’S HIGHEST-IN-THE-NATION PROPERTY TAXES

SUBMITTED BY:  MICHAEL BILLIG
36 MONTEREY CIRCLE
LAKEWOOD, NJ 08701
732-730-1947

THE PROBLEM

Property taxes! They may well be an evil necessary to underwrite New Jersey’s public services, but there can be little argument as they stand today they are far too high and intrinsically too inequitable as they are foisted upon a segment of the state’s population.

Why should just one class of citizen (home-owners/property-owners and, by extension, landlords) pick up the entire tab rung up by the whole of any municipality’s population? Do tenants not need police, fire and emergency medical services? Do they not enjoy access to libraries and other assorted public departments and entities? Do their children not attend our schools and/or utilize the attendant means of transportation thereto?

Of course they do... and, in many instances, exert more of a drain on public resources than any property-owner would. And yet, when “tax-rebate” time rolls around, tenants historically received stipends from the state... an obvious “vote-buying” maneuver.

THE PROGNOSIS

It’s time to split the bill when it comes due; tenants in a position to pay their fair share should be required to pick up some of the costs associated with our current infrastructure.

Understand, I’m not advocating a complete non-taxation of real property. In the interests of community preservation, there probably should be some fee paid toward municipal upkeep. However, over and above said fee, all tax-paying (and tax-exempt?) citizens and entities should pay into the pot... perhaps in line with their actual cost-of-public-service?

Accordingly, the suggestion here is that the overwhelming majority of localized fees and taxes be shouldered by all those financially positioned above the poverty line. If one can pay dividend, earnings or income taxes, they should similarly pay “municipal taxes.”

Addressing the heaviest burden of property taxes (as they now stand) is that sum allegedly apportioned to the education of our children. Refraining for the most part from unleashing a justifiable tirade against NJEA (and other governmental as well as quasi-governmental unions), and at the same time appreciating the plaintive cries of our senior citizenry who may have lost sight of just who paid for their education way back when, following is one possible formula to ameliorate this currently untenable situation.
PRIMER ON THE PROBLEM WITH, AND PUNITIVE NATURE OF,
NEW JERSEY’S HIGHEST-IN-THE-NATION PROPERTY TAXES
(continued)

THE PANACEA

In calculating what might be considered a fair and equitable division of cost for today’s
child-education process, let me suggest the state (and maybe one day, the entire country?)
lay down a formula akin to the one set forth below:

\[ X = \text{A set amount of school-tax money to be paid by everyone (of some means) within}
\text{any given municipality.} \]

\[ Y = \text{An amount of extra tax to be paid if one has a child enrolled in—or utilizing any}
\text{services of—the local public school system.} \]

\[ Z = \text{The additional amount to be levied for each additional school-age child enrolled in a}
\text{particular district (or perhaps to be figured as } 2Y, 3Y, \text{ etc.).} \]

Consequently, a school-tax-paying entity’s fiscal liability could be measured as (at least)
\( X \), and quite possibly more. Of course, I leave it up to the individual township and county
mathematicians to go back to school and learn how to fairly and properly “solve for \( X \).”

THE PAYOFF

In addition to finally providing some long-promised, sorely needed relief to property
owners being squeezed between skyrocketing local tax assessments and plummeting
bank-avowed property appraisals (it would be nice if everyone could get on the same
page!), ANY governmental movement to address this situation would go a long way
towards quieting the unruly mob now gathering as a tempest and not a tea party! In short,
it would make some of us (property owners) stop to consider and believe you legislators
may actually be willing to listen to us and— dare we hope— feel our pain?

Moreover, on a less ethereal/more substantive plane, think what such a move could mean
to boosting the state’s housing marketability. After all, well aware of the excruciating bite
taxes take out of a property owner’s pocket or purse, why would anyone consider buying
a home—or a business site—in this state? But if property ownership were to be made
less onerous, there would be more building and sales/resales, generating an increased
level of inspection, permit and transfer fees across a wider, deeper pool of payers!
March 27, 2007

Bea Perry
26 Sylvester Avenue
Trenton, NJ 08638

Dear Ms. Perry:

Please allow me to acknowledge your recent conversations with my staff regarding issues of concern to you involving the City of Trenton. You were concerned about the following:

1.) A possible safety concern regarding City Side Housing rental units at the corner of Monmouth Street and Walnut Avenue. Specifically, whether the one entrance/exit is permittable according to municipal ordinances;

2.) Overgrown tree near your property and Brunswick Avenue; and

3.) Road paving issue on Sylvester Avenue and N. Warren Street.

Please be informed that these concerns have been forwarded to the Mayor’s Office of Citizens Concerns for appropriate review and action. If you have additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Shirley K. Turner
Senator - 15th District

SKT:mls
ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING A PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES TO BAYVILLE HOLDINGS, LLC FOR 143-149 EAST STATE STREET, TRENTON, NEW JERSEY PURSUANT TO N.J.S.A. 55:14K-1 ET SEQ

WHEREAS, Bayville Holdings, LLC (hereinafter referred to as the "sponsor") proposes to construct a housing project (hereinafter referred to as the "Project") pursuant to the provisions of the New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency Law of 1983, as amended (N.J.S.A. 55:14K-1 et seq.) and the rules promulgated thereunder at N.J.A.C. 5:80-1 et seq. (the foregoing hereinafter referred to as the "Municipality") on a site described as Lots 3 and 23, Block 201 as shown on the Official Assessment Map of the City of Trenton, Mercer County and commonly known as 143-149 East State Street, and 148-158 East Front Street, Trenton, New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, the Project will be subject to the HMFA Law and the mortgage and other loan documents executed between the Sponsor and the New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Agency"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of the HMFA Law, the governing body of the Municipality hereby determines that there is a need for this housing project in the Municipality; and

WHEREAS, the Sponsor has presented to the Municipal Council a revenue projection for the Project which sets for the anticipated revenue to be received by the Sponsor from the operation of the Project as estimated by the Sponsor and the Agency, a copy of which is attached hereto and made part hereof as Exhibit A.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Trenton (the "Council") that:

1. The Council finds and determines that the proposed Project will meet or meets an existing housing need.

2. The Council does hereby adopt the within Ordinance and makes the determination and findings herein contained by virtue of, pursuant to, and in the conformity with the provisions of the HMFA Law with the intent and purpose that the Agency shall rely thereon in making a mortgage loan to the Sponsor, which shall construct, own and operate the project.
3. The Council does hereby adopt the within Ordinance with the further intent and purpose that from the date of execution of the Agency mortgage, the proposed Project, including both the land and improvements thereon, will be exempt from real property taxation as provided in the HMFA law, provided that payments in lieu of taxes for municipal services supplies to the Project are made to the Municipality in such amounts and manner set forth in the Agreement for Payments in Lieu of Taxes attached hereto as Exhibit “B”.

