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GOOD morning, everyone, and welcome to this hearing of the Legislative Select Committee on Investigation.

Today marks the beginning of an important new phase of our inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the closure of lanes leading into the George Washington Bridge from Fort Lee in September, and the apparent abuse of government power.

Today the Committee will receive testimony from Christina Renna, a former employee of the Governor’s Office of Intergovernmental Affairs who, as part of her official duties, worked under Bridget Kelly, and can hopefully shed light of a number of matters including the Fort Lee connection of this story.

Ms. Renna, thank you very much for agreeing to appear here today.

As everyone here is aware, the information we have available to us indicates that a number of individuals have firsthand knowledge as to what happened on that bridge in September. Unfortunately for the people who were affected by these four days of unnecessary traffic jams, some of those parties have refused to cooperate with this investigation, invoking their constitutional rights against self-incrimination. The reason we’ve asked you to appear here today is because of the unique insights into some of the facts surrounding this matter that you appear to have by virtue of the people with whom you most recently worked.

Our hope is that the information that you and other witnesses provide will help us understand what safeguards broke down and allowed a critical piece of infrastructure like the George Washington Bridge to be used
as a political tool. We hope that you can help in answering some of these questions, and we appreciate your cooperation, and we appreciate your being here.

May we have a roll call, please?

MR. BUONO (Committee Aide): Assemblywoman Schepisi.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Here.

MR. BUONO: Senator O’Toole.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Handlin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Carroll. (no response)

Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle. (no response)

Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Here.

MR. BUONO: Majority Leader Greenwald. (no response)

Senator Greenstein.

SENATOR GREENSTEIN: Here.

MR. BUONO: Senator Gill.

SENATOR GILL: Here.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Caride.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Present.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN S. WISNIEWSKI (Co-Chair): Present.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Weinberg.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Here.
Thank you.

Assemblywoman Handlin, you have a statement before I call the witness?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Actually, I have a few questions about the schedule of witnesses. About a week ago we all received an official communication which gave us a list of the individuals who had agreed to testify before this Committee. And on that list there were two top decision makers from the Port Authority; one was Foye, the other one was Schuber. And then, a couple of days later, there was an exposé in the media about yet another unconscionable backroom deal at the Port Authority. This was the one where the Port Authority paid a half a million dollars to some architect crony who had not even been hired by the Port Authority. And I am dismayed at the fact that magically our two witnesses discovered that they were too busy to come to talk to us. And apparently they found conflicts that are holding them until at least June; perhaps longer.

Frankly, I’m very skeptical that they have any intention of coming here. And we all know that the Port Authority is spending $22 million a day, every day, while this Committee -- for whatever reason -- fails to take up the task of reform.

And so my first question is: What exactly is the strategy for dragging these Port Authority decision makers in here?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman, I think they have both agreed to appear, and we do have them scheduled for June.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: When they were scheduled-- One of them was scheduled for this afternoon.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Correct. But there was a conflict in schedules, and we also felt that Ms. Renna’s testimony might run over a little bit. So we were happy to accommodate. But they both have agreed -- as far as I know -- they both agreed, and their attorneys have agreed, and they will be here in June.

So although we will be officially -- or have officially issued subpoenas, we’re really not dragging them here; they’re coming appropriately.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: Well, and noting that we did in fact go to court and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to try to force Kelly and Stepien to come here, because we believed that they might be at the center of the lane closure controversy, this is a case where we know we are dealing with the ringleaders of the circus. They are the ones who are deciding about all the shenanigans over there. And I don’t think that we should continue to let them continue to run their clown operation while we pursue headlines any way that we can. And if they won’t come in, I would like to ask that we consider bringing in a number of other top decision makers at the Port Authority who can give us all the insight, that we repeatedly said we needed, into the Port Authority. After all, our one, unique contribution to this whole situation is that we are the ones who can legislate, we are the ones who can reform the Port Authority.

So I would like to ask if we would consider issuing subpoenas for the following people, at a minimum: General Counsel Darryl Bookbinder; Vice Chairman Scott Rechler; Peter Zipf, the Chief Engineer;
Jose Rivera, the Chief Traffic Engineer; Robert Durando, the General Manager of the George Washington Bridge; and Cristina Lado, the Port Authority Government Affairs person.

I know that what we’ve done in the past has been to walk into the back room and somehow, out of the air, a list of subpoenas has been presented to us that we’ve agreed to. But perhaps this time we can have a public discussion about whether or not these people can be dragged before us, because we need to hear from them.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman, your term is dragged. As I told you, both the Executive Director Pat Foye and the Commissioner Pat Schuber have agreed to appear before us on June 3. So I have no question about that. If you want to submit your list, we will take that under consideration. So thank you for putting it forth.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: I absolutely will. You have more faith in them than I do. Again, for the record, I don’t believe that they’re going to be here. I think they’re going to find many other things to do. And that the longer we let them get away with it, the more the meter runs, and the more money we’re looking at being spent by a bunch of clowns who really have no interest other than themselves.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Madam Chair.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman Schepisi, I am going to give you the floor, but I-- Let me just give you a little housekeeping here.

We have a very important witness before us, and we’re here to hear her -- not, hopefully, too much from ourselves. We will have a quick lunch break around 12:30 for a very short time, and I plan to adjourn this
meeting by 3:30 today. So I need your cooperation in being able to move the questioning forward.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Chair, just for a moment. After Assemblywoman Schepisi, I have like a 60-second comment that I’d like to make. I'll keep it short.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I'll get the time watch ready.

(laughter)

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Thank you, Chair.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman Schepisi.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Madam Chairwoman, I do appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Unfortunately we haven’t met as a group in a while, so just going to what Assemblywoman Handlin had said I would like to make a motion to issue subpoenas to the General Counsel, the Vice Chairman, Peter Zipf, Jose Rivera, Robert Durando, and Cristina Lado to have them come in as well and testify. If we’re truly trying to understand what transpired at the Port Authority to be able to put forth appropriate reforms to the Port Authority, I think it’s important that we bring in these additional Port Authority individuals who, even in timelines and stuff that we have received -- documents that we have received -- these are names that have come up repeatedly with respect to the traffic study, with respect to lane realignments and the like.

And I do make a motion to issue subpoenas to them.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: I’ll second that.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Any comment?
ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I move to table that at the moment. And, quite frankly, I’m-- You know, we have a witness here. And I would like to get on with conducting that interview with this witness instead of all of this information that’s coming up for the first time.

Assemblywoman, I find it distressful that you say we’re trying to “chase headlines” instead of bringing in these people. The Chairwoman has stated that they are scheduled in June. She said it not once, not twice, but three times, and you keep belaboring the point. Let’s get on with this witness, and let’s discuss, at an appropriate time, other subpoenas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: And, if I may, just real quickly--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Pardon me, there’s a motion to table. May I have a second?
ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Second.
SENATOR WEINBERG: It’s not debatable. May I have a roll call?
MR. BUONO: On the motion to table the motion, Assemblywoman Schepisi.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: No.
MR. BUONO: Senator O’Toole.
SENATOR O’TOOLE: No.
MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Handlin.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: No.
MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Carroll.
ASSEMBLYMAN CARROLL: No.
MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle. (no response)
Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Majority Leader Greenwald. (no response)

Senator Greenstein.

SENATOR GREENSTEIN: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Senator Gill.

SENATOR GILL: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Caride.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Weinberg.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Yes.

We will take those names under consideration.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: And Chairwoman, if I may just very briefly, to Mr. Moriarty’s point.

We recognize we have an important witness here. We have not had an opportunity to have a public meeting, I think, in close to two months. We have had various concerns about process and procedure that we’ve sent letters to the Committee on. And while we are very appreciative of receiving -- for the first time on Friday and Monday -- information regarding the strategy of what we’re doing and the like, we really, other than just having subpoenaed documents on a website, have not participated in this process. We have had numerous conference calls, we’ve been billed for memoranda we have never seen. So with respect to-- There are certain concerns that we still have about this process, particularly with respect to
the confidentiality, with respect to concerns that were raised as recently as May 2 in the letter from Angelo Genova to our Committee. We have respectfully requested numerous times, going back to January, that we all enter into confidentiality agreements for the integrity of this process; that we have grave concerns regarding leaks to the media of documents. And it’s not a partisan type of issue; it’s absolutely nonpartisan. Angelo Genova wrote a very strongly worded letter on May 2 and, to my knowledge, he’s counsel for the New Jersey State Democratic Party. And we have not had an opportunity to discuss any of these issues; we don’t know if our counsel intends on addressing it; if it’s going to be addressed before we bring in additional people; whether or not we’re going to actually do anything about it.

So I just wanted the opportunity to ask counsel very briefly whether or not there’s a strategy in place for us to be able to maintain the integrity of our investigation and not have witnesses refuse to provide documents because of their grave concerns about them being leaked to the media in violation of various rules, including N.J.S.A. 52:13E-1 and N.J.S.A. 52:13E-8.

And real quickly before we get on to this witness, if we can just have some sort of discussion with counsel regarding what we are doing to address this.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman, with all due respect, I do want to get on to the witness.

We have stated this publicly, and we have stated this privately -- Counsel has been at all of our private meetings -- that any of you are free
to call him -- you have his phone numbers -- to have a full discussion with him about anything.

So now you have put your process issues before us in writing, as well as publicly here. And I would like to move on. You have received all the documents that we’ve received. Everything is uploaded onto the secure website.

Senator O'Toole, you wanted to say something?

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Thank you, Chair. Briefly -- the clock is moving.

The letter that came to us from the lawyers Genova and Chertoff raised a very alarming issue. And now we have three New Jersey lawyers -- including Mr. Marino -- who’s essentially accusing this Committee or Committee members of leaking confidential documents in violation of the Fair Procedures Act. That, to me, is alarming. I think we have to do something about that. And I’d like to know here if there is any member who either accidently, intentionally, authorized the release of confidential subpoena documents in January, February and March. And if no one is willing to admit that -- and I don’t see anybody rushing forward-- I think it is such a serious charge. We are now under a cloud of suspicion. It undermines the integrity of this Committee. I’d like to make the motion that we collectively petition the Attorney General and ask him to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate this charge that’s been leveled at this Committee by three New Jersey lawyers. And as you well know, if a person is guilty of that -- forget the conspiracy part, if there is one -- they face up to six months in jail and $1,000 per offense. And for us to have three lawyers
accuse this Committee of leaking confidential documents and it goes unanswered, it really raises a question.

So I make that motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: I second it.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Any comments?

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I move to table. I find it preposterous. You know, now we’re going to investigate the investigators? You know, I find this-- These attorney letters -- they’re doing their job. You know, they’re claiming-- They’re trying to protect their clients and they’re taking a swipe at us. I see no purpose in this.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Well, Paul, it’s undeniable. The subpoenas were in the papers before we had received them.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Excuse me, through the Chair, Senator O’Toole.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Through the Chair. Thank you.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Through the Chair.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblyman Moriarty, are you finished speaking?

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I agree it’s troubling; but I don’t think that that’s going to help matters.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: It does help matters if other people will cooperate.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Excuse me, Senator O’Toole.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: I second the motion.

SENATOR WEINBERG: We have a motion to table.
May I have a vote, please?

MR. BUONO: On the motion to table the petition to the Attorney General to appoint a special prosecutor,

Assemblywoman Schepisi.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: No.

MR. BUONO: Senator O'Toole.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: No.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Handlin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: No.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Carroll.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARROLL: No.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Vainieri Huttle. (no response)

Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Majority Leader Greenwald. (no response)

Senator Greenstein.

SENATOR GREENSTEIN: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Senator Gill.

SENATOR GILL: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Caride.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Weinberg.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Yes. And in the interest of full disclosure, Angelo Genova was also my attorney who helped me fight the
case to get into the State Senate. And I respect that he’s representing his client to the best of his ability.

Thank you.

Okay, if there are no further issues to come before the Committee, the Committee calls Christina Renna, the former Director of Intergovernmental Affairs in the Office of the Governor, to testify.

Ms. Renna, thank you for appearing here today. I am Co-Chair; Assemblyman Wisniewski-- We are the Co-Chairs of the Committee. Are you accompanied by attorney today? And if so, please introduce yourself -- the attorney.

Henry E. Klingeman, Esq.: Good morning, members of the Committee. My name is Henry Klingeman, on behalf of Christina Renna.

Senator Weinberg: Ms. Renna, do you understand that the statements you make today-- I’m sorry. I’m going to make you more nervous than you already are.

Do you understand that if the statements you make today are willfully false, if you fail to answer a pertinent question, or commit perjury you may be subject to penalties under the law?

Christina Genovese Renna: I understand.

Senator Weinberg: Did you receive a subpoena from this Committee compelling your testimony at this meeting?

Ms. Renna: I did.

Senator Weinberg: Did you receive a copy of the Code of Fair Procedures, together with the subpoena?

Ms. Renna: I did.
SENATOR WEINBERG: Do you understand that you have certain rights under the Code of Fair Procedures, including the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to confer with you during your questioning, advise you of your rights, and submit proposed questions on your behalf?

MS. RENNA: I understand.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Does your counsel have any questions to submit today?

MR. KLINGEMAN: Not at this time, but as I explained to the Co-Chairs of the Committee, Ms. Renna has a very brief statement she’d like to make at the outset of her testimony.

SENATOR WEINBERG: As you can see we have a hearing reporter from the Office of Legislative Services Hearing Unit present. Your testimony is being recorded that it may be transcribed for the Committee and it may be used in other proceedings. Do you understand that?

MS. RENNA: I do.

SENATOR WEINBERG: You are entitled to a copy of the transcript of your testimony at your expense when such copy is available. Do you understand that?

MS. RENNA: I do.

SENATOR WEINBERG: You have the right to file a brief sworn statement relevant to your testimony for the record at the conclusion of your examination. Do you understand that?