4. The Council hereby authorizes the Mayor of the City of Trenton to execute, on behalf of the Municipality, the Agreement for Payments in Lieu of Taxes in substantially the form annexed hereto as Exhibit “B”.

5. The Council understands and agrees that the revenue projects set forth in Exhibit “A” are estimates and that the actual payments in lieu of taxes to be paid by the Sponsor to the Municipality shall be determined pursuant to the Agreement for Payments in Lieu of Taxes executed between the Sponsor and Municipality.

6. Any and all ordinances previously adopted approving a payment in lieu of taxes for the property identified in this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

7. The City Clerk is hereby directed to attest to the execution of the Financial Agreement, and to publish this Ordinance as required by law.

8. This Ordinance shall take effect after final passage and publication in accordance with applicable law.

---

**RECORD OF COUNCIL VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCILMAN</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
<th>A.B.</th>
<th>COUNCILMAN</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
<th>A.B.</th>
<th>COUNCILMAN</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
<th>A.B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETHEA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MELONE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PINTELLA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEGURA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARTIGUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X—INDICATES VOTE, A.B.—ABSENT, N.V.—NOT VOTING, X.O.R.—INDICATES OVERRIDE VETO

Adopted on first reading at a meeting of the City Council of the City of Trenton, NJ on SEP 2, 2007
Adopted on second and final reading after hearing on SEP 6, 2007

Reverted and Reconsidered

Mayor

Mayor

President of Council

City Clerk
ON THE SPOT AWARD JUSTIFICATION

DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 1996

AMOUNT: $150

EMPLOYEE: BEATRICE PERRY

SSN:

DIVISION: AF

ROUTING: 81FB

TITLE, SERIES, GRADE: LMS-346-GS-7

JUSTIFICATION:

Since your arrival at Newark three years ago, you have transformed the culture and dynamics of our operation through your prudent judgment and discreteness in spending. Prior to your arrival, we had to pay an airline for the use of a forklift to unload heavy deliveries and we were also forced to rent cherry pickers from vendors to work on the LLWAS. However, due to your ability to get along well with others, you were able to cultivate an excellent rapport with the Port Authority. Due to this rapport we have derived benefits that are readily felt. We no longer have to contract out for forklifts and cherry pickers. This, in turn, saved the FAA thousands of dollars each year.

There are other instances of your resourcefulness and money smarts. On January 26, 1996, the NAVCOM unit needed an UPS for the FDIO, an item that was not depot supported. You made several calls to local vendors who quoted prices ranging from $1100 to $950. You felt that these prices were exorbitant and proceeded to contact GSA. You obtained a list of GSA-approved vendors, made calls, and compared prices. Ultimately you were able to obtain the same UPS for $530; a savings of over $400!

Ms Perry, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the excellent job you have done since your arrival. Your dedication to the job and willingness to take that extra step has helped the FAA accomplish its objectives. For your professionalism and commitment to saving the FAA money, I hereby nominate you for an "on the spot award" of $150.

Recommended by SSC manager: Thomas W. Lee

Approved by the Airport manager: Glenn Madison

6010/81FB/211/115D
AF NATIONAL HONORARY AWARDS PROGRAM

This certificate is presented to

Beatrice Perry

For being nominated for the

Team Achievement Award
Liberty SMO Program Support Office

Thomas Gassert
Manager, Airway Facilities Division, AEA-400
2/2/2010

Intro:
- My name is Daniel Hogan. I am a small business owner. I am a locksmith by trade but an entrepreneur at heart.

- Last week during the state of the union address the President spoke of the resolve of the American people during tough times. Small Business is a prime example of that resolve, each day entrepreneurs find ways to create opportunities and overcome challenges.

- The President suggested that we need to provide world class education for everyone and suggested an emphasis on improving our community colleges. I agree and would add that we also need to enhance our technical and trade schools as well.

- For too long the emphasis on education has been solely on white collar and professional disciplines. During this time resources to develop skilled trades and technical personnel have diminished. The demand for these skills in the job market is stronger than ever. Has anyone here tried to get a plumber to their house lately?

- There is no silver bullet that overnight will create the thousands of jobs lost in the past few years.

- Small businesses like mine produce jobs in a smaller scale but these jobs offer long term reliable careers.

- I'm in the Security and Life Safety industry and I've identified opportunities in my business plan that will create a significant number of permanent jobs over the next few years.
Small businesses like mine would love to expand, however the time and financial burden necessary to train employees is beyond the already challenged resources we all have. We need help.

One of the special resources I have relied on has been our Small Business Development Centers or SBDCs, I would like to further suggest that these SBDCs are invaluable and should also be considered for additional investment to expand their role to entrepreneurs.

The Governor has stated that he intends to emphasize “workforce development” and I believe that a partnership of small business along with the state together could find ways where the business community can provide the expertise and the state could share the financial burden and jointly develop specific skilled training that would result in permanent jobs.

To achieve long term success, We need the following:

- Workforce development Grants for providing industry specific skill training
- A public voice in the department of workforce development to develop long term opportunities for small business development
- An emphasis on Technical and Trade education in our community colleges and schools and expansion of our SBDC programs for entrepreneurial education

In closing I’d like to suggest that during the President’s speech he made the point that he took the job during difficult times and his intention is to work toward making things better.

Our Governor has also taken the job during difficult times and resolves to make things better, no matter what your party affiliation or philosophical differences are, you’ve got to respect both of these men for taking on this very difficult challenge.

Last year Richard Branson was interviewed and he predicted: “It’s the small businesses that are going to get America back on its feet again,”

These are tough times but let’s draw on the resolve we all have as Americans and by working together we will get our state and country back on its feet.
Ralph J. Evangelista, CPA, MS Taxation
Testimony Addressing the Assembly Leadership on 2/2/2010
Assembly Speaker Sheila Oliver and Alex DeCroce

Ideas for making the state a better place to live:

1) Corporate Minimum tax – for companies with little or no gross income $500 per year is excessive. The minimum tax at the beginning of my career for corps in NJ was only $25.00, twenty five years later it's between $500 – $2,000.