MS. RENNA: I do.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Please note that all of your responses should be verbal. We cannot record a headshake or a nod. And if you do
not understand a question please ask for clarification; otherwise, we are going to assume that you understand the question and that your answers are responsive to that question. Do you understand that?

MS. RENNA: I do.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Before I proceed with the oath, do you have any questions?

MS. RENNA: No.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. You will be free to stop at any point and confer with your attorney, or if you need a brief break to just let us know.

Okay, please stand and raise your right hand.

(witness stands and raises right hand)

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is true, correct, and complete to the best of your information, knowledge, and belief?

MS. RENNA: I do.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Please be seated, and state your name for the record.

MS. RENNA: My name is Christina Renna.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you, Ms. Renna; and again, welcome.

Could you start out by describing for us the last position that you had in this Administration?

MS. RENNA: Respectfully, Chairwoman, I have brief statement I wanted to give.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Oh, I’m sorry. Yes, thank you.
Please go ahead with your statement.

MS. RENNA: Thank you, Chairwoman.

I appreciate the Committee giving me the opportunity to provide what knowledge I have regarding the George Washington Bridge lane closures, and share the truth about the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs. I hope I am able to further your understanding of the facts today.

I had no knowledge of, or involvement in, the bridge lane closures, but I do know IGA. The bridge lane closures did not in any way, shape, or form, exemplify the IGA I know. For four years IGA’s focus was good government. We engaged in proactive, consistent, and inventive outreach to Sandy storm victims, to a variety of community groups all across the political spectrum, to Democrats, to Republicans, and to Independents, in towns up and down New Jersey.

IGA was people helping people, State government helping local government regardless of political affiliation, ethnic or religious background, or economic standing.

IGA was amazingly nonpartisan in keeping with the Governor’s desire to maintain open communication and responsiveness as our top priorities. I am proud that IGA was exactly what government should be, and I am prouder still that the IGA staff mastered it. We accomplished truly wonderful things that Governor Christie extolled on numerous occasions -- praise that was echoed back to him by local officials, both Democrats and Republicans, as unprecedented.

I look forward to answering your questions today, and thank you for the opportunity to give a statement.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you, Ms. Renna.
Well, let me start off, since you gave your brief description of the IGA -- what was your title when you began working at IGA?

MS. RENNA: When I began working at IGA I was Director of Business Affairs.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And what were your responsibilities when you began-- What year did you begin?

MS. RENNA: I began in April of 2010.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, and what were your responsibilities when you began at IGA?

MS. RENNA: When I began at IGA my main focus was business outreach; specifically, I would reach out to local Chambers of Commerce and also counties Chambers of Commerce, regional Chambers of Commerce, and all the business organizations in the state to try to help, sort of, further the Governor’s message of what he wanted to do in office for economic development and job growth in the state.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And who did you directly report to when you started working there?

MS. RENNA: I directly reported to a woman by the name of Amanda Gasperino at the time; DePalma now -- Amanda DePalma.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And who headed IGA at that time?

MS. RENNA: Bill Stepien.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And what-- Was Bridget Kelly working at IGA at that point?

MS. RENNA: Yes, she was.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And what was her role and responsibility there, if you remember?
MS. RENNA: I believe her role was interfacing with the Legislature at that point.

SENATOR WEINBERG: She was a legislative liaison from IGA?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And when Mr. Stepien left the IGA to work on the campaign, is that when Ms. Kelly took over?

MS. RENNA: Yes, that’s correct.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Did she assume all of Mr. Stepien’s duties and responsibilities?

MS. RENNA: That’s my understanding.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And when Ms. Kelly took over the IGA, who did she report to?

MS. RENNA: Kevin O’Dowd, Chief of Staff.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And did she-- Is that where she took direction, or was she still-- Did she interface with other members of the Administration -- Mr. McKenna, the Governor himself -- anybody else in Administration?

MS. RENNA: I don’t specifically know; I would assume so.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Now, how did IGA differ from the Office of Constituent Relations? Do you know?

MS. RENNA: Yes. Constituent Relations -- OCR as we called it -- handled specifically constituent outreach: constituent phone calls, communications, e-mails that came in through the generic e-mail address, letters that were written. So Constituent Relations handled that aspect of
it. IGA was constituent relations specifically for local and county elected officials, and also certain constituent (indiscernible).

SENATOR WEINBERG: So Constituent Relations was more confined to individual constituents -- your bureaucratic problems.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Now, what about your interaction generally with the Port Authority? That’s obviously an issue that this Committee has devoted a fair amount of time to and will continue to in the future. Did the Authorities Unit that existed in the Governor’s Office interface with the Port Authority, or did you, from IGA, have any interface with them?

MS. RENNA: The Authorities Unit was the primary interface between the Port Authority and the Governor’s Office. IGA had some contact, but the primary point of contact was the Authorities Unit.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Were there any matters on which the IGA would have contact with the Port Authority that the Authorities Unit might play a role in or not play a role in? And if so, what kinds of activities would that be?

MS. RENNA: That’s a hard question for me to answer, just because I’m not sure what the Authorities Unit knew or didn’t know about what IGA -- the things IGA interfaced with the Port Authority about. I’m just not sure, so I don’t feel comfortable answering the question.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, but-- And, by the way, just for everybody’s edification, any of these exhibits that we have, if we refer to them, I think OLS is able to project them for all of us and everybody else to see.
And let me get into a little bit about your interview with Gibson Dunn.

MS. RENNA: Sure.

SENATOR WEINBERG: You told the interviewers that Kelly and Wildstein were “exceptionally close,” and that Wildstein called Kelly frequently, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: How did you know that?

MS. RENNA: Just from proximity to Bridget; just being in a room when he would call, or overhearing conversations between them.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Was your office located near hers?

MS. RENNA: No, it was not.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So it would just be when you happened to be in her office, or in the general vicinity that you noted-- I assume you couldn’t hear her when you were sitting in your office.

MS. RENNA: I mean, I just know factually from conversations with Bridget, to overhearing myself-- I mean, they were close friends. They were-- They got along very well together.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, so did you attribute that kind of interface between the two of them to a social relationship or to a business relationship? Or do you know why?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know the answer to that question. I would speculate business, but I don’t know the answer.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. You stated that you rarely interacted with David Wildstein, and that you did, maybe, five or six times, if I remember correctly. And that you interacted with some younger folks
who worked under Wildstein at the Port Authority. Could you tell us who those younger folks were?

MS. RENNA: There was one gentleman by the name of Jared; I can’t remember his last name. Ann O'Rourke was there; I used to deal with her quite a bit. But as far as other names, I don’t remember right now.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And what did you deal with them about?

MS. RENNA: A variety of issues. A lot of what IGA did was interfacing with the departments -- that’s a different component to the IGA operation. And for some time I was in the role of doing departmental relations. So whenever there were events with the Port Authority or events where Bill Baroni would be a speaker -- a surrogate on behalf of the Administration, things like that -- I would work logistically with the Port Authority on lining things like that up. That’s one good example. That was probably the most frequent communication I had with David and his team.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And that would be through these younger folks who worked under David Wildstein, generally?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I talked with David occasionally as well. But, you know, mostly it was done more at the staff level.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Does the Port Authority have its own communications staff who would be handling some of these issues like when Bill Baroni was giving a speech someplace, or explaining things somewhere?

MS. RENNA: I believe so.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, but the IGA or your office did interact with them anyway?
MS. RENNA: We wouldn’t interface with the communications shop, no.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Chair, a procedural question.

Are we asking questions about what she directly knows, or what we assume-- She said a couple of times, “I assume so.” We’re asking her whether the Port Authority had a communications department. So I think the directive-- If she doesn’t know, I don’t think she should assume, and I think the counsel would agree with me on that.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I assume that Ms. Renna’s counsel is perfectly able to give her counseling.

Anything else? (no response)

Thank you.

The reason I asked the question about the communications is that you brought up that you had some interactions with Bill Baroni when he was going to be a speaker someplace -- that’s when the IGA, or your office, had interactions with him. So my question about the communications staff was, wouldn’t they ordinarily be handling that? If you don’t know, feel free to say so.

MS. RENNA: I don’t know. And just a point of clarity, I never communicated with Bill Baroni directly.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

MS. RENNA: Okay.

SENATOR WEINBERG: All right. So who did you communicate with when you were dealing with-- I believe, if I understood you, you said that you had the interaction with the Port Authority when
Bill Baroni might be giving a speech someplace. I don’t know if I’m quoting you accurately, but that’s what I thought you said.

MS. RENNA: When Bill Baroni was a surrogate on behalf of the Administration I worked with staff to orchestrate that. I just wanted to clarify that I had not had any direct communications with Bill Baroni.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So when Mr. Baroni was employed at the Port Authority, he acted as a surrogate for the Governor. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And that’s when you would have had some interaction with whatever was going on around then?

MS. RENNA: Correct, yes. That’s an example.

SENATOR WEINBERG: If not directly with him.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Were you under any impression that when things were going on at the Port Authority or outreach of any kind by the Port Authority out to communities, that the IGA had any kind of a role in that?

MS. RENNA: I don’t think I understand your question. Could you clarify what you mean?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, when-- There was obviously a lot of interaction between the Port Authority and communities in New Jersey.

MS. RENNA: Right.

SENATOR WEINBERG: For a whole variety of reasons. Did that actually have to get approval by the IGA when those kinds of outreach,
or interactions, or grants, or whatever they were enabling local municipalities to do-- For instance if, in fact, they were helping Fort Lee with a transportation program, would that have to be approved by the IGA or would there be an interaction on that?

MS. RENNA: I don't know. I don’t think it would have been approved at the staff level, so I would have no knowledge of that.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Now, in January of 2013 -- I’m moving ahead a little bit here -- Mr. Stepien gave the go ahead to begin contacting our “Dem allies” to seek endorsements for Governor Christie. And that is Tab 1, Page 4. Mayor Sokolich was included on the list of targets -- which is on Page 2 of the same tab. And when the e-mail thread was forwarded to you, you replied “super, super exciting.” So this was an outreach to Democratic allies, is Mr. Stepien’s description, I think. Why did you think this was “super, super exciting?”

MS. RENNA: I wish I had chosen better words in retrospect.

It was just, you know, 2013 marked the start of the Governor’s reelection. There were a lot of people enthusiastic about it and excited about it. So, you know, that e-mail was forwarded to me just to say, “Hey, head’s up. This is starting,” and I said, “It’s exciting. It’s time to get the ball rolling on the Governor’s reelection plans.”

SENATOR WEINBERG: So in your opening statement you talked about the bipartisan -- or nonpartisan nature of the IGA. So in 2013 there was some change there where -- because it was the Governor’s election year?

MS. RENNA: No.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So that it was--
MS. RENNA: I’m sorry.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, I think your testimony was just that it was the beginning of the Governor’s reelection year, and it was time to start reaching out -- or maybe I’m not paraphrasing that correctly. It was 2013; that’s a fact. It happened to be the Governor’s reelection year. And there seemed to be some emphasis in the IGA to not be so bipartisan or nonpartisan and to respond to everybody. So you brought up in your testimony just now that this was the beginning of the Governor’s reelection. And so was-- Why was this kind of interesting that we had a list of Democratic allies to approach?

MS. RENNA: Just so to clarify previously, I was just talking more globally. I wasn’t talking about IGA being -- or 2013 being IGA’s start. They are two completely separate things. So I want to clarify that statement. Obviously, with 2013 -- January 2013 -- the Governor was up for reelection. That was the start; that’s what that comment reflected.

To your question, just because there were Democrats who were potential endorsers did not change the dynamic or the day-to-day operations of IGA at all. IGA was amazingly bipartisan, and everything we did was in a bipartisan nature. Just because there was a list of elected officials who could potentially endorse the Governor, that doesn’t change what our day-to-day job was of reaching out to Democrats, Independents, and Republicans alike. It’s apples and oranges.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. But I didn’t use the words Democratic allies; that was used in Mr. Stepien’s e-mail. So they were somehow different from all of those nonpartisan folks who you were reaching out to. You had a group of Democratic allies. That was sent to
you. Did you feel that those were people you were supposed to be reaching out to, perhaps, a little more often? Or why was this list sent?

MS. RENNA: Well, Democratic allies is simply a description of the grouping of people. There are Republican allies as well; there are all kinds of allies. I mean, it’s just a simple descriptive term of a grouping of people that doesn’t impact or influence the day job we did. That’s just what this e-mail happened to be about.

You know, Democratic allies are just that: they were Democratic allies. The Governor has a lot of them. And so, again, it’s just a descriptive term more than anything else.

To your question about getting more attention than others, the answer is no.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So people were described in categories in this bipartisan or nonpartisan operation -- people were sometimes described by Democrat or Republican?

MS. RENNA: Well--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Those are the groupings they used?

MS. RENNA: I would say that’s just normal conversation as you relate to elected officials. We knew who were Democrats and who were Republicans; it didn’t change the kind of work we did daily.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, were-- Did you participate or hear any discussion about tracking certain officials, particularly the Democratic allies -- as they were apparently referred to within the halls of the IGA -- of tracking those who were endorsing, those who weren’t endorsing, or those who were considering endorsing?

MS. RENNA: Was I in fear? No, I was not in fear.
SENATOR WEINBERG: I'm sorry?

MS. RENNA: Was I in fear of tracking them?

SENATOR WEINBERG: No, no. Did you hear? Did you hear? I'm sorry. (laughter)

MS. RENNA: Oh, oh. Sorry. Did I hear? Sure. There was--I mean, you keep an eye, keep track of all kinds of people. Not specific classifications. There was just day-to-day work. It was just the normal course of business work.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So you did hear of people who were coming -- that you were reaching out to as part of your responsibility? I'm really speaking generically of the office -- you can separate yourself out anytime you want as a person, or as what the atmosphere and environment was -- that there was tracking who was endorsing and who wasn’t endorsing, particularly from the Democratic allies.

MS. RENNA: There was tracking of who potential endorsers were, yes; and if there was tracking done of any kind it was done on nights and weekends -- their personal time, when they’re allowed to do that kind of work.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Madam Chair.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, there was no tracking being done within the office during the course of the day? There was no discussion, or who to reach out to, or which ones to give special emphasis to?

MS. RENNA: I mean, again Chairwoman, 565 municipalities. You know, one day we might have cared specifically about hard hit Republican mayors in Monmouth County for another reason. Another day
we might care specifically about members of the autism community. You know, painting it in this narrow focus is unfair -- I personally feel as though it’s an unfair characterization. You know, again, normal course of business work, we interacted with a lot of different people, a lot of different groups of people.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Madam Chair, may I ask a follow-up question to her?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Excuse me?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: May I ask a follow-up question?

SENATOR WEINBERG: You will get an opportunity to do that.

Ms. Renna.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I’m not characterizing; I’m reading the words that were put forth: Democratic allies. And then your input about Democratic mayors and about the knowledge of endorsements and so on. So I’m not ascribing that to anything other than your testimony and the documents that we have had in front of us, and that we have in front of us.

If there were mayors who were chosen or somehow ascribed -- that people in IGA should be especially nice to some group of mayors, was there any discussion like that?

MS. RENNA: IGA being especially nice to certain people?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Yes.
MS. RENNA: No, I think we treated everyone fairly and equally. Now, that’s not to say that-- There were many elected officials who didn’t want to engage with us -- many where we tried and they just had no interest in dealing with the Administration. But it was a level playing field -- very much so -- and the same with our interactions with the Legislature, county officials -- just an equal playing field. I don’t think you could characterize it as being nicer or--

SENATOR WEINBERG: So there were never any instructions put forth to anybody in the IGA by the – when you were Director or prior to that, that you know of firsthand, that certain mayors needed extra attention, as opposed to other mayors?

MS. RENNA: Giving certain mayors extra attention can go a lot of different ways as well. I mean, I think you’re saying this in the vein of Democratic allies.

SENATOR WEINBERG: No, I’m just asking you if--

MS. RENNA: We gave special attention to lots of--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Ms. Renna, I’m just asking you if in fact you as Director -- when you were Director, or before you assumed the extra responsibilities, you were ever given any instructions to be extra nice to some group of mayors?

MS. RENNA: I don’t think that’s an accurate characterization. No, I-- No.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, it’s a question, not a characterization.

MS. RENNA: No.
SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Were you kept abreast in any way of the endorsements or other outreach to elected officials?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And how were you kept abreast of the endorsements?

MS. RENNA: Of— Just a point of clarity: endorsements or outreach?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Endorsements and other outreach to elected officials.

MS. RENNA: So IGA conducted outreach to elected officials day in and day out. It was basically our main charge. If grants were coming down from DEP, we would call a municipality and let them know that, “Your town is getting $5,000 in recycling money.” That kind of outreach was all tracked, and the way we tracked it was with a mayor’s name and then the feedback they provided. “Oh, that’s great news,” or, “Oh, I’m only getting $5,000” -- whatever it may be. That was the way we monitored the receptiveness of the mayors, their enthusiasm, and things like that.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So you monitored the acceptance and the enthusiasm of various mayors?

MS. RENNA: I’m talking about, for as an example, when they were receiving grant dollars for, as I said, a recycling-- This is an example. Sure, we hoped that they were pleased with the news; we were calling to deliver good news. It’s part of what we did every day.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Did you ever come across a mayor who was unhappy when you called and told him he just got a grant?
MS. RENNA: Yes. I just said yes. “I only got $5,000; I wanted $10,000.” We heard that all the time as well.

SENATOR WEINBERG: If that ever happens again, I’ll give them another name that they can call for a grant. (laughter)

MS. RENNA: So yes, but that’s why tracking the outreach was so important and sort of interesting -- to gauge the feedback. And, you know, in the same breath it gave us a nice pulse on the different grant programs in the departments and how they were being implemented. And we could answer questions about the calculations that go into that and things like that. It was just-- It was good government. It was a way to give good news, and monitor results, and answer any questions they had.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So the monitoring of enthusiasm -- was that kept in any formal way, or passed on to anybody?

MS. RENNA: Oh, yes. The outreach was always passed on to IGA leadership, who was curious as well.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Now, I did ask you, and I don’t think you answered that part of the question: Now, clearly, were you kept abreast of the endorsements that were coming in?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I was.

SENATOR WEINBERG: In what manner were you kept abreast of that?

MS. RENNA: Either just verbal communication with the staff, or over e-mail -- either/or. This was specifically during the period -- just for clarity purposes -- of January through November. Because this was really the only time I was overseeing the bulk of the staff at that point. So I’m
talking specifically, in answer to your question, of that period between June and when I left the Governor’s Office.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So we’re talking about the period between January and November?

MS. RENNA: June.

SENATOR WEINBERG: June and November.

MS. RENNA: Sure, yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Did your office, in any way, work on or bring up issues that you know about concerning endorsements or work on garnering endorsements from certain mayors?

MS. RENNA: I don’t think I understand the question.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Did you, or anyone in your office who you are directly aware of, work on garnering endorsements from certain mayors for the Governor?

MS. RENNA: I personally did not, but some of the staff who I oversaw did.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And were you aware while you were overseeing them that they were working on garnering endorsements?

MS. RENNA: I was.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And how were you made aware of that?

MS. RENNA: Just conversation.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, who gave them instructions to garner endorsements for the Governor?
MS. RENNA: Well, IGA leadership was always very clear that any of this sort of volunteering campaign work that we would do, as long as it was done on our volunteer time, was absolutely fine. And they received that advisement from counsel.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Let’s get back to my question about whether or not IGA staff -- and if I wasn’t clear -- during the course of the working day were garnering endorsements for the Governor in any way, shape, or form.

MS. RENNA: Any endorsement work was done on nights or weekends, or before work.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So there were no discussions by IGA staff with mayors during the course of the workday on, perhaps, endorsing, considering the endorsement?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know the answer to that. I wasn’t the one garnering the endorsements, so I don’t know.

SENATOR WEINBERG: You said you were made aware of the issues around endorsements.

MS. RENNA: Sure.

SENATOR WEINBERG: You were made aware just from general conversation? There was no formal discussion about this -- nothing with leadership?

MS. RENNA: No, there were formal discussions; I mean, I was their boss so we had conversations about it. But do I know what the staff was advised to do per IGA leadership?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Who did you have conversations with?
MS. RENNA: My staff -- the IGA staff.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And who gave you the instructions to talk about endorsements?

MS. RENNA: IGA leadership always gave all of us instructions; it wasn’t just me.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Who was that IGA leadership who gave those instructions?

MS. RENNA: Depending on the timeframe we’re talking about, it was either Bridget Kelly or Bill Stepien.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, so let’s talk about 2013.

MS. RENNA: Okay.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Let’s concentrate on that timeframe. Bridget Kelly and/or Bill Stepien were the only two who gave those instructions? Did they give it directly to staff, or through you?

MS. RENNA: Just generally the way IGA was set up, it was Bill or Bridget who were the decision makers; they were senior staff. I sort of, in this role from June on, oversaw 10 people. I’m sort of the implementer -- I’m the one who took the information they gave me, passed it along to them, and then they did the work. That’s exactly why I said I didn’t seek any endorsements from mayors myself; the staff did that. I sort of was the pass-through as far as information is concerned.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, so you-- Somebody passed this information through to the staff.

MS. RENNA: Sure.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So you were the implementer, you said.
MS. RENNA: I think that’s a fair way to put it, yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And you got those instructions from Mr. Stepien and/or Ms. Kelly.

MS. RENNA: Who received, yes, advice from counsel’s office on it. That’s my understanding.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And they received advice from the Governor’s Counsel Office on-- What did they transmit to you that they received advice about?

MS. RENNA: That I’m not specifically sure, and I don’t know specifically if it was the Governor’s Counsel. I assume it was. Again, I don’t know.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, you referred to counsel. Do you know which counsel?

MS. RENNA: Well, there are also attorneys that work for the reelection campaign. I just don’t know what attorneys specifically they got advisement from, but I was told that it was cleared with counsel’s office. They were very particular to make sure all the things that we did -- and this wasn’t just IGA, this was every department in the Governor’s Office -- was following the letter of the law in how we were conducting ourselves.

You know, a lot of people on the IGA staff worked on other political campaigns previously, or had been in roles like this before in other government offices. You know, the nights and weekends directive is something that mirrored what a lot of people had experienced in other legislative offices or on other campaigns. So the advisement was there, and I think the staff -- the majority of the staff felt comfortable with that advice.
SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Ms. Renna, again, I’ve preaced the last couple of questions, I believe -- the fact that I’m concentrating -- my questioning is concentrating on 2013, which you characterized, which is a fact, the beginning of the Governor’s reelection campaign. And that staff, through you -- you were the implementer -- that somehow staff knew that there was an outreach for endorsements. And that information -- please stop me if I do not report this correctly -- that information came somehow from Mr. Stepien and/or Ms. Kelly, through you, to the staff.

MS. RENNA: Yes, or sometimes it came directly from Bill or Bridget to the staff without-- It could have been either/or.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And when that information was coming from Mr. Stepien, was it while he was still working in IGA, or after he left to go to work for the Governor’s reelection campaign?

MS. RENNA: That was when he was still in the Governor’s Office.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So while he was still in the Governor’s Office, he was talking about potential endorsements for the Governor.

MS. RENNA: Yes. In his spare time, personal time, yes he was.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So he only had that discussion after 5:00 or before 9:00 in the morning, or at lunchtime, or was it confined to certain hours? I mean, you yourself described yourself as the implementer--

MS. RENNA: Right.
SENATOR WEINBERG: --of a policy that apparently sought endorsements for the Governor, and that this was somehow, through you or sometimes directly from them, transmitted to the staff. So this was only done-- You only had those discussions with Mr. Stepien or Ms. Kelly after 5:00 or on weekends; or were those discussions-- I’m having trouble separating in my mind what you perceived as was going on here in the solicitation of those endorsements. Were they done -- were there discussions done during the business day because you’re implementing -- using your words -- you were responsible for implementing some kind of endeavor? I won’t describe it as a policy, but an endeavor. So could you kind of clear up my confusion about this?

MS. RENNA: The political work was done during our personal and volunteer time.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So this issue about your implementing -- what was it that you were implementing?

MS. RENNA: Just the structure of IGA was such that, candidly, no one had a lot of access to Bill. I personally did not have much access to Bill. When Bridget moved into that role, not everyone had access to Bridget. I had access to Bridget.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Right.

MS. RENNA: So a lot of times the communication flowed downward through me.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, that’s the structure.

MS. RENNA: Right.
SENATOR WEINBERG: But I would like to know what you were referring to that you implemented -- that you got instructions from Mr. Stepien when he was there, and then Ms. Kelly when she took over.

MS. RENNA: I never got specific directives from Bill. That e-mail, as you see, was forwarded to me and I was not on the original e-mail chain.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Which e-mail are you referring to?

MS. RENNA: The one where I articulately responded “super, super excited.” (laughter)

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

MS. RENNA: That e-mail, as you see, as you pick through line by line of that e-mail, I was not on that initial e-mail. That went to another colleague of mine. And Bill specifically lays out in that e-mail that IGA can do this sort of work at the appropriate times -- on nights and weekends; that there is no problem with that. That e-mail was simply forwarded to me; that was not a directive that I got directly from Bill. Any communications I had on endorsements did come, really, from Bridget.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

MS. RENNA: Globally, to the IGA staff, Bill and Bridget both gave directives. They were the bosses.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So again, what was it that you were implementing? You’re telling me that you got some kind of instructions, but I’m not sure what-- What were you implementing in terms of dealing with Democratic allies, seeking endorsements, not seeking endorsements. What were you implementing? Those are your words.
MS. RENNA: I was making sure they were doing what they were doing. I mean, I was making sure if they felt as though there was a mayor--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Who is they?

MS. RENNA: The staff.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. RENNA: If my staff felt as though there was a specific mayor who they had an interest in endorsing; or, counter, if a mayor broached a subject on their own with an IGA staffer -- which happened several times as well -- they would say, “I need to talk to over the weekend” -- or whenever it may be – “about this.” Then they would report that call back to me and say, “Listen, I just got a call from X mayor. It seems as though he’s interested in endorsing.” So I was again, I guess, implementing -- I was a pass-through of information.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I’m going to come back to that in a moment.

Let me move to all the people who you’re being nice to; to the people who you were told to keep hands off from, or be not so receptive to. How was that list drawn up, or how were you given instructions to implement, “Don’t call back whoever”?

MS. RENNA: So just to clarify, as I previously said, we were never told to be nice, specifically, to anyone. I just disagree with that characterization.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I’m sorry; hold that for one moment if you don’t mind.

Okay; I’m sorry. Are you finished?
MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: All right. I'm going to refer to Tab 28, and it's Page 7, Tab 28, of the Gibson Dunn report. And under Number 2 -- List of Mayors -- it says, “Renna believes--” Now this is Gibson Dunn’s characterization of your interview with them. “Renna believes Stepien kept track of mayors who were not in favor with IGA.” We’re not talking about the campaign, now.

MS. RENNA: Right.

SENATOR WEINBERG: We’re talking about not in favor with IGA. “But Renna was not privy to that process. But IGA staff would receive mandatory directives along the lines of, ‘Do not rush to return this mayor’s phone call.’” Again, a characterization by Gibson Dunn of your interview: “IGA staff was given mandatory directives.” This was not, “Call me back after 5:00,” but a mandatory directive. “Renna remembered responding” -- Oh, pardon me. “Renna recalled an IGA staffer asking Renna, ‘Can we get a list of hands-off mayors?’ Renna remembered responding, ‘You know we won’t get it, and it would change daily anyway.’”