2) Licensed Professional Fee- $150 for professional working for a Corporation, LLC or Partnership makes NJ quite unattractive to professionals not yet established here. What is it that professionals receive since the $150 came into existence that they weren't receiving prior to the fee being assessed? Don't we already pay for our licenses?

3) Collection Agency- My own firm received a notice from a collection agency this year concerning GIT withheld from employees for the second quarter. There was an overpayment applied from the first quarter that apparently was missed by the state. No notices were sent by the state. The only notice we received was from a collection agency and even they called before sending a notice. Many taxpayers might be intimidated and pay when a collection agency calls even though there was no debt.

4) Double Taxation on S Corporations: An S Corporation can pay the minimum tax of $2,000 as well as pay New Jersey Gross Income Tax based on whatever income flows through to them from the corporation to their individual income tax return at their individual tax rate which can be as high as 10.75%.

5) Business Losses can only be deducted against like business gains. For example a partnership loss can only be deducted against partnership gains.
CONTACT INFORMATION:
rsims23@aol.com
  Cell phone: 973-517-1126
  Home phone: 973-338-7266
  582 East Passaic Avenue
  Bloomfield, NJ 07003

"For the great enemy of the truth is often not the lie-deliberate, contrived and dishonest- but the myth, persistent, persuasive and unrealistic. Too often we hold fast to the clichés of our forebears. We subject all facts to a prefabricated set of interpretations. We enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought" John F. Kennedy

How can we help New Jersey? Know the truth and expose the myth!

Myth #1 Individuals and their families want them to leave the developmental centers and move into community waiver settings.

Truth #1- Most of the consumers currently targeted for community placement are under the Bureau of Guardianship services. These guardians have been ordered by the state Division of DD to only recommend community
placement. The Bureau of Guardianship services budget and the Bureau itself should be eliminated and family members and perhaps retired social workers, doctors, lawyers etc be solicited to provide a neutral resource to speak to the clients to determine their ability to understand the issue and to staff to get an honest assessment as to their appropriateness for giving up ICF/MR services. A recent survey of parents and family members from 6 of the 7 Developmental Centers shows that 96% of those who responded want their loved ones to remain at their current centers and receive the same level of care they are currently receiving.

Myth#2: Serving these people in the community is cheaper.

Truth#2: Most studies have compared apples to oranges // Placement in an ICF/MR (individual care facility for the mentally retarded) requires an Active treatment plan with goals and objectives that are worked on throughout the day every day. They also provide all the therapeutic and medical services on grounds that this vulnerable population needs keeping them out of hospitals and emergency rooms. Community Waiver programs like group homes are only a part of the services these people need and the room and board in a group home unlike the ICF/MR’s is not reimbursable under Medicaid. The reimbursement rate at the ICF/MR is 50% federal match of all costs
while the CCW clients only receive 25% reimbursement and that does not cover room and board. All DDD clients are required to pay the state of NJ 75% of their Social Security money leaving 25% of the money for items like recreation, personal items etc. For those in the Developmental Centers the majority of residents list the state and not a family member as representative payee and the state gets 100% of those dollars less a $40 per month amount for personal spending. By not having the 25% in client accounts on grounds the state has lost Medicaid coverage as these accounts often go over the $2000 cap they are allowed to hold. How much has this mistake cost the state? I have included a peer reviewed and published cost comparison study completed by well-known NJ researchers that the state uses for your review.

DDD is currently spending millions of dollars in an attempt to move the innocents out. They have contracted an organization to supply Transition Support Coordinators at the rate of no less than $50,000 per worker. These persons are not social workers or psychologists and some do not even have college degrees. They are given free reign to "troll" the clients medical and personal records looking for victims. They do not ask the family or even the staff prior to doing this. This is not a practice in the community group homes. Parents and family members are respected. Families' visits and
phone calls are not counted as ours are to prove what good parents and families we are. Documents that show the needs and goals for the clients are called IHP's (individual habitation plans). Clients, who whether they can express thoughts or even speak in the centers have their IHP's written in the first person as if they had written them while those in group homes have theirs written in the third person. The "person centered" IHP is a lie and a fraudulent document and this practice should be stopped at once.

Agencies like the UMDNJ school of Public Health and the Developmental Disabilities Planning Institute at NJIT have very lucrative contracts to produce propaganda to families with loved ones in the Developmental Centers. This money could and should be used in better ways. NJIT contracts for this year are over $600,000 and provide no direct service to families at all. These contracts and all contracts with DDD must be audited both from a fiscal and forensic look to eliminate waste, duplication of services and money spent in any other way than provided direct service to individuals and families.

Myth #3 The last closure was successful
Truth #3 The Division has refused to conduct a ten-year study to see how the clients are doing today. There is an offer from Dr. Ted Kastner to perform this research pro bono so that it will not cost the state at all. At
the last look at the five year mark there were some trends that caused concern and we
wrote it to the clients to know where they are and how they are doing. My feeling is that we do not know what has happened to many of the former residents of North Princeton Developmental Center and we need to know that they are safe before moving anyone else out. The site is still unused and an EPA nightmare from what I hear so no big money was or is forthcoming from any sale as was promised.
We need to look at the results from other closures like Pennhurst in PA. In his March 28, 1994 opinion, Judge Raymond Broderick said that the city and state had engaged in sustained and deliberate avoidance of their obligations to hundreds of former Pennhurst residents. Specifically, the court found the following:

70 to 90 clients were "lost" in the system

· 35% of the homes had out-of-date programs.

· 83% lacked various types of services

· 45% had no program to take clients into the community.

· 68% did not provide adequate therapy.
38% had rapid staff turnover.

We must make sure that this is not the fate of those from the closure at North Princeton by asking for a full accounting of their current whereabouts and how they got there. We must also ask where the residents of recent discharged from the DC's are. We have had a few that have come back to our centers with serious injury's and other's that have been hurt and either sent to nursing homes, other homes or sadly to the homes where they were hurt due to abuse or neglect.