So that leads me to believe -- particularly if there was a mandatory directive that changed daily -- that there was some way of informing IGA staff during working hours who was a “hands-off mayor,” and that there was a mandatory directive to that effect. Is that correct? I mean, I’m reading from Gibson Dunn’s characterization of your interview.

MS. RENNA: So a few things in this.

First, your convoluting in your question -- respectfully -- lists of mayors -- just the 565 municipalities -- which, day-to-day, that was IGA’s
job to contact them during the workday, versus potential endorsers. That work happened after 5:00.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So excuse me, Ms. Renna. There was a mandatory directive after 5:00 that said, “These people are hands-off mayors?”

MS. RENNA: Mandatory directive were not my words. You notice they are not in quotation marks. Those were Gibson Dunn’s words. That was their characterization; they were never words I would use. I would never use mandatory directives except in one incident, which we can circle back to. They were not my words.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Did you correct that with Gibson Dunn when you saw that characterization?

MS. RENNA: I didn’t see these until it came out publicly.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So you didn’t have a chance to correct any of their characterizations of people’s interviews?

MS. RENNA: Correct -- or some of their facts. There are minor facts in my interview throughout it that are just-- There are some inaccuracies.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Do you know what other inaccuracies are contained here that you can recall?

MS. RENNA: Sure. For example, there are 60 affected towns, not 16. An important error in the report was this mandatory directives; it has gotten a lot of attention and is upsetting to me because it was not my characterization at all, nor would it be. The phone call I exchanged with Bridget Kelly on December 12: She called me, I called her back. The call dropped mid-conversation; we tried to call each other back. I actually
reached her first, not vice versa. So little details like that, for example. But *mandatory directives* is the one that, candidly, was most alarming to me because it’s aggressive language and it’s not language I would have used.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. What did you mean then by -- and this is in direct quotes, or at least-- I’m not sure it’s a direct quote from you, but “Staffer asking Renna ‘Can we get a list of hands-off mayors?’” And your response, ‘You know we won’t get it; it would change daily anyway.’”

MS. RENNA: That was from a text message exchange, which I submitted in my documents to you. That is a text message between me and a colleague of mine in the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs where we’re anecdotally talking about proactively setting up meetings. Hands-off mayors list. List? There’s not a formal list. It’s not like there’s a secret, hidden list out there that is labeled “hands-off.” It doesn’t exist. This was more conversational in tone. And what this gets to is -- and circling back to the other line in this portion of the memo, “Do not rush to return this mayor’s phone call.” The directive was never, “Don’t return this mayor’s phone call. It was proactive. *Proactive* is a very important word as to what we were instructed. IGA conducted proactive outreach via phone or via meeting requests all day, every day to local elected officials. That’s what this meant. Let’s pull back on the proactive outreach; however, if a mayor were to call, it doesn’t mean don’t be responsive. As a matter of fact, for four years of working in IGA, I have wracked my brain and I can’t think of one example when we were not responsive to a mayor who called -- whether or not they were in favor or not in favor with the Administration for
whatever the reason may be. So it’s an important point to clear up because this paragraph is, I think, mischaracterized.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Is there anything else in the Gibson Dunn interview with you that you think mischaracterized what you were trying to get across to them?

MR. KLINGEMAN: Madam Chairwoman, I think that’s an unfair question. Ms. Renna has not, in preparation for her testimony today, gone through the report, line by line, for the purpose of reciting from memory mistakes that were made. If you’d like us to undertake that exercise after the hearing we will do so.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I respectfully understand that, Counselor. And since there is a very important phrase in the Gibson Dunn characterization of their interview with Ms. Renna -- mandatory directive -- I think it would be worthwhile that she gets an opportunity to please review their characterization of her interview and let us know what else might be wrong -- which you can do at a later date.

Thank you.

Well then, let me move to the interchanges with Mayor Sokolich.

Why-- Again, if there was-- Were you told in any way, shape, or form not to return any phone call from the Mayor of Fort Lee?

MS. RENNA: I was not told directly to not return a phone call to the Mayor of Fort Lee.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Were you told indirectly?

MS. RENNA: There was an e-mail exchange I shared with Bridget Kelly where she was clearly unhappy that a member of our staff
proactively outreached to Mayor Sokolich and set up a meeting. She was clearly angered by that, although I didn’t know why. Based on her reaction I advised staff to just, “Let’s wait and see. Maybe we can figure out what the problem is.” It was-- It didn’t make sense to me at the time.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Did you ever figure out what the problem was?

MS. RENNA: I did not.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So you advised staff to, kind of, back off from Mayor Sokolich because Bridget Kelly was so angry about it.

MS. RENNA: Well, I didn’t actually communicate that to the staff. I personally knew she was angry, but I just said, “Let’s just hang tight. I need to have a conversation with Bridget about what the issue is with Mayor Sokolich, because there is clearly something.” But that conversation never happened; I never had that conversation.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And there was an exchange which I assume we’ve all seen in the documents where, I guess, you were kind of explaining away -- Evan Ridley, was it? -- his making a terrible mistake by taking a call from the Mayor of Fort Lee. That’s my impression; again, an impression is that you were sort of covering for him. I’m not saying that in a negative manner. (laughter)

MS. RENNA: Well, I was trying to placate Bridget, seeing that I didn’t understand what was happening. In the same breath you’ll notice I didn’t communicate that to Evan either, because I was trying to, kind of, protect Evan from that since I didn’t really understand what was going on.
SENATOR WEINBERG: Is Mayor Sokolich the only mayor that either Bridget or anybody else in IGA got a little exercised about setting up meetings, proactively reaching, not answering the phone, whatever?

MS. RENNA: Obviously Mayor Sokolich stands out. I don’t know; I just don’t know. We dealt with 565 mayors, Chairwoman. I mean, respectfully, it’s a tough question to answer.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So let’s go back for a moment to-- Let’s talk about the fact that the Lieutenant Governor was going to-- I guess she was invited by the Fort Lee Chamber of Commerce to be a speaker. And there was an exchange between you and Bridget Kelly about whether or not she should accept this invitation because Mayor Sokolich might show up. Can you give me a little bit of the background of that exchange, or what took place, or why the Lieutenant Governor would not come to a -- or you might consider -- not you personally -- but that you might consider asking her not to go to a Fort Lee -- any Chamber of Commerce because the local mayor might show up?

MS. RENNA: So this e-mail chain began-- This actually started because I proactively reached out to the Fort Lee Chamber of Commerce inquiring if they had an interest in having the Lieutenant Governor speak to their members.

SENATOR WEINBERG: What was the date of that?

MS. RENNA: Of this e-mail exchange, or--?

SENATOR WEINBERG: No, when you reached out to the Fort Lee Chamber of Commerce.
MS. RENNA: Well, they sent me the formal invitation on August 22, so it was some time before that -- probably the week before that would be my guess.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Of 2013?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

MS. RENNA: Once I received the invitation, I just forwarded it to Bridget Kelly as I always would. And this is on the heels of, a few days prior, her being angry that Evan Ridley met with the Fort Lee Mayor. So her response to me, “Should we do this in light of the Mayor?” seemed strange, but I sort of understood what she meant. Because clearly I knew that she was animated about Evan’s meeting the week prior. That’s why I sort of said, “I guess not. It’s a good Chamber, though, because it is a strong Chamber of Commerce in Fort Lee.”

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, I think what you said before that is that he might now go if you don’t tell him about it, because he works during the day.

MS. RENNA: Well, yes, right. So after that she responds to me with, “I assume the Mayor will go.” And, again, this is me operating under the assumption that something -- Mayor Sokolich has done some critical wrong for whatever reason, I don’t know what, or something is going on with the Mayor that I don’t know about. So she responds to me by saying, “Not necessarily” -- or I respond to her saying, “Not necessarily. If we don’t tell him he works right?” As in, he has a job. And she says, “Correct. Good call.”
So in light of our current situation, I understand why this looks strange. But candidly -- and this gets back to the mandatory directive conversation as well -- oftentimes information did not flow downward as it relates to why we weren’t talking to an elected official of any kind -- State, county, local. There were a few -- several occasions over the four years that this information was not shared with us because a certain person might be under investigation -- which sometimes that came to fruition, and sometimes that did not. But there are several examples -- which I would like to not name names, but I’m sure we can all think of who those people would be -- that our interactions in IGA were scaled back inexplicably. And a lot of times it could -- well, not a lot of times -- but on occasion it could be because someone was under investigation or someone was about to be indicted; things of that nature. So we were all looking at this with a critical eye; but I was looking at it with the eye of: Bridget was clearly very upset a few days prior; she did not give me a reason why. Here we go again. She makes this comment about the Mayor. So now I’m certain that something is going on with the Mayor, and it could be any of the things I just outlined. So again, it’s hard to say, “How often did this happen?” It happened for a variety of reasons, most of which were incredibly legitimate -- but that’s one example.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I’m going to get ready to close my portion of your questioning. And if you need to take a break at any point--

MS. RENNA: I’m okay.

SENATOR WEINBERG: --let us know. We do have some time before we will move to a lunch break.
But I just-- I want to again clarify this directive issue -- whether mandatory or only a directive -- that Gibson Dunn’s characterization of your implying there was some kind of a mandatory directive is incorrect.

So the list of hands-off mayors -- as opposed to the list of everybody who you were proactively reaching out to -- the list of hands-off mayors was never given to any member of IGA staff, or through you as the implementer, except in the context of the campaign. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: The hands-off mayor’s list, again, is not a real list. It’s not something that would be written down. It’s not real. This was conversational in nature. That list does not exist.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So then conversationally were you given any information from either Bridget Kelly, Bill Stepien, or anyone else about certain mayors who were hands-off for whatever the reason?

MS. RENNA: Through the course of any work day -- again, we’re dealing with literally thousands of elected officials -- I am sure conversations like that happened. It’s the normal course of business. I mean, I’m sure.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And your interpretation of the hands-off mayors were that they might be people who were under investigation?

MS. RENNA: No, no, no. Hands-off mayors would be people IGA would not be proactively conducting outreach with. We would not pick up the phone and say, “Hey, Mayor, how are you doing?” But if that Mayor called us and said, “Hey, I have a pothole,” then we would figure it out. But we didn’t call the Mayor and say, “Hey, I’m going to be in Bergen
County. May I swing by and maybe take 30 minutes of your time and catch up?” We didn’t do any of that. That’s what that meant.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So then the hands-on mayors -- the ones who you did the proactive outreach to -- was there ever any discussion about those folks and endorsements?

MS. RENNA: I mean, I think it’s fair to say that IGA was about creating relationships. We forged relationships. There’s nothing wrong with forging relationships, obviously. In 2013, the dynamic did change because the Governor was up for reelection. So as I said, we had elected officials coming to us with open arms saying, “I want to endorse.” Similarly, you look at the 565 mayors and you say, “Who really enjoys what the Administration has done for the past four years? Are there people who you think would be open?” Those conversations did happen, sure, as it would with any elected official, I would think.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. I am going to pause now and turn the questioning over to my colleague, Assemblyman Wisniewski.

Are you both okay? Do you need--

MR. KLINGEMAN: Yes, thank you.

MS. RENNA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Do you need a break?

MS. RENNA: No; I could use a little more water.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I think we can get you some water.

MS. RENNA: Okay, thank you.

MR. KLINGEMAN: That’s my job. (laughter)
MS. RENNA: I bring Smart Water literally everywhere.

(laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: That’s not a plug or anything?

MS. RENNA: No. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

First of all, thank you for being with us this morning.

Just a couple of areas of follow-up, if I may, that Senator Weinberg started with that I just want to try to get a better handle on.

And so drawing your attention to what is marked Tab 28, Page 7 -- which is, again, the memorandum prepared in response to your meeting with the Gibson Dunn attorneys. And I just want to try to understand. The memo says that you believed that Mr. Stepien kept track of mayors “who are not in favor with IGA.” Is that something you said to the Gibson Dunn interviewers?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall my exact words with Gibson Dunn.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Something to that effect?

MS. RENNA: Something to that effect. It would not be in favor with IGA, it would be in favor with the Administration.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. In your interview you said you “believed.” How did you believe? Why did you believe that Stepien kept track of those mayors who were not in favor, either with IGA or the Administration?

MS. RENNA: Because Bill kept track of literally everything. It’s just his nature. And candidly, it’s completely appropriate for him to
know the dynamics between certain elected officials, certain people, generally speaking. I mean, in his role that was appropriate.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you know that because you had a conversation with Mr. Stepien, or you had a conversation with someone else who told you that?

MS. RENNA: I worked for Bill Stepien for four years. There were a lot of conversations. So nothing I can specifically recall, but I’m sure conversations happened.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just to be fair to you, was it more of an assumption on your part or something that you understood?

MS. RENNA: Both.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay, thank you.

In the interview memo, the memo states -- and I’m quoting from the memo Tab 28, Page 7 -- it says, “IGA staff would receive mandatory directives along the lines of ‘do not rush to return this mayor’s phone call.’” So I just wanted to ask you about the words that are used to describe your interview that say, “Would receive mandatory directives.” Can you describe for me how you would receive those mandatory directives?

MS. RENNA: We did not receive mandatory directives. I’m correcting this language in there.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So you’re saying that that, a representation of your interview, was incorrect.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay, thank you.
Then there is, on Tab 14, I believe it’s a text message exchange with Chris Stark. Who is Chris Stark?

MS. RENNA: He was a colleague of mine in the office, IGA.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did he report to you, or did you report to him?

MS. RENNA: He reported to me.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So Chris Stark says, on Saturday, August 17, 9:29 a.m., “Is it possible to get a list of hands-off mayors?” Was that a term of art that was used within the IGA staff?

MS. RENNA: No, I don’t think so. Again, I think it was just conversational in nature. I think that’s just how Chris characterized it. That wasn’t a common term thrown around.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you seemed to understand, because your response was, “You know we won’t get that.” So you understood what he meant.