Myth #4 Closing centers will provide more money for those on the waiting list. Truth#4 Closing our centers will not result in movement off the waiting list for anyone and will delay any planning to find placements in this already growing list. Using our centers for admissions of those who need ICF/MR services and opening the doors of the center for use as a community medical resource will save money and allow more people to be served, decrease the waiting list, provide medical, dental and respite services and keep those in the community out of emergency rooms desperate to find a doctor or dentist that know how to treat them. The current climate is making parents of those on the waiting list look at parents from the Developmental Centers as the cause of their problems and that is neither true nor fair. Our children are like
the intensive care end of the DD population. It is not cheaper to have ICU patients all over the hospital and it is not cheaper to keep severely disabled children spread into community settings where either their care will be as or more expensive (without Medicaid reimbursement) or not existent putting them at serious risk.

There needs to be a moratorium in place to stop the removal of clients from our centers, until we can be sure that this is the wish of family members, team members and guardians without prejudice. There are very few if any current residents of the centers who can fully understand what they would be giving up by leaving their current home and moving into a group home. They also don’t understand that the move is permanent, as the door seems to swing only one way.

Final Thoughts
It is necessary to have a full and forensic audit of all DDD records and contracts. There should be an effort made to eliminate spending within this department that does not directly provide services to clients and families across all placements and that duplicate services to those already within the division should be ended including outside case management and Information and Referral Database services.
It is necessary to eliminate the Bureau of Guardianship Services and replace it with guardians from the community. This will save the state money and provide a firewall
between the Division of Developmental Disabilities and the clients best interests.
COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 1032  
Bill Ricci, Principal Engineer, DOT  
February 2, 2010

COST SAVINGS BY BRINGING CAPITAL PROGRAM  
ENGINEERING BACK IN-HOUSE AT THE DOT

**Construction Inspection**

Average Annual Expenditures for Consultants  
In five fiscal years from FY 2003 thru FY 2007  
(Data provided by DOT Commissioner)  
$37.19 million

Savings by doing work in-house  
(DOT Cost Study, 2007)  
39.5%

**Annual Dollar Savings by doing work in-house**  
($37.19 million X 39.5%)  
$14.69 million

**Engineering Design**

Average Annual Expenditures for Consultants  
In five fiscal years from FY 2003 thru FY 2007  
(Data provided by DOT Commissioner)  
$99.76 million

Savings by doing work in-house  
(DOT Cost Study, 2008)  
54%

**Annual Dollar Savings by doing work in-house**  
($99.76 million X 54%)  
$53.87 million

**Bridge Inspection**

Average Annual Expenditures for Consultants  
In five fiscal years from FY 2003 thru FY 2007  
(Data provided by DOT Commissioner)  
$10.12 million

Savings by doing work in-house  
45%

**Annual Dollar Savings by doing work in-house**  
$4.55 million

**Total Annual Dollar Savings by doing the work in-house**  
$73.21 million

*All calculations are based on the FY 2007 Advisability Studies prepared by the Division of Budget, Bureau of Program Analysis*
On behalf of New Jersey Association Community Providers, our Board of Directors and the 35,000 people with developmental disabilities our agencies support, we appreciate the opportunity to share our thoughts on improving New Jersey’s economic climate. My name is Kim Todd the CEO of the New Jersey Association of Community Providers (NJACP). NJACP is a statewide association committed to ensuring continuing progress toward greater quality of life for people with developmental disabilities. Our organization is comprised of community based organizations that provide an essential foundation of services and supports including group homes, supported living and a full range of community services to support individuals with developmental disabilities both in agency residences, at home with their families and in their own homes. We applaud the Legislature for looking to bold new ideas to put New Jersey on a forward looking path to economic stability.

New Jersey’s fiscal climate presents an opportunity to revise our continued costly investment and overreliance on institutional care to better meet the needs of New Jersey residents with developmental disabilities and their families. Due to our continued reliance on institutional care, New Jersey has been unable to provide desperately needed supports and services to the ten thousand people who wait on the community services waiting list and the thousands that are segregated in NJ’s institutions. There are countless stories of people who continue to wait in developmental centers segregated from society for years while awaiting a chance to live in the community. Thousands of others wait for services, many of whom are being cared for by aging caretakers and are at risk of developmental center placement while they await services sometimes for over a decade on a community services waiting list that continues to grow by the thousands. Young people transitioning from the education system have few options.

This year, New Jersey’s Division of Developmental Disabilities will expend 1/3 of its $1.3 billion dollar budget to support about 2,900 people or 8% of the people it serves with over 80% in institutions that do not require these costly services based on their individual habilitation plans.

In 2008, these services were provided at an average cost of $642 per day per person or an annual cost of $234,434 per person. Each year, the costs have risen approximately 9%. Over the last year, the daily rate has escalated to $710 per day per person or $259,150 per person annually. Four years from now, the average daily rate will escalate to $1,000 per day. In addition, these aging large institutions will cost the tax payers millions of dollars in unavoidable upkeep and capital renovations.
We believe a solution lies in passing A-1673/S-811, the proposed bipartisan legislation to rebalance the DD system sponsored by Assemblyman Lou Greenwald and Senators Joe Vitale and Tom Kean, Jr. This proposed legislation provides:

- a plan to rebalance the way services are funded to develop and strengthen community options, offering much needed supports, personal choice and self determination
- a plan to reduce our reliance on institutional care while strengthening community supports and services without additional cost.
- a budget neutral way to provide more services to more people
- and capitalizes on the efficient use of existing funds and maximizing the federal support.

The plan contained in A-1673/S-811 provides a responsible approach to funding services based on the successes of other states, increases opportunities and the choices for people with developmental disabilities and spends the taxpayer dollar more efficiently and effectively. Taking this step, will enable New Jersey to follow the path of the rest of the nation and change the lives of thousands of New Jersey residents with developmental disabilities. Across the nation, for three decades states have closed 140 institutions and restructured their services to support people living with developmental disabilities in the community. We look to New Jersey to follow suit.

Without this bill, the status quo of unnecessary institutionalization, spiraling costs, less services and decades long waiting lists will continue to grow leaving generations to come with little hope.

Thank you.

New Jersey Association of Community Providers
1005 Whitehead Road Extension – Suite 1B
Ewing, New Jersey 08638  Phone: 609-406-1400 – Fax: 609-406-1442  ktodd@njacp.org
www.njacp.org
February 2, 2010

Remarks to Assembly Bi-Partisan Hearing

For us it’s very simple. We are all the same. Everyone belongs. Everyone has a right to live in a community. We all do – everyone in this room lives in a community. We do not segregate because someone has a developmental disability.