MS. RENNA: Correct, because if you read the entire exchange, we’re talking about a proactive meeting that Evan Ridley set up with Mayor Sokolich. If you read beyond the parts you just highlighted, he goes on to say that -- I go on to say a few things, and then he goes on to say, “It’s hard to do because some people aren’t available; then we have to go through getting vetted again.” This is as it relates to being out on the road -- because the Regional Directors were primarily based out on the road -- and trying to secure meetings to fill their days on a whim. So if they know they’re spending the day in Monmouth County, for example, they would try to fill their day.
Chris saying, “Can we get a list of hands-off mayors?” and me saying “You know we won’t get that and it would change daily anyway,” that’s candidly a reflection of Bridget. Bridget, day-to-day, it just always varied.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, did she create that list?

MS. RENNA: There is no hands-off mayors list.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you both seemed to understand what that meant.

MS. RENNA: It was, again, people who we would not be conducting proactive outreach with.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: How would you know who those mayors would be?

MS. RENNA: Either through communications -- Bridget would mention something, whatever it may be. I mean, we worked in an office.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: No, I understand.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But, I guess-- So how would Bridget communicate to you that somebody was a hands-off mayor?

MS. RENNA: You know, again, I use that term loosely. But, you know--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I tell you what--

MS. RENNA: Sometimes she would just--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: --before you answer that, use the term that you would use. If you feel uncomfortable with the term *hands-off mayor*, what term would you have-- If you’re saying that this is not
an accurate representation of the discussion, how would those mayors be referred to?

MS. RENNA: Mayors we were not conducting proactive outreach with.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And so how would you find out who a mayor you’re not conducting proactive outreach is?

MS. RENNA: Bridget would tell me either by not telling me -- in an e-mail, like we saw as it relates to Fort Lee -- which is being upset; or sometimes she would communicate that there was a problem. Oftentimes she didn’t give me the reason that there was a problem, but I would know that there was a problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Isn’t that a difficult way for you to be able to do your job if you don’t know who you’re not supposed to be proactive to?

MS. RENNA: It was.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Let me move forward to the issue of the use of personal e-mail accounts.

On Tab 28, Page 5, in your interview with Gibson Dunn you explained that you created a Gmail account about a year after you began working for IGA. And your explanation was -- and again I’m quoting from the Gibson Dunn report -- “everyone was using a personal e-mail account for work purposes.” Did somebody come to you and suggest or direct you that you needed to create a personal e-mail account?

MS. RENNA: No, not that I can recall.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So how did it come about that you decided to create a personal e-mail account that is referenced in this memorandum?

MS. RENNA: Well, as I stated, I sort of viewed the fact that a lot of people around me were using personal e-mail addresses. So after being in IGA for a full year, and I didn’t have one for a full year, I created one. And, you know, just picking up the practice, really, of my colleagues. That’s why I went ahead and did that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So up to that point in time when you created that Gmail account, you’re saying you did not have a personal e-mail account?

MS. RENNA: Oh, no, I did. That’s where my Banana Republic coupons go. (laughter) But I never used it for work purposes now.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So this was a secondary personal e-mail account that you used for work purposes.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: When you were creating this second personal e-mail account for work purposes did you have a conversation with any of your superiors in the Governor’s Office -- whether it be Governor’s Counsel or anyone else -- about the propriety or the advisability of using a personal e-mail account for your work?

MS. RENNA: Not that I recall. Again, I’m sure conversations happened. We had annual ethics training in the Governor’s Office as well. I just can’t sit here and specifically recall when this conversation was and who had those conversations with me.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did the annual ethics training in the Governor’s Office discuss the use of personal e-mail accounts for public business?

MS. RENNA: I genuinely don’t recall.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What type of public work would you communicate about using the personal e-mail account?

MS. RENNA: I can only speak for myself.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: That’s all I want you to do.

MS. RENNA: For me, I did a lot of work on the personal e-mail account because I reported directly to Bridget. And Bridget was always available on her personal phone. She was not as available -- she was not always checking the government BlackBerry. And you know, as is -- I guess in the past four years everything is very fast-paced. I always was looking for quick responses. So I started to default to the personal e-mail address for no reason other than the fact that Bridget was more responsive to it. So we talked about a variety of things, all kinds of things, but that was for that reason primarily.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you use that personal-- The secondary personal e-mail account -- which I think you called a Gmail account -- did you also use that to discuss campaign matters?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And you volunteered for the Chris Christie for Governor reelection campaign?

MS. RENNA: I did.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you participate in what was the nominated Bridgewater Wednesdays?
MS. RENNA: I participated twice a month.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Twice a month. On those Bridgewater Wednesdays, or at other times?

MS. RENNA: Usually on the Wednesdays, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And were those Bridgewater Wednesdays created specifically for IGA staff to participate?

MS. RENNA: No, it was open to the entire Governor’s Office.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So that was a term that the entire Governor’s Office understood?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

So you said one of the reasons you used your personal Gmail account to get a hold of Bridget Kelly is that she didn’t respond to her governmental e-mail account?

MS. RENNA: I wouldn’t say she didn’t respond; I was just able to get her more quickly usually. She always had the personal phone on her because of the children. So it was just if I needed something right away, that’s where I went.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So the personal e-mail account that you communicated-- When you communicated with Bridget Kelly, you communicated to her personal e-mail account.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And was that personal e-mail account on her governmental-issued phone, or on a private phone?

MS. RENNA: On her private phone.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Now, there was a -- and you may not be aware of it -- but do you know who Vinny Napolitano is?

MS. RENNA: I do.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Who is he?

MS. RENNA: He was one of my colleagues in IGA.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did he report to you?

MS. RENNA: No, he did not.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you report to him?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What was his position?

MS. RENNA: He was, at the time that I left the Governor’s Office, he was my equal in the office of IGA. He oversaw the constituency area of IGA and managed a staff that oversaw relationships with different communities.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. In his interview with the Gibson Dunn law firm he talked about that he was directed to use his personal e-mail account to draft and maintain Google spreadsheets for IGA purposes. Are you familiar with these Google spreadsheets?

MS. RENNA: I am.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And what was contained on these Google spreadsheets?

MS. RENNA: You name it: everything from generic contact lists -- that’s where we kept all databases of cell phone numbers and personal e-mail addresses for local elected officials. That was only privy, obviously, to staff. When the Governor would host a town hall we found it
much easier to track RSVPs through a direct link to a Gmail document; it just electronically-- I mean, you name it -- tracking all the outreach we did. The reason why we defaulted to Google documents was because the staff was so sizable that, as you know, with an Excel worksheet you make your changes but then you have to send it to your counterpart to make changes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Sure.

MS. RENNA: This was a way that we could all log on at the same time, make our changes simultaneously. It just made work -- life -- a lot easier.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did any of those Google spreadsheets have any information about mayors -- mayors that might be endorsing, mayors that might not be endorsing?

MS. RENNA: Yes. We had spreadsheets for that as well, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And so just so I understand it, the spreadsheets encompassed contact lists?

MS. RENNA: Some had contact lists, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Some were lists of mayors to endorse or who may not endorse?

MS. RENNA: Yes. Some were State of the State invitation lists. I mean -- Drumthwacket, holiday parties. Again, with so many cooks in the kitchen it was just the easiest way.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why were those Google spreadsheets accessed through private e-mails, and not through your governmental e-mail account?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know enough about technology to answer that question. But I think -- I believe that you have to have a Gmail
account to access the Google document. I’m not sure, Chairman. I’m sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And other than the ethics training that you referenced a few moments ago, did you receive any other advice, or counsel, or guidance about using your private e-mail account for public business?

MS. RENNA: Not that I can recall, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

I’d like to move ahead to the August 15 e-mail that Mr. Ridley sent to you with his daily report. It’s Tab 11. And he says to you, “Meeting with Fort Lee Mayor Mark Sokolich, 3:30, TBD” -- to be determined, I would imagine. And you replied, “This is great.” Why did you reply, “This is great?” What was great about it?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know; hold on one second.

I don’t know that we have that document. Do you mind-- I think that--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: It starts at the top with “Meeting with Fort Lee Mayor Mark Sokolich.” I think right there.

MR. KLINGEMAN: Mr. Chairman?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MR. KLINGEMAN: Would you happen to have an extra set of documents for us?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: The book with the copies.

MR. KLINGEMAN: Thank you.

So what tab are we referring to right now?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Tab 11.
MS. RENNA: So do you mind repeating the question?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Your response to Evan Ridley’s communication, stating, “Meeting with Fort Lee Mayor Mark Sokolich, 3:30,” is, “This is great.” When I read this e-mail it implies that you knew something about this meeting. Why did you say, “This is great?”

MS. RENNA: Well, I don’t know that that’s-- I just don’t know that that’s what I was responding to with, “This is great,” because of all the redactions. I’ve never seen this document before, so I can’t say that “This is great” was because of the Fort-- I don’t know what else was contained in this.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So you’re not aware of why you said, “This is great?”

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And you’ve never-- I mean, this is an e-mail you responded to.

MS. RENNA: Yes, I’ve never seen this document before. So I’m sorry, I can’t clarify.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You do not recall responding to this?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay, okay.

This e-mail, however, became the subject of a controversy between Mr. Ridley and Ms. Kelly, correct?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: The fact that he was scheduling a meeting with the Mayor of Fort Lee?
MS. RENNA: Yes, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Subsequently there was an exchange where Ms. Kelly expressed her displeasure.

MS. RENNA: Correct, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Do you know why Mr. Ridley should not have scheduled a meeting, or that scheduling a meeting would have evoked displeasure in Ms. Kelly?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

There’s a reference in the documents to a weekly sit-down with IGA staff. Are you familiar with those?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And did you participate in them?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And what took place in those weekly sit-downs?

MS. RENNA: They were just a normal staff meeting, weekly. They were usually held on Fridays where Bridget got the entire staff together and just we round-robined. We just went around the table and talked about the things we were working on; talked about any large-scale initiatives, or projects, or whatever we may be working on. It was just a staff meeting.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And at that staff meeting, Mr. Ridley would be there?

MS. RENNA: Sure, yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You would be there?
MS. RENNA: Yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Ms. Kelly would be there?
MS. RENNA: Yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Anyone else?
MS. RENNA: The entire staff; unless we were not in that day, of course.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And would it be correct that at those meetings, discussions about what that staff, such as Mr. Ridley, were doing in the upcoming week?
MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And so if a staff member was going to do something in the upcoming week, and there was a problem, that would have been flagged by Ms. Kelly or somebody?
MS. RENNA: Yes and no. So the answer is yes, that if they talk about the meetings that they have scheduled for the upcoming week, if there was a problem Bridget would then respond to it at that time directly and then we would know. However, because the Regional Directors-- Their schedules were very fluid. A lot of times it was based around where the Governor and Lieutenant Governor were, because every Governor and Lieutenant Governor event has an IGA staffer there. So if the Lieutenant Governor adds a business stop on Tuesday that was not planned for on Friday at the staff meeting, and let’s say Evan Ridley had to go staff the Lieutenant Governor, then he would build a day out on the road pretty quickly because he’s already going to be out. So he may as well take the
second half of the day to meet proactively with the mayor to check in and see how things are going in a town.

So this actually gets back to the text message exchange, too, and the vetting being a problem, because so often the staff was creating meetings on the fly that it became hard to just go out there and schedule a meeting -- and then obviously something like this happened with Mayor Sokolich where Bridget was clearly upset over it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So after that e-mail, in the period of August 16 to 17 there is an exchange between you and Ms. Kelly where Kelly appears very upset that Ridley met with Sokolich, implying that he should have asked for permission before doing so. Are you familiar with those e-mails? It’s Tab 12, Page 4 and 5.

MS. RENNA: I am. I’m dreading putting it up because I used a curse word and my mother and father are in the audience. So let’s not scroll through. (laughter)

SENATOR O’TOOLE: We can tell them to leave, just for a moment -- the parents. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, we can work on the deletion up there.

MS. RENNA: Thank you, thank you. It’s not pertinent to the discussion.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why was Kelly upset that Ridley met with Sokolich?

MS. RENNA: Why was Kelly mad?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: yes.

MS. RENNA: I don’t know.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Did you ever have a conversation with her at this time about why?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why not?

MS. RENNA: She would have shared the information if I needed to know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Now, it seems that your discussion with Kelly about the Ridley meeting with Sokolich -- my read of it appears that you’re trying to, at least, help Ridley out; that you didn’t want him to feel the full brunt of Kelly’s ire. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes, that’s accurate.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Is this something that was a common occurrence -- where you kind of knew that you had to help him out because you knew Bridget would be upset about this?

MS. RENNA: I loved my staff, and they were excellent. And when things like this happened I did try to, kind of-- Protect isn’t the right word; but there was no reason for this to be communicated down. I just tried to placate, and explain, and that was that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So at this point in time were you aware that Ridley had communicated back that he thought that he could still get Mayor Sokolich’s endorsement? On August 16, he still thought Mayor Sokolich might endorse the Governor?

MS. RENNA: No. It was never my understanding that Mayor Sokolich was going to endorse at all through this time period. Evan did put a line in one recap to me, just kind of saying, “public endorsement looks
bleak.” That was information we already knew. We knew from the spring that Mayor Sokolich had no interest in endorsing the Governor.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And you tried to protect Ridley in your communications with Kelly, but you never addressed this issue with Kelly directly.

MS. RENNA: No, I never addressed it with her directly.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why not?

MS. RENNA: Information flowed down; I mean, that’s the only way I can describe it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MS. RENNA: Bridget can sometimes be a little difficult, as far as sharing information goes. I never wanted her to get the feeling that I was trying to overstep or ask information I wasn’t privy to. So, you know, she shared what she felt I needed to know, and I left it at that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Tab 12 on Page 5 – you assured Kelly that even Stark -- one of the other reports to you -- would have flagged a meeting with Sokolich, suggesting that it was understood that there was some problem meeting with Sokolich. Why would you communicate that, “Even Stark would have flagged this meeting?” I mean, you seem to have known something about there being an issue with meeting with Mayor Sokolich.

MS. RENNA: No, no, no. With the way the IGA flowchart worked. So I was the Director of Intergovernmental Affairs; Chris Stark was the Senior Regional Director. The other Regional Directors reported up to him, so technically the flowchart went up through Chris, then up through me. So a lot of times if I was busy in meetings or not in the office
for whatever reason, they would run their schedules by Christopher, but
Chris would always flag it with me. I mean, he didn’t want me to be out of
the loop. He was a good staff member that way, and so we communicated
frequently about what the staff was doing. That’s what that means.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Would it be fair that, to
describe your position in IGA, that you were essentially the staff’s
intermediary with Bridget?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I think that’s fair.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MS. RENNA: The regional team, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But they would work
through you, and then you would work through Bridget?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. I’m trying to
understand, from a business practice standpoint, how this works where
there is the level of anger, displeasure expressed with one of your staff
people about meeting with Mayor Sokolich. You communicate that even
Chris would have flagged this meeting, but you don’t have any
understanding as to why, or what the issue was. Can you help me
understand that?

MS. RENNA: No. Again, information flowed on a need-to-
know basis. Was it frustrating? Sure. But one can argue as well that it’s
discipline as well. There are plenty of discussions that happen day-to-day in
the Governor’s Office at the senior staff level that I had no business
knowing about. And so was it frustrating? Yes, but who am I to know if
this fell into that category or not? So that’s the way I looked at it.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So is your testimony that one of those staff members, like Mr. Ridley, really had to get preapproval before meeting with the Mayor?

MS. RENNA: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So every single meeting with a mayor had to be preapproved?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And if they weren’t preapproved then they wouldn’t happen?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Or they’re not supposed to happen?

MS. RENNA: They’re not supposed to happen, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

There was also a skepticism expressed about whether Ridley actually even met with Mayor Sokolich.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why did you express that skepticism?

MS. RENNA: Anecdotally I had heard that maybe Evan was not meeting with some of the people he said he was meeting with. So I felt that there was a chance that he could have lied about this meeting, and not done it, and just been off for the afternoon.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you ever have a conversation with Ridley about that?

MS. RENNA: I believe I did, yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And what did he say?

MS. RENNA: I didn’t specifically have a conversation with Evan about this, but just generally about performance issues, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: All right, so I just want to understand. So you expressed skepticism about whether Ridley actually even met with Sokolich. You’ve had other conversations with him about performance issues?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I mean--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But on this particular occasion where you had this skepticism, you didn’t take him aside and say, “Evan, did you really meet with him?”

MS. RENNA: Well, he provided me with the recaps from the meetings. So his meeting recap was decently detailed. I don’t think it was something that he would have made up.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So why did you express the skepticism?

MS. RENNA: I expressed the skepticism on the front end before I received that. Once I got that, it seemed legitimate. I actually had more questions about a second meeting he took that day with the Mayor of West Milford. I’m not sure that that was real. But, again, it was just-- I’d rather, respectfully, not detail my staff’s performance issues. I just don’t think it’s relevant.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: There was this issue about -- that Senator Weinberg raised -- about the Fort Lee Chamber of Commerce breakfast. And the e-mail exchange is captured on Tab 16. You had raised a question about the Chamber of Commerce to Bridget Kelly,
and Kelly asked, “Should we do this in light of the Mayor?” Do you now, or did you then, have an understanding of what she meant by, “Should we do this in light of the Mayor?”

MS. RENNA: No. As I explained to Chairwoman Weinberg, this e-mail exchange and my reaction to it was based solely on the fact that four days previously she was clearly very angry about any interactions with Mayor Sokolich.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So I’m just trying to understand that your response, “I guess not,” is based on what?

MS. RENNA: Just placating Bridget.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I just want to--

MS. RENNA: Obviously there was an issue--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes, it seems to me that -- and correct me if this is an incorrect characterization -- that at least a thread of consistency through your testimony is that you did a lot to placate Bridget. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: I did some, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why was that?

MS. RENNA: Bridget could be a very good manager sometimes; and she could also be difficult sometimes. So it varied day by day. You just rolled with the punches and did the job.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Now, you and Bridget were close at one point in time.

MS. RENNA: We were.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And that was during the period of time when you both worked in IGA.
MS. RENNA: Correct, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And then there was an estrangement -- a progressive estrangement.

MS. RENNA: I think that's a fair characterization, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Do you know why?

MS. RENNA: I don’t.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: She never said anything to you?

MS. RENNA: No, she didn’t.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you ever say anything to her?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Were you always placating or trying to placate Bridget Kelly even when you had a closer relationship?

MS. RENNA: The dynamic was different then, I would say. I also didn’t have a staff of 10 people. So all in all, the dynamics evolved over time as well. There are times – yes, placate is the right word. You know, honestly I really tried every day to do a really good job for Bridget. And she had a lot on her plate, and she was enormously overwhelmed between family and work. And I just really tried to make her life easier.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Going back to the Chamber of Commerce breakfast, Tab 16 -- which I think is displayed-- Kelly’s response back to you after you say, “I guess not. It’s a good Chamber, though” -- she writes back, “I assume the Mayor would go, no.” And you respond, “Not necessarily if we don’t tell him. He works, right?” My
reading of that says you understand that there’s a reason to not have Mayor Sokolich and the Lieutenant Governor at the same event. Why is that?

MS. RENNA: That’s because of the whole e-mail chain. I mean, it’s obvious that Bridget doesn’t want the two of them together by the reading of this e-mail chain. So I’m simply being reactionary.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you’re not giving her any feedback; you’re just basically-- Is it correct that you’re just essentially responding to what you think she wants to hear?

MS. RENNA: I’m giving her an option that-- I’m obviously telling her that the Chamber is a strong chamber; that it would make sense to send them there. And if she has an issue with the Mayor -- which she clearly did -- a way of getting around it was that the Mayor’s working and he’s likely not going to come anyway. So I was reminding her of those facts.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Again, this is another instance of where it appears from the e-mail exchange that you had some level of understanding that there was a level of animus or disagreement between Bridget Kelly and Mayor Sokolich.

MS. RENNA: I can assure you I did not have any knowledge of that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Even though in this instance and in the prior instance that comes across in the e-mails?

MS. RENNA: It depends on how you read the e-mails.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And your explanation is that you were just simply trying to placate her on both occasions?

MS. RENNA: Not always. If you read the e-mail exchange--
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just in those two occasions that we’re talking about -- with Evan Ridley meeting with Mayor Sokolich--

MS. RENNA: I was trying to placate her when she was upset with Evan’s meeting, yes. With this I’m trying to be helpful and give her other suggestions of how we can get around the issue that she apparently has with the Mayor. I wouldn’t call that placating.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you, at this point in time, still don’t know what the issue is.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And no one’s ever shared with you at the office -- Stark, Ridley, anybody -- about what this issue is?

MS. RENNA: None of them would know. If I didn’t know, they wouldn’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Let’s go forward to September 9, Tab 18. You were copied on an e-mail that Bridget Kelly sent to Evan Ridley. And the e-mail is, “Have you spoken to the Fort Lee Mayor?” Which Ridley replies, “No, not in a while.” When that e-mail came to your inbox, at that point in time were you aware of the lane closures on the George Washington Bridge?

MS. RENNA: I don’t believe I was, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Was it unusual for Kelly to directly communicate with Ridley?

MS. RENNA: I wouldn’t say it was unusual. It wasn’t regular, but I wouldn’t call it unusual.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay -- maybe a different choice of words on my part. The normal chain of command would be for Ridley to communicate with you.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And for you to communicate with Kelly.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And so this was a departure from what was a normal method of communicating?

MS. RENNA: Again, I wouldn’t say it was a departure, because there are times that Bridget would just go to one of my staff members and, as a way of looping me in to make sure I’m aware, CC me on it. So that happened pretty frequently, too -- decently frequently.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So there was no consistent pattern of communication in terms of the chain of command? Sometimes it went through you, sometimes it didn’t?

MS. RENNA: The chain of command always went through me, but she is the boss. So if she wanted to reach out to a member of her staff, she did that. And out of respect for my position, she would CC to make sure I was in the loop about it. It was just a way of keeping everyone on the same page.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: After this e-mail exchange on September 9 that you were copied on, did you have an opportunity to see Bridget Kelly on that day or the day after?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Did you ever have a conversation with Bridget Kelly about this e-mail?

MS. RENNA: No, I did not.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you ever have a conversation with Evan Ridley about this e-mail?

MS. RENNA: I don’t believe so, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: The e-mail that we have here is a photocopy of an e-mail having been printed out. It’s not-- You can see, it’s skewed on the page. Why and when did you print out this e-mail?

MS. RENNA: In response to the court subpoena I received.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Now, on September 12 -- so three days later -- Evan Ridley came to you in person and he described an angry call he had gotten from Mayor Sokolich -- and that’s reflected on Tab 28, Page 13. That’s Evan Ridley’s interview memo, and according to that memo he had been in a meeting with the North Arlington Mayor and he was unable to take the call so it went to voicemail. Afterwards, Ridley called Mayor Sokolich back and learned about the lane closures, and the traffic problems, and Mayor Sokolich’s frustration and concern about political retribution. You took handwritten notes about this.

MS. RENNA: Yes, I did.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Was it always your practice to take handwritten notes if somebody like Evan Ridley came into you to explain something or discuss something?

MS. RENNA: Something-- Yes. I mean, something of larger importance, sure. Or if I was on the phone taking notes, yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So in your mind this was something of larger importance.

MS. RENNA: Evan made it clear that it was an important situation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And why did you think it was an important situation?

MS. RENNA: Because Evan made it clear it was an important situation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Other than-- He just came in and said, “This is important?”

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And that’s it?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

On Tab 19 Ridley says he asked you if the Office of the Governor had anything to do with the lane closures, given Sokolich’s suggestion of political payback. Did you answer that question?

MS. RENNA: I believe I told him I didn’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You didn’t know? Okay.

Did you communicate this directly to Bridget Kelly?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why not?

MS. RENNA: Because I couldn’t get a hold of her.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And how did you try to communicate to her?

MS. RENNA: I typed an e-mail and sent it to her.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Why didn’t you pick up the phone?

MS. RENNA: She was in the Governor’s weekly Sandy meeting.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MS. RENNA: And so she was in that meeting; it lasts anywhere from an hour to two hours, depending upon-- So I cannot reach her at that period. And during that meeting is when news broke of the Seaside Boardwalk fire. So then she was with the Governor and obviously focused on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What time is that weekly standing meeting?

MS. RENNA: It varies week to week. It’s never at the same time.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And you didn’t think about leaving a voicemail message for her?

MS. RENNA: No. I don’t-- I’m not a big voicemail message leaver, period.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Was that a policy of the office?

MS. RENNA: No, it’s my personal preference.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Now, there’s a distinction that I want to make sure I understand completely -- is the interview memo says that he let the phone call go to voicemail. However, in the e-mail you wrote to Bridget Kelly you say that Ridley answered the phone when he received the call from an
unrecognized number. Why was your recounting of the facts different than what Evan Ridley said had happened?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know. I just reiterated it as I recalled it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Were you trying to protect Ridley in some fashion from Bridget Kelly?

MS. RENNA: The e-mail led as the e-mail led, because I knew three weeks previously she was angry that Evan met with Mayor Sokolich. I did not have a follow-up conversation with Bridget about why that was a problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

MS. RENNA: Now-- Sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: No, go ahead.

MS. RENNA: And now, obviously, the Mayor is calling. And, yes, in an effort-- If I didn’t lead the e-mail that way, her response back to me -- my guess is that it would be, “Why did Evan pick up the phone?” That would be my guess. So I led the e-mail that way, explaining why he fielded the call in the first place.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And so you didn’t feel comfortable saying exactly what happened?

MS. RENNA: Well, I don’t recall Evan telling me that. I just think it’s a discrepancy in how we’re remembering it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. But this was contemporaneously written, at the time. Is there a chance your recollection now is different than it was when you wrote this?

MS. RENNA: Maybe I’m not-- I don’t think I’m following. I don’t think we’re talking about the same things.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, I’m trying to understand why Evan Ridley would say that he let the call go to voicemail and then called him back. And your contemporaneously written e-mail message to Bridget Kelly says that he took a call from an unrecognized number. There is a significant variance, and so I’m trying to understand--

MS. RENNA: No, but the number did come from a number he was not familiar with --- which is why he let it go to voicemail.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So the only reason-- Your testimony is, the only reason you didn’t explain that he returned the call, as opposed to answering the phone, was that you felt that that was in some way protecting Evan from Bridget Kelly’s displeasure?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So again, this is another instance of where you felt it necessary to intercede on behalf a staff member to protect them from Bridget?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So I just want to show you Tab 20, which is this e-mail. And this was the e-mail that you sent to Bridget, and you recounted the conversation we just discussed. And the response from Bridget Kelly was, “Good.” Did you understand why she said, “Good?”

MS. RENNA: I didn’t understand it, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Sounds like she was pleased?

MS. RENNA: That is one way you could read it, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Is there another way?
MS. RENNA: You can read it that she was glad that he said he would call him back. There are varying ways to read it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But if you were concerned that Bridget Kelly would be upset about Evan Ridley speaking with Mayor Sokolich, why would she be saying, “Good,” that he was talking to him?

MS. RENNA: I agree.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So would you agree that it's not likely that she was saying, “Good,” that he called him back?

MS. RENNA: I agree with that, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Did you have a discussion with Bridget about her response, “Good?”

MS. RENNA: No, not that I can recall.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Did you have a discussion with anyone else about this e-mail?