We don’t know any family who has said “I want my loved one to live in a segregated, congregate living arrangement.” Yet that is what most families have lurking on the horizon if their loved one needed an emergency placement today. Families who have supported their loved one in the family home, who are waiting for community services and want it in their own community are one step away from an institution in the event of an emergency because our state has not kept up with much of the rest of our nation.

Maryland recently closed their last institution. Governor Patric of Massachusetts ordered the closing of 4 of his state’s 6 institutions over a four year period for fiscal reasons. Yet New Jersey continues to talk about it. “We can’t do it” is a common theme. Eleven states in our country have no institutions. The majority of the other 39 have plans to close their institutions. Yet New Jersey continues to talk about it. If they can figure it out, why can’t we?

A1673/S811 are unprecedented. This legislation addresses the looming waiting list that so many families dread – they address the individuals who want to live in a setting that is not an institution – and they address the redeployment of staff. Finally, they address the NJ taxpayer whose hard earned dollars are poured into institutions with 9% unsustainable annual budget increases. A1673/S811 answer the question of “How can we rebalance the DD system and state resources so all will be served equitably?” It will end the fear families have of having their loved one placed in an institution because there are not enough community resources. It will put NJ in the 21st century and move us where most other states in our country have been for years.

We believe our state can change. We believe the proposed legislation will effect positive change for everyone in NJ who has a developmental disability. I thank
you for listening and acknowledging the rights of our family members to be fully engaged citizens.

Ann C. Martinelli, President
Advocates for Alternatives, Inc.
P.O. Box 162
Colts Neck, NJ 07722
(908) 586 – 9257
advocatesforalternativesinc@yahoo.com
Testimony to the Bipartisan Leadership Committee
February 2, 2010

Mark Valli
President & CEO
New Jersey After 3, Inc.

New Jersey After 3 is a private, nonprofit corporation that supports a network of evidence-based afterschool programs in 117 urban, rural and suburban schools; supporting some 12,000 students and their families statewide. New Jersey After 3 programs operate in public schools (including charter schools) through partnerships with over 40 nonprofit organizations that include Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCA’s, museums, community & faith-based organizations, hospitals and universities.

New Jersey After 3’s goals and demonstrated impact align with the administration’s top priorities, and include the areas of Crime & Gang Prevention, Urban School Reform, and Workforce Development. New Jersey After 3 tackles each of these priorities in a way that is cost-effective and measurable; while delivering a significant rate of return on the state’s financial investment.

Investing in New Jersey After 3 Addresses Critical State Priorities

A) Crime/Gang Prevention: Nonprofit organizations are a critical component in the State’s efforts to improve public safety & reducing violent crime. Investing in New Jersey After 3 is a cost-effective and smart way to deliver on this promise. National studies demonstrate that for every $1 invested in afterschool programs, the reductions in social and public services save between $3 and $121. Every at-risk child steered clear of the justice system through afterschool programs saves between $1.7 and $2.3 million in costs to tax payers2.

B) Urban School Reform: Expanding student learning time through afterschool programs is an effective way to improve student achievement and turn around low-performing schools. Recent, independent evaluation demonstrates the academic benefits of participation in New Jersey After 3 programs, such as improved language arts skills, improved study skills and improved homework completion among other academic and behavioral benefits3. Comprehensive, national studies of high-quality afterschool programs demonstrate that students who participate do better in school,

---

1 Afterschool Alliance, Afterschool Alert Issue Brief No. 22, November 2005
2 The Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth; Journal of Quantitative Criminology, Cohen, Marc A; 1998
3 Increasing Opportunities for Academic and Social Development: Evaluation of New Jersey After 3; Policy Studies Associates, January 2008
are less likely to drop out of school\(^4\), and support higher income in adulthood\(^4\). New Jersey After 3 intends to be part of the State’s Race to the Top application, and will be a competitive applicant in the U.S. Department of Education’s Investing in Innovation (i3) grant competition.

C) Workforce Development: New Jersey After 3 drives workforce development in two distinct ways. In the short-term, it ensures affordable care for thousands of children from 3pm to 6pm: a time when parents are still at work, and juvenile crime triples\(^5\). Student participation in New Jersey After 3 programs allows parents to seek and retain fulltime employment. In the long-term, New Jersey After 3 is developing the skills students will need to succeed in the 21st century workforce. With growing demand on schools to meet NCLB requirements, lessons and activities that teach and reinforce critical skills like communication, problem-solving, teamwork and leadership are falling to the wayside (along with other activities like art, gym and civics). New Jersey After 3 expands learning time each school day by 40% to develop these critical workplace skills in students.

Delivering Measurable Results in Student Achievement
A three-year, external evaluation published by Policy Studies Associates in April 2009 shows that New Jersey After 3 programs significantly impact student achievement, particularly in the critical areas of language arts and study skills\(^7\). The study found that participants reported finishing their homework more often, solving math problems better, feeling better about schoolwork, and achieving better grades. Students, their classroom teachers, and their parents attributed these benefits to the New Jersey After 3 program.

Delivering Cost-Effective Solutions
According to the findings of a national study by Public/Private Ventures in 2009, New Jersey After 3 spends less than half the average daily cost of other high-quality afterschool programs in the nation\(^8\). The cost of New Jersey After 3 to the State is about $8 per child, per day. Public/Private Ventures reports that the average high-quality programs cost between $22 and $26 per child, per day. Our total program costs for a year of programming are about $1,100 per child, per year.

Need & Strong Public Support
There is resounding public support for high-quality afterschool programs locally and nationally, across private and public sectors, and across political party lines. A February 2009 poll by the


\(^7\) Increasing Opportunities for Academic and Social Development: Evaluation of New Jersey After 3; Policy Studies Associates, January 2008.

\(^8\) The Cost of Quality Out-of-School-Time Programs; Commissioned by The Wallace Foundation; Public/Private Ventures & The Finance Project; 2009.
Monmouth University Polling Institute shows that 9 out of 10 New Jersey residents believe all students should have easy access to affordable afterschool programs and a more recent study released by the Afterschool Alliance shows that 80% of New Jersey residents support public funding for afterschool programs and that more than 400,000 students would attend an afterschool program if one were available to them.

**Delivering Private Sector Support and Federal Investment in New Jersey Communities**

In just five years, New Jersey After 3’s program network has leveraged more $35 million against the State’s overall investment – a 46% rate of return. These investments, however, are contingent upon the State maintaining, if not increasing, its current level of support of $10,400,000 per year.