MS. RENNA: Not that I can recall, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you have any further discussions with Evan Ridley that day about this e-mail or about the conversation with Mayor Sokolich?

MS. RENNA: Subsequent to this, Evan did follow back up with me, because I told him when he reported all this to me, “Hold. Let me check in with Bridget about this.” This was the first time I had heard about any of the lane closures -- this e-mail here.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MS. RENNA: Or the phone call fielded from Mayor Sokolich. So I said, “Hold, because I don’t know what we should do.” Then the
Seaside fire happened. We were really consumed by that for a few days -- we being IGA. And then on the back end of it-- No. I mean, I believe Evan checked in with me once just to say, “Did you get any feedback?” I told him I hadn’t yet, and I think that that’s it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Were you aware that on December 12 Bridget Kelly showed Kevin O’Dowd the September 12 e-mail that you wrote to her about what Sokolich had told Ridley?

MS. RENNA: I read that in the memo and learned that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you weren’t aware of that independently?

MS. RENNA: I was not, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: On or after December 12, did Mr. O’Dowd ever talk to you about this e-mail?

MS. RENNA: No, he did not.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did anyone else on the Governor’s staff talk to you about this e-mail?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Now, according to your interview memo, the IGA office -- this is what they said you said, so correct me if this is incorrect. “The IGA office did not engage in any outreach with Mayor Sokolich between the Ridley August 16 meeting and the Fort Lee lane closures.” Is that what you said?

MS. RENNA: Yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Aside from the conversations that we just talked about, is it correct that the IGA ceased to interact with Mayor Sokolich?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Do you understand why?

MS. RENNA: That was at my recommendation to Evan because I didn’t want Bridget to be upset with him.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So you made a recommendation to Evan to cease all communication with Mayor Sokolich.

MS. RENNA: Until I had a chance to talk to Bridget further about this -- and that opportunity just never came.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you ever share with anyone that you had made that recommendation to cease all communication with Mayor Sokolich?

MS. RENNA: No, I don’t believe so.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Is there a reason why-- You just testified that you made that recommendation. Is there a reason why that’s not related or conveyed in any way in your interview memo with the Gibson firm?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know. No, there’s no specific reason for it. I think you just asked the question.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did they ask you that question?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.
So you were the one who personally instructed Ridley to stop meeting with Sokolich?

MS. RENNA: Right, for his protection in this.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you or anybody else think it relevant to reach out to Mayor Sokolich? I mean, you’ve instructed the Intergovernmental Affairs Office to essentially cease contact with a mayor.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So I’m just trying to understand that in the context of the phrase that was used in your interview about the office being “amazingly nonpartisan.” You’ve recommended, “Don’t talk to this Mayor,” because -- your testimony -- one staff member was very unhappy about any communication, but you don’t know why. I’m trying to understand how you could call it “amazingly bipartisan” or “nonpartisan,” and at the same time shut this Mayor out.

MS. RENNA: You’re making it seem like this is a partisan or a nonpartisan issue. It was just an issue. It was a traffic issue. And, you know, I’m willing to take the blame for that. You know, I instructed Evan to halt communication with Mayor Sokolich until I had a chance to talk to Bridget further about it; and that I never followed up. So this was not as it relates to hands-off mayors, or any of that. This was just me saying to Evan, “Something is up. I need to get to the bottom of it.” And I never got to the bottom of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And so, in a sense, you put Mayor Sokolich on, essentially, a do-not-call list.

MS. RENNA: I don’t think that’s a fair characterization.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Was anybody allowed to reach out to Mayor Sokolich?

MS. RENNA: If Evan had reached out to Mayor Sokolich that would have been fine. I just said -- again, I didn’t express to him that Bridget was upset with him. I was trying to protect him a little bit from that. So I didn’t express to him why. He didn’t know any of the reasons why. I just said, “Don’t.” And if he had, that would have been fine. But I was recommending to him to halt until I could have a further conversation with Bridget.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I’d like to go back to the December 12, 2013-- I’m sorry; I’d like to go back to that e-mail -- Tab 20 -- that e-mail. On December 12 you received a call -- or Kelly called you -- at about 8:30, 8:45 at night.

MS. RENNA: On December 12?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: The two of you talked for about 20 minutes, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: She called you specifically to ask about the timing of trying to secure the endorsement for Mayor Sokolich, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes, that’s how she led the conversation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Now, what did you tell her?
MS. RENNA: I told her I wasn’t 100 percent certain because I was not overseeing the operation at that time. I was not overseeing the Regional Directors, I had different responsibilities in IGA. I communicated to her what I had heard anecdotally, which was that Matt Mowers -- a member of our staff at that time -- felt the Mayor out to see if he would be interested in the spring of 2013, although I couldn’t remember specifically when -- if it was April or May.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why would Bridget Kelly call you to ask you to recount the efforts to get Mayor Sokolich’s endorsement?

MS. RENNA: Because at the time I was the person overseeing the regional team. And if there were people in IGA seeking endorsements, it was those Regional Directors. So, you know, the person who used to oversee the regional team was no longer there.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So the Regional Directors are the individuals like Evan Ridley--

MS. RENNA: Sure, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: --who reached out to mayors. And it was your understanding their job was to secure endorsements.

MS. RENNA: It was not their job to secure endorsements.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: One of their functions.

MS. RENNA: If they felt an opportunity to secure an endorsement and were comfortable doing so, they were given the green light to do that, yes. I wouldn’t call it a job or a responsibility at all.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But I’m trying to understand why Bridget Kelly would call you and ask you to recount for her the timeline of obtaining Mayor Sokolich’s endorsement. The question, at least, seems to imply that she thought in your role that you had some knowledge about that. You’re saying you had no knowledge about that?

MS. RENNA: No, I mean-- You know, candidly, Chairman I was the only other-- Bridget called me a lot to bounce things off me. I’m an older member of the staff. She called me, not frequently around this time, but generally over the time we worked together-- This was not a strange call; this was not a strange ask. Even though I didn’t oversee the team at the time, I can’t think of anyone else in IGA she would have called about that except Evan directly. But she didn’t-- She went through me before-- Most of the time she went through the regional staff.

Chairman, do you mind clarifying to me-- Obviously, a good point was made. I’m not clear if you were asking me to clarify this based on what I know now, or based on what I knew at the time -- because the answer differs, obviously, dramatically.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Sure. Let’s start with what you knew at the time.

MS. RENNA: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Bridget Kelly called you on December 12 at 8:45 in the evening. Did you always get calls from Bridget Kelly at 8:45 in the evening?

MS. RENNA: Not at that point, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So this was an unusual call.
MS. RENNA: Absolutely, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And so in this unusual call she asks you to recount for her what you knew about the timeline and securing Mayor Sokolich’s endorsement. That was her question.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Now, did you say to her, “Bridget, I don’t know anything about that.”

MS. RENNA: Sort of, yes I did, as you see in my memo. I say, “Well, I wasn’t involved with that side of the operation at that point, but this is what I can tell you that I heard anecdotally.”

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What side of the operation was involved with securing endorsements?

MS. RENNA: The regional operation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: The regional people like Ridley?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. So it’s your understanding that one among, perhaps, many obligations of Evan Ridley was to secure endorsements.

MS. RENNA: That’s false. It was not an obligation at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Job function?

MS. RENNA: It was not a job function.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What was it?

MS. RENNA: It was a voluntary exercise.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I’m having trouble understanding -- and maybe we’re using language to not communicate
correctly here, so let’s try this again. Why would Bridget Kelly think you knew anything about the Sokolich endorsement?

MS. RENNA: Because we had staff members on staff who were interested in pursuing an endorsement from Mayor Sokolich.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. But there were times where Bridget directly communicated with those staff members, you testified earlier.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So why didn’t she call Evan Ridley? Why did she call you if you say you had no knowledge of that?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I don’t know why she chose to speak to me about this.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. The call was actually broken into two parts because the call dropped, right?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And in your Gibson Dunn interview memo, you noted that there was a change in demeanor in the call. What was the demeanor on the first part of the call, and what was the demeanor in the second part of the call?

MS. RENNA: I would characterize the first part of the call as being businesslike. You know, for lack of a better term, normal -- conversing, asking questions about work and whatever it may be. The second version of the call was-- She was enormously nervous, enormously sort of erratic. She wasn’t making a lot of sense. She talked in circles a bit; she repeated herself a lot. She sounded nervous. I was having a hard time following her in the second part of the conversation.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just so that we’re clear. So this conversation broke into two parts. She calls, first part, matter-of-fact, businesslike.

MS. RENNA: I mean, just normal. It was a normal exchange about normal things. It was not an abnormal tone, not abnormal anything -- just a normal conversation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And the first part was about what you know about securing the endorsement of Mayor Sokolich.

MS. RENNA: Correct -- the timeline.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And the second part was-- She had used some phrases in it, in your conversation, that you recounted in the Gibson Dunn -- and I’m paraphrasing -- but essentially something to the effect that “if somebody told me to do something, that’s okay.”

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What did you think she was talking about?

MS. RENNA: I took that to mean that, candidly-- One way I would describe Bridget is a little insecure. And she relied heavily on other people, I think, to make decisions for her. I think that that was absolutely the case up until she became Deputy Chief of Staff, and then she didn’t have anyone to make those decisions for her anymore.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I’m not sure I follow when you say “making decisions for her.” What kind of decisions would she have people make for her?

MS. RENNA: She looked for guidance a lot. She was just not a decision maker, I would say. I guess I don’t know how else to describe it.
When she says something along the lines of, “Someone tells me something’s okay,” I took that to mean that feeds into that insecurity that she has. That someone told her something, and just knowing Bridget she wouldn’t challenge really anyone, even at her level or above her at all. I mean, she doesn’t-- I really don’t want to pile onto Bridget, but--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, I just-- With all due respect, it also sounds like something that you did, because you weren’t willing to challenge Bridget Kelly.

MS. RENNA: If that’s what you want to say, that’s fine.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, but I’ve asked you why you didn’t challenge Bridget Kelly, and you said, “It’s just not something you did.”

MS. RENNA: I didn’t want to feed her frustration that (indiscernible); I just didn’t.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You didn’t want to feed her frustration?

MS. RENNA: And aggravation. And she--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why was she--

MS. RENNA: --was enormously overwhelmed, and enormously stressed with day-to-day life. And again, I served her day in and day out and tried to make her life easier, which I told her a million times.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: At the end of that phone call she asked you to do her a favor.

MS. RENNA: She didn’t put it that way.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: She asked you to do something for her.
MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What did she ask you to do?

MS. RENNA: Well, it wasn’t the end of the phone call; it was the middle of the phone call. But she said that she-- I brought this e-mail chain up -- the “Good” e-mail chain up to her.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You raised it in that phone call?

MS. RENNA: I raised it to her. She led by saying, “I didn’t know anything about this -- the lane closures.” I countered with, “Well, yes you did, because Mayor Sokolich called Evan and I e-mail you about it.” And that’s when the tune started to change; that’s when her demeanor changed. And she knew exactly what e-mail I was talking about. She said that she-- She responded to me by saying, “Oh, are you talking about the e-mail I responded to with, “Good?” And I said, “Yes.” And she said, “Well, ‘good’ can mean a bunch of different things. You can read that a bunch of different ways,’” and she sounded very nervous. And then she said, “You know, just do me a favor and get rid of it.”

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And what did you understand her to mean by “get rid of it?”

MS. RENNA: Well, I clarified. I said, “You want me to delete the e-mail?” I said that to her.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MS. RENNA: And she said, “Yes. Listen, I’m getting a lot of questions, and I’m just really nervous. And, you know, I can’t take getting grilled about this over and over again.” So she sort of said yes, but moved
on and never actually reacknowledged the point again, if that makes sense. She acknowledged it, she confirmed it, she moved on and didn’t address it again. And right around then is when the call dropped.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: For the second time?
MS. RENNA: No, the first time.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: First time?
MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: When she asked you to get rid of it, and you confirmed that she wanted you to delete it, did you challenge her in any way saying, “Bridget, that might not be a good idea; there’s a legislative committee investigating this”?

MS. RENNA: No. I couldn’t get a word in edgewise at that point. She was talking very fast, talking in circles. The call dropped mid-sentence. And the topic never came back up in the second half of the conversation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And this e-mail was on a private Gmail account.

MS. RENNA: Correct.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You had access to Bridget’s private Gmail account?

MS. RENNA: No.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, how would you-- She wanted you to delete it from your e-mail account?

MS. RENNA: Yes. That is what I assumed she meant, yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. I’m curious that of all the transactions, this phone call at 8:45 at night -- which you clearly
didn’t anticipate -- in that phone call you were able to pinpoint this one e-
mail communication. How did that rise to the surface? Was it significant
to you in some way?

MS. RENNA: It’s the only thing I knew about the Fort Lee lane closures. Mayor Sokolich never reached out again. This was it; this was all I knew. I knew that I had this on this e-mail exchange, because I remembered. I remembered the call coming in.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So you deleted the copy of the e-mail that you had.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: On your e-mail account.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But then you did something else.

MS. RENNA: Before I deleted it I forwarded it to another account to preserve it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: This e-mail account that you deleted it from, this was your e-mail account.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did anyone else have access to it?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why would you delete it from an e-mail account that no one else would see and then send it to another e-mail account?
MS. RENNA: I wanted to be able-- If she asked me, if it came up again in conversation, I wanted to be able to tell her in good faith that I did what she asked me to do. But I also knew that I had never been asked to do anything like that before. I felt the request could have been inappropriate. And, candidly, I was uncomfortable with it. So I did what she asked me to do, but I protected myself as well. That’s the way I look at it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why do you use the term you protected yourself?

MS. RENNA: I mean, being asked to delete an e-mail is a strange request and a unique request. And, you know, in four years of working in IGA, I was never asked to do anything that I felt uncomfortable with.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You thought it was wrong?