At a time when businesses, schools and working families are struggling, New Jersey After 3 continues to be an attractive investment for corporate, foundation, and federal grants. Private sector investment in New Jersey After 3 has increased 76% in its most recent fiscal year despite the economic downturn, and the organization is well-positioned to bring ARRA and other federal funds to New Jersey’s communities and schools as they become available in 2010.

New Jersey After 3 provides an innovative and evidence-based model that delivers real results for New Jersey’s children and families in alignment with the Governor-elect’s priorities. It keeps kids safe, supports working families, promotes positive youth development, and improves student achievement. Finally, New Jersey After 3 is cost-effective and produces a measurable return on the State’s investment by attracting private-sector investment.

Thank you for your time, and for your consideration of continued support for New Jersey After 3.

---

9 America After 3 PM Study, Commissioned by The JC Penny Foundation, Afterschool Alliance, October 2009
Comments to New Jersey Legislature
John F. Laezza
February 2, 2010

Thank you for the opportunity to present my opinions to this august committee as to the thoughts that may be considered to better serve the State as it relates to its’ fiscal health.

Prior to presenting my ideas, I would like to provide a brief summary of my background being involved in government my entire professional life.

I am a graduate of Rider University with both a BS in Commerce and a Masters in Public Administration.

I am a Certified Public Accountant, Registered Municipal Accountant, and a licensed Public School Accountant.

My career started in 1952 being involved in municipal audits, school audits, county audits, and authority audits. I was also involved in many financial consulting projects to improve the management of local government.

- In 1970, I was the Deputy Director of Local Government Services in the Department of Community Affairs and became the Director in 1972. I was fortunate enough to serve under both Governor Cahill and Governor Byrne.
- I left state government in 1979 to become a partner in Arthur Young, which was subsequently merged with Ernst and Whinney to become Ernst and Young. I was the partner in charge of Government Practices.
- Presently, I am the Business Administrator in the Township of Clark, Union County.

I give you this background in an attempt to convey to you that my thoughts come from many years of government experience in matters of finance and property taxation.

At the outset, I was somewhat ambivalent to present my views as some may perceive them to be extreme, however, I thought that in these economic times with the condition of the fiscal health of both the State and our Local Governments, extreme actions must be considered and start to be implemented.

For the past 33 or 34 years since the start of the NJ Gross Income Tax that was to be the savior of property tax relief, I continue to marvel at the yearly actions taken by state government. They balance the state budget on the backs of local government and brag about maintaining a nominal income tax rate.

In an attempt to soothe the citizenry, with emphasis on seniors, the Property Tax Rebate and the Property Tax Freeze have been instituted and continue to be a political promise
with little or no thought on how to develop a true property tax relief program. I am sure I am not telling each of you anything new.

Everything you read in the press is that property taxes are exorbitant because local elected officials are not prudent in developing their municipal or school budgets. Having been involved in 567 municipal budgets and 21 county budgets during my tenure as Director of Local Government Services, I can truly say that those charges are the exception and not the rule.

In fact, those governments that were “mismanaged” were usually rewarded by the legislature with programs such as “Extraordinary Aid”, “Discretionary Aid” and you name whatever additional aid program you can recall. They have been doing this, while continually shorting local government aid, in accordance with legislation on the books.

Let me try to get specific with a certain topic that we all agree is a major cause of our State deficit; pensions for both public employees and police and fire personnel.

The “blame” is usually put on either Governor Whitman’s bonding of the pension due to the breakdown in the investment of pension funds or the “pension holiday” that local governments were afforded during these same times.

As to the “pension holidays” I was the first and probably the only person opposed to same as they were of no help to local governments.

Why, you may ask? The answer is that the State reduced state aid to each municipality in the like amount. Therefore, the only benefit was that state government balanced their budget on the backs of local government, but called it property tax relief.

The legislature also continued to increase pension benefits to anyone making $1,500 or more, now $7,500. A number of people in the past 20 years had low paying public positions and then in the two or three years prior to their retirement, were “politically rewarded” with high paying positions. It is still going on. It must be stopped immediately! I am sorry to say some of the biggest abusers of this system have been legislators.

I cringe when I see the press call many valuable public servants who have been involved in positions as Tax Collectors, Finance Officers, and Assessors being put in the same categories as Municipal Attorneys and Engineers who have worked in many municipalities offering services.

The difference is that attorneys and engineers also had private practices and were Professional Consultants to the municipality. This practice must be stopped. Personnel serving on various paid government boards, be they State or Local, should not be considered pensionable positions, but merely receiving compensation for their time as private citizens.
I believe that the State should fund the shortfall that they created. We should also look at positions such as school crossing guards and police specials.

Speaking about school crossing guards, I would request that school guards be put in the category of seasonal employees and not be allowed to receive unemployment checks for both the summer vacation and the holidays that schools are closed during the year. I am sure that an investigation of these costs over the past will show a substantial charge to the unemployment funds.

“Shared services” and “consolidation” are two buzzwords that have been voiced in the halls of the Statehouse for the past 38 years with the “hope” that the voluntary approach by local governments with certain revenue incentives from the State would make it happen and would make a significant reduction in property tax relief.

It has not happened for several reasons. One is that the State, in developing incentives always inserts the golden rule of government, namely that "the one with the gold rules how it can be spent". Secondly, it was never sufficient to be a good carrot and lastly everyone wants to maintain “local home rule”.

If the State wants to truly effect “consolidation” it can only be accomplished by a “Constitutional Convention” similar to what was done in 1947. I say this in earnest as it was a paper I had written in 1974 working towards my Masters Degree at Rider College. We now have 566 local governments with over 350 having a population of less than 10,000 people, in fact many with populations of less than 5,000 people. That is inefficient. That accounts for 350 mayors, legislators, chiefs of police, attorneys and all other ancillary services. This State should probably be made up of no more than 200 to 250 local governments. The same probably holds true for school districts. That would go a long way in developing property tax relief.

Legislation has recently been introduced by Senators' Kyrillos and Smith. This legislation would mandate that Tax Collection Services, Tax Assessment Services, Health Services and Animal Control Enforcement be transferred to county government.

This would only add another layer of bureaucracy to services that by in large are being performed in an efficient manner. It would also cause a hardship on the citizens as well as being a problem as to accountability in relation to the fiscal operations of local governments in complying with Title 54, Title 40a, etcetera. County government is not the answer to property tax relief.

In fact, county government as it is presently created should be abolished. Once again, this probably needs to be done by a Constitutional Convention. I would suggest that someone investigate how it was done in Connecticut.

County government, as it is presently created has “no essential powers”. This means that it cannot perform any services without approval by the legislature. I know this because in 1972 when Federal Revenue Sharing was passed, counties in the state of NJ were not
eligible to receive revenue sharing. Further, all the townships in NJ were not considered municipalities, but were in fact, places and as such, did not qualify for revenue sharing.

I went to Washington to explain to President Nixon and his staff how all municipalities were incorporated governments and should be entitled. We won that battle. It was also necessary for all municipalities in each county to enter into an Interlocal Service Agreement to transfer municipal powers in order to have revenue sharing passed from Federal to counties and then to municipalities. That process is still in place today as it relates to community development block grants.

In today’s property tax world, municipalities transfer 100% of the property tax needs of the county in relation to the equalized property values of their communities without input as to services available to each of them. As an example, a municipality such as Clark Township, where I presently am the Business Administrator, sends $10 plus million dollars to Union County for such services as snow plowing on three county roads, leaf collection on those same roads, bridge replacement when needed as ongoing operational services. County police services include travel through the township to oversee county parks, which I feel is a duplication of regular police services.

This is a simplification of county services as many other services are provided to other municipalities, however, I just want to stress that the services provided can be implemented by local governments at well below the $10 million expended by Union County.

The county is in reality a “State Agency” and should therefore be funded by the State for those services rendered such as the courts, hospitals, welfare and human services, correctional facilities, prosecutors and investigators. I believe that the elimination of county government would provide well in excess of $3 billion in property tax relief.

Who would fund the other services? That is a good question. The answer is simple; a slight increase in income taxes. This would be a better approach to taxation rather than a regressive property tax.

A further idea as to a revenue source for education could be related to businesses in NJ with over 50 employees. It is a well-known fact that businesses in NJ are here because of their ability to find people with the academic background to serve their respective needs. In that regard, I feel that if we charged each business with over 50 employees a 2% gross payroll tax and dedicated that revenue to education, it would go a long way in closing the gap. Extreme maybe, but I think it is worth a look. I presently do not know the gross payroll in NJ, but I feel sure that it exceeds $70 billion.

Another extreme idea would be to reduce the sales tax to 3.5% but tax all products purchased. Once again, a hard pill to swallow, but I believe necessary.

As to reduction in state expenditures, I believe that the operation of the Department of Community Affairs can be assimilated by the Department of Treasury. It provides
services that can be provided by private firms, professional consultants and local
governments. The overseeing of local governments by the Division of Local Services
can continue in the Department of the Treasury where it first began in the 40’s.

I am also sure that there are a number of departments that have grown over and above
their respective needs.

Another area that needs a detailed study is the operation or need for Civil Service. I
know the concept of the program is to eliminate cronyism or favoritism in hiring;
however, the unions have that control. The structure of local government today is a
guarantee for failure. If private enterprises had Civil Service restrictions as to hiring and
firing, we would have more failures than successes.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, I would be happy to try to answer
them.
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly,

Thank you for holding this forum today and providing us with the opportunity to speak. I am James Zarzaca and I am a resident of Willingboro. My father was the first sergeant hired when the Willingboro Police Department was started in 1959 and was a nationally competitive shooter. I am also a recently retired officer from the same police department. During my years on the police department, I was a firearm instructor, a Remington shotgun armorer and a Glock master armorer. I mention this so you will understand that I have been around firearms extensively my entire life and that I am coming from a public safety perspective. I would like to address a few pieces of pending legislation dealing with firearms and our 2nd Amendment rights.

I have recently read Assembly Bill No. 1384, cited as “The Citizens’ Protection Act.” Kudos to Assemblymen Carroll, Chiappone, DiMaio and all the co-sponsors who have introduced this bill. This bill is long overdue and would go a long way towards returning to the citizens of the State their Right to protect themselves. I would like to encourage the entire legislature to pass such a bill, with a few changes that I will mention later.

As is pointed out in the Bill, Article 1 of the NJ Constitution states:

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

The Bill then goes on to list a number of statistics as justification for the need to change the existing legislation. These statistics prove that crime rates are lower and people are safer in areas where law-abiding citizens are allowed to carry weapons. I would like to point out a few more important statistics to illustrate the need to allow citizens to protect themselves.

According to the most recent data released by the FBI in the Uniform Crime Report, there were nearly 1.4 million violent crimes in the U.S. in 2008. Aggravated assault accounted for 60.4% and robbery for 32% of those violent crimes. Nationally, offenders used firearms in 66.9% of all murders, 43.5% of robberies and 21.4% of aggravated assaults.

The New Jersey State Police conducted a gang survey in 2007. They reported that street gangs are present on 43% of the State’s municipalities, up 10% from the 2004 survey. 69% of all residents in the State reside in a town with a street gang presence. In the southern half of the state where I happen to live, more than 55% of the towns report a gang presence. This is more than double the 25% reported in 2004. The most common violent crimes committed by street gangs are Assaults, Aggravated Assaults and Robbery/ Thefts.

Contrary to what anti-gun proponents would have you believe, police cannot protect you. It is a reactionary job. A crime is committed against you and you call the police. They show up after the fact. Hopefully they can solve the crime and catch the perpetrator. Unfortunately, criminals are usually back on the streets with little or no real punishment. I have arrested dozens of people
for crimes including weapons offenses, aggravated assaults, robberies and vehicle thefts and not a single case was heard in Superior Court. With the exception of one domestic violence assault, every crime I ever handled was either plea-bargained or downgraded in Superior court. So instead of limiting the rights of honest citizens, maybe the legislature should be spending its time revising Court procedures.

It should be noted that police have been having a hard enough time protecting themselves. In this months issue of the New Jersey FOP News, NJ FOP President Ed Brannigan wrote that there has been “an abrupt increase in ambush and rampage-style assault on police officers. Law enforcement fatalities as a result of gunfire rose 26% last year.” In its 50 year History, WILLINGBORO HAS HAD 6 G.I. SHOOTINGS; ONE IN THE ’60S, ONE IN THE ’70S, 4 IN THE LAST 4 YEARS.

New Jersey’s current law requires a citizen to prove to a Judge a “justifiable need” to carry a weapon. It is widely known that this terminology is intentionally meant to discourage people from applying for a carry permit. It has effectively banned honest law abiding citizens from carrying a weapon and prevents them from protecting themselves. This is in direct conflict with Article 1 of the NJ Constitution.

I’ve had numerous conversations with local business owners in this matter over the years. Many have expressed a concern in the rise of armed robberies and are worried about getting robbed either in their place of business or when transporting their daily receipts to the bank. Most have told me that they know they would not be granted the permit so they would not even bother applying. I’ve personally known two businessmen who did apply for a carry permit. Both requests were denied by the Courts and in both instances, the businessmen were instructed by the Judge in effect, “to just hand over their money if they were robbed, that’s what insurance is for”. The Courts apparently do not care that their life would be in danger.

This type of policy is 100% contrary to both Article 1 of the NJ constitution and the 2nd Amendment of the U. S. Constitution. The 2nd Amendment states:

“...the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.”

In their District of Columbia vs. Heller, 554 U.S. (2008) decision, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the 2nd Amendment was an individual right. Any law in NJ that violates either of these articles is unconstitutional and should be struck down.

I would like the assembly to consider changing the requirements for retired officers in this bill to more closely match the requirement of civilians. Currently, retired officers permits are valid for one year and civilians’ for two. Bill 1384 proposes changing the civilian permit to five years. I would suggest that these permits should be valid until a person changes their address. This is the policy that is currently in effect for the Firearms ID card. It would drastically cut down on the backlog of paperwork for the State Police, which currently takes 2-3 months to return a permit. I have been waiting over two months for my new permit. This would save the State money in labor costs. It would also save retired officers and civilians alike from paying annual fees, which are nothing more than added taxes.

I would also like the Assembly to consider removing the requirement for retired officers and civilians to qualify on a bi-annual basis. I understand the need for qualifications for active law enforcement for liability reasons. However, as per 2C:3-1, retired officer and civilians that use deadly force assume their own liability. I would much rather spend my time and money on ammunition for practical training. It has bee my experience that the type of person who would apply for a carry permit would also be concerned with keeping up on their proficiency with their
gun handling. Most of the civilians I have met that would like to be allowed to carry, practice
shooting and compete at shooting events much more frequently that most police officers I've
known.

The fact of the matter is that criminals will always circumvent the law and use weapons to
commit crimes. Police cannot be everywhere and protect everyone. It is up to the individual to
protect themselves, their family and their property. I can see no justifiable reason for the
legislature to enact any laws that prevent this. This includes the weapons ban and
the pending "Ammo Accountability" bill.

Thank you for your time and attention. I look forward to answering any question.

James Zarzaca
45 Enderly Lane
Willingboro, NJ
February 2, 2010 Public Hearing  
Chaired by Representatives Munoz and Bramnick  
New Jersey Annex Trenton.

Name: Robert B. McDonough  
Address: 3 Bradford Ln. Plainsboro NJ  
Phone: 609-658-5376  
Email address: Maybeboss826@aol.com

Subject: How to save money in the State of New Jersey

I have 2 concerns regarding how the state could save money. I run a small business in this state and am faced with an increase in my Workman’s compensation taxes in July because the fund is now out of money. I have read that this could cost my company as much as an additional $1,000 per employee to help the state to revitalize the fund. This will cause me to consider letting go of at least half of my employees because I can not afford to pay this additional added money over from what I am now paying. New Jersey needs to find funds from other sources.

My next suggestion is that we need to try and get people who have not even been convicted of a crime released in a timely manor.

I have researched that we incarcerate an inordinate number of people for crimes that could be adjudicated much faster in the courts thereby saving the need to have these low level people kept in jails at very high excessive bails. This causes their families to find means how ever they can to try and get them released. It costs over $30,000 to keep one person in a country jail or more if they are then sent to prison. We have people in county jails that have bails in excess of $650,000 for crimes that do not warrant such high bail. They sit and wait for the overburdened court system to eventually put them on a docket for a trial that in many cases would end up with an acquittal. The county jail system in my mind is a “make work” program. It allows the counties to hire people so they have jobs at the expense of the people they are charged to supervise in the jails. This is like modern day slavery.

This state should not be known as a state that puts everyone that makes a mistake or commits a minor crime to keep them in jail for so long. New Jersey could save millions of dollars by not just offering a plea which then has person end up in the system, but using the courts to move people through to a faster acquittal. Fine the person, but don’t put them in Limbo for an extended period that costs the tax payers excessive dollars that could be spent on more productive activities for the needs of the people.

I just hope that our new administration can correct the years of problems that we the people of New Jersey have now come to face.

Regards,  

Robert B. McDonough
HOW CAN NJ SAVE MONEY?

1. Overhaul the County Jail System- Why are our county jails overcrowded with so many non-violent people simply because they can't make bail?

This is burdening the NJ taxpayer for NO good reason. Too many non-violent people are being kept in county jails due to high bail. The inmate loses his job, and when he finally gets out- must go on welfare. Another burden to the taxpayer. Inmates are treated as a commodity. Where is innocent until proven guilty? What about the right to “make bail”? This is costing our state and the taxpayer huge amounts of money. Everyone loses except the penal industry. It seems to be all politics. By not allowing the accused to make bail, every one suffers. They are forced to take a plea or go to trial after sitting in the county jail for more than a year. Often, most will take a plea just to get out of jail, but then they are still in the system. Just costing more money. They are not allowed to go on with their life while they await trial.

2. Overhaul the NJ Prison System- Too Many Inmates Costs the Taxpayer

Too Many People Are Being Incarcerated for Non-Violent Crimes; many suffer from either a mental disability or have an addiction. They need help, not punishment. They then would be able to go on and lead productive lives and add to the economy, rather than waste away in prisons just costing the taxpayer.

3. Overhaul Megan’s Law and the Registry- Too Costly and Not Effective

Right now, so many people who are NOT child predators are on Megan’s Law. Megan’s Law is not what it was intended for. There are people on it for consensual sex or even only consensual contact. Young men in their twenties, either duped by teenagers or having consensual sex or even contact, are put on Megan’s Law. Yet these people are not child predators by any stretch of the imagination. Aside from it ruining their lives forever, it is a major cost to the taxpayer. Keeping them on Megan’s Law and making them go on probation forever costs NJ dearly. An absolute waste of our hard-earned taxpayer money, with no benefits.