MS. RENNA: And I just thought it was-- I thought it was strange; I thought it was strange. And I felt she was paranoid -- that’s really what I felt.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: This strange request -- the next morning, you were at work?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did you talk to anybody in terms of somebody who oversees ethics, or law, or chief counsel, or anybody like that and say, “Hey, I just want to let you know I got this strange request.” Did you talk to anybody?

MS. RENNA: I did not.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why not?
MS. RENNA: I didn’t think I needed to. I just didn’t.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: All right. So I’m just trying to understand. So the night before you thought it was “strange,” correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you didn’t report it to anybody.

MS. RENNA: Again, we’re looking at this on the back end view. I didn’t think that it rose to a level of having to go to an ethics officer for it. I just-- I didn’t -- not at the time.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Now, you were aware at that time that there were legislative hearings on this issue.

MS. RENNA: I was, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And notwithstanding the fact that there are legislative hearings on this issue, Bridget Kelly asked you to delete an e-mail from your own personal e-mail account. You delete it, and preserve it somewhere else, but you don’t think it rises to the level to talk to somebody.

MS. RENNA: I didn’t, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. When did you eventually talk to anybody about this deletion?

MS. RENNA: I brought it to Regina Egea on January 9.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Why on January 9?

MS. RENNA: That was the day after it became exposed -- Bridget’s involvement in the lane closures.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And who did you talk to?
MS. RENNA: Regina Egea.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

MS. RENNA: That’s who I brought it to.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And did you talk to anybody else?

MS. RENNA: Not at that time.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And what was her response when you brought it to her attention?

MS. RENNA: Regina didn’t say much. She looked surprised. I explained to her the timestamps, and the different e-mail addresses, and why they varied. And I just explained to her that I felt a responsibility to turn it over in light of what came out yesterday. And I knew the Governor was going to have a press conference later that morning, and I just wanted to make sure the Governor had all the information I knew on this before he got up behind the podium, essentially. So I brought this down to Regina first thing in the morning.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So the e-mails-- The Bergen Record story came out on January 8.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: You waited until January 9 to go to Regina.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: When you saw the story on January 8, why didn’t you go to Regina on January 8?

MS. RENNA: Candidly, I was-- We were all completely in shock. It was a day of -- not to be dramatic -- but it was a day of a lot of
tears in the office. A lot of people were very upset about what transpired. A lot of people were genuinely in shock by it all. I’m getting upset even talking about it. It was just traumatic for definitely the entire IGA team. There are a lot of younger people on the staff. My door was a revolving door that day of people upset, asking for advice on what to do.

I did this first thing in the morning.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: On January 9?

MS. RENNA: The next day, before I even interacted with my staff, as a matter of fact.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Up until that point in time-- So that conversation between you and Bridget Kelly on the evening of December 12, through January 9 -- did you speak to anybody either about the request to delete the e-mail or the content of the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: Not that I can recall, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: There are references to there being an inquiry made in the Governor’s Office staff if anybody was aware of an e-mail or any communications related to the bridge issue -- which I think was in December before the Governor had his December 13 press conference.

Were you aware there was this inquiry within the Governor’s Office if anybody had any knowledge?

MS. RENNA: I wasn’t aware of that, but I can recall it now.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Nobody knocked on your door and said, “Do you know anything? Does anybody know anything?”
MS. RENNA: Knowing that information-- I don’t recall that at all. The information would have probably flowed through Bridget on that. I don’t recollect it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

Co-Chair, I’m going to take a break now, and turn this over to other members.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

MS. RENNA: You’re welcome, Chairman.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. Does anybody over here have some short questions? Otherwise, we’ll take a lunch break.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: I think we should take a lunch break. I’d like to take a break.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman Schepisi, did you--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: I can wait until after the break.

SENATOR WEINBERG: All right. We’re going-- It’s 12:40 p.m. Be back here at 1:10-- just 30 minutes, please.

(recess)

SENATOR WEINBERG: We are back into session. Thank you for being comparatively prompt -- relatively prompt.

Thank you, Ms. Renna. You know, of course, you’re still under oath.

So I’d like to recognize Assemblywoman Holly Schepisi.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Thank you.
MS. RENNA: Thanks, Assemblywoman.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Ms. Renna, how are you?

MS. RENNA: Doing well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Good.

It sounds a little bit like your relationship with Bridget, with information flowing on a need-to-know basis, is similar to being a Republican on this Committee. (laughter)

But I do have a couple of questions to ask you, very quick.

At the time that Bridget spoke to you about not responding to Mayor Sokolich, did you believe that it was because he was a Democrat?

MS. RENNA: No. No, I had nothing-- I don’t believe that that had anything to do with that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Okay. Did you ever speak to the Governor directly about any of these issues?

MS. RENNA: No, not at all.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Okay. And the last question is, when you were talking earlier about campaign activities and IGA activities -- when the campaign kicked into gear, were you guys instructed by anybody to keep the two activities separate?

MS. RENNA: No -- absolutely, the directive was always to keep the activities separate. I mean, in the capacity that IGA staff was working in, it was like any volunteer that wanted to volunteer for Governor Christie. So it was the same. And yes -- there was a strict delineation between keeping the two. Which is why nights and weekends were so important; which is why Bridgewater Wednesdays when we would make
calls on behalf of the election campaign happened around 6:00 every night. That’s why.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you, Assemblywoman.

And just before I recognize Senator Gill, I have one more question that was kind of left over from my earlier questioning, which has to do with the phrase mandatory directive.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: If I remember correctly, in your earlier answer to the questions, you said something about a “mandatory directive took place once before.” Could you speak to that? What was the “once before”?

MS. RENNA: I mean, I sort of got into it in an answer to another question. But the only time -- if you want to use that phrase mandatory directive -- which, again, were not my words, but words that make sense in just this one capacity -- it’s that, as I said: If there was any reason to believe that a person was under investigation or was about to be indicted, we were told, off the bat-- We weren’t told they were under investigation; we weren’t told that at all. But we were told absolutely no contact with this person; and if this person reaches out to you to not return the call -- nothing. And that was obviously for the protection of the Governor, but obviously also for the protection of us, of the staff.

Now, you know, in one specific case -- which I don’t want to give examples, obviously -- but I remember none of us knew why. And a month-and-a-half later, there it was in the newspaper -- and we understood. So that would be the one exception. If you want to use that term mandatory directive, that’s where it would fit.
SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. And when you were doing the Bridgewater Wednesdays or weekends, what kind of phone calls were you making there?

MS. RENNA: Oh, a variety. A majority of them were calling people to see if they would come to events for the Governor. So the Governor was doing a campaign headquarters opening in Paterson. So we would call people in Paterson and say, “The Governor welcomes you to come out” -- things like that.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. So you weren’t doing endorsement calls from the Bridgewater Wednesdays.

MS. RENNA: No. It was like a get out the vote-type-- That kind of phone banking; traditional phone bank.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And you weren’t doing the endorsement calls during the week in the office.

MS. RENNA: We weren’t doing endorsement calls in the office during the week, no.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So then how did the endorsement calls get done?

MS. RENNA: Well, I don’t want to say exclusively. I mean, maybe if one of the staff members who was working on an endorsement happened to be in Bridgewater at 6:00 at night, then maybe they made an endorsement call. That would have been fine because that would be after hours. I mean, I can just only-- I can speak for myself: I never made an endorsement call at Bridgewater.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. I’m not going to belabor the point any further.
MS. RENNA: Okay.

SENATOR WEINBERG: But obviously endorsement-- According to your knowledge, endorsement calls were not made -- request endorsement calls, outreach, whatever -- to potential Democratic allies during the business day. And generally the Bridgewater Wednesdays or weekends were about GOTV calls. So somehow, however many democratic allies endorsed the Governor, we don’t quite know how all that happened? It’s just kind of a mystery?

MS. RENNA: Well, as I just said, maybe endorsement calls were made on Wednesdays after hours. I’m sure, possibly, that happened. It would have been acceptable for that to happen after hours.

However, at the end of the day, once a week people from the Governor’s Office went to voluntarily make calls on behalf of the Governor’s reelection campaign. It was one day a week; it didn’t happen on weekends unless people wanted to go on weekends. The characterization that you can’t figure out when endorsements took place if we worked during the day and one day a week made phone calls is, I think, a little shortsighted. There’s plenty of time to do that work.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So one day a week people from the Governor’s Office -- that during the day they took a vacation day or whatever and--

MS. RENNA: Some people-- No, no. Some people went two times a week. People who enjoyed doing get-out-the-vote calls went whenever they wanted after hours.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

MS. RENNA: It was just--
SENATOR WEINBERG: All right, well I’m sure as we review documents from the campaign of Governor Christie we might find out how those endorsements took place, or when they did.

But thank you.

I would like to recognize Senator Gill, and then Assemblyman Greenwald.

SENATOR GILL: Thank you very much.

I have a couple of questions. And some of them I will frame with respect to certain events.

Now, I just want to make sure-- And you may have testified to this. When did you first become aware that the Mayor of Fort Lee communicated or interacted with IGA regarding the lane closures?

MS. RENNA: It was September 12 when he called Evan Ridley.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. Have you ever received a communication that claimed that the Port Authority, the Governor’s Office, or the Administration was acting in retribution?

MS. RENNA: No.

SENATOR GILL: So would it be correct of us to say that based upon -- and if we can put the exhibit up; it would be Tab 20. And this Tab 20 is your e-mail and your description of your conversation with Mr. Ridley. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And in your e-mail, in your description of your conversation with Mr. Ridley, you state that Mr. Ridley said that the Mayor told Evan -- and Evan is Mr. Ridley, right? -- that he
had no idea why Port Authority decided to do this; and this refers to the lane closures, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. But there is a feeling in town that it is government retribution for something, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: All right. Had that been the first and only time that you had a conversation or received communications from anyone claiming that the Governor’s Office or the Port Authority was acting in retribution?

MS. RENNA: I believe this is the only time.

SENATOR GILL: Do you know, or do you believe, or--

MS. RENNA: I believe.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. So it would be correct of me to say that this was out of the ordinary for you.

MS. RENNA: What was out of the ordinary?

SENATOR GILL: For you to receive a communication or a conversation with Mr. Evans (sic) or anyone who references that there is an allegation of governmental retribution.

MS. RENNA: No, I disagree with that statement.

SENATOR GILL: Okay, so then I want you to tell me why you disagree.

MS. RENNA: I disagree with the statement because IGA’s day-today job was fielding, really, complaint calls -- because no one calls when they’re happy; they only call when they’re upset about something -- of all kinds, all day long, alleging all kinds of things.
SENATOR GILL: So is it correct to say -- and I’m asking you what you received. I’m not asking what IGA-- This is specific to you. Have you received information or communication alleging that actions taken were taken as part of governmental retribution?

MS. RENNA: Not that I can recall, no.

SENATOR GILL: Now, I’m asking you, with respect to your knowledge. Aside from Ms. Kelly’s response of “Good,” did you -- and we’re talking about with respect to Tab 20 -- did you ever have any subsequent conversation between September 12 and December 12 with Ms. Kelly, Mr. Ridley, or anyone else about the Mayor of Fort Lee or the issues of government retribution or lane closures?

MS. RENNA: After September 12 I had a follow-up conversation with Evan, during which he asked me if I had received feedback from Bridget on how to proceed on this issue. I previously stated that earlier. Beyond that, Evan submitted in his daily report to me a *Wall Street Journal* news article link which I then turned over to Bridget in my daily report.

SENATOR GILL: Did you read the link? Did you go to the link and read the *Wall Street Journal* article?

MS. RENNA: I did not. But that, I believe, was in our clips -- the Governor’s Office clips that day.

SENATOR GILL: Did you read it in the Governor’s Office clips?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall if I did or not.

SENATOR GILL: Did you-- And you supervised Mr. Ridley, correct?
MS. RENNA: I did.

SENATOR GILL: And when Mr. Ridley -- after you’ve had this conversation with him about government retribution and the lane closures -- he sends you a specific link with respect to the *Wall Street Journal*. And you did not simply click on that link to see what Mr. Ridley was referring to?

MS. RENNA: No, it came through in our clips earlier in the day, so I already knew what article he was referring to.

SENATOR GILL: Did you read the clips?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall if I did or not.

SENATOR GILL: Well, then how do you know what article he was referring to if you don’t remember if you read the clip or not?

MS. RENNA: He described the article before putting the link in the daily report.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And did he describe the article before putting the link in the daily report to you?

MS. RENNA: In his daily report, in writing; not personally.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And did you read that?

MS. RENNA: His daily report? Yes.

SENATOR GILL: So what was the article that you say he referred to in his link that you now say he described in the daily press?

MS. RENNA: It was the first-- I believe it was the first news article published on the lane closures -- I believe. Or at least it’s the first that got any attention.

SENATOR GILL: And so since it’s the first that got any attention, what did it say, in substance?
MS. RENNA: I don’t recall.

SENATOR GILL: Do you recall if it said anything about political retribution?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall, no.

SENATOR GILL: And at any point after did you ever go back and view the link that was supplied to you by Mr. Evans -- right? Is that his name?

MS. RENNA: Mr. Ridley.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. Help me out here, because I do mix up names.

MS. RENNA: Evan is his first name; Ridley’s the last name.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. My first name is Nia, my last name is Gill. That’s pretty easy.

So did you ever go back and just click on the link to see what Mr. Ridley had?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall if I did or not.

SENATOR GILL: Okay.

Now, I just would like to frame this by establishing a little guide -- framework -- so it can direct our attention more specifically. So we know that on October 1, the Wall Street Journal published a story quoting the Port Authority Executive Director Patrick Foye’s directive to reopen the closed lanes. And in that e-mail it is reported that Director Patrick Foye stated that he “believes this is a hasty and ill-advised decision that violates Federal law and the laws of both states. To be clear,” he states, “I will get to the bottom of this abusive decision which violates everything this agency stands for.” He continues, “I intend to know how the Port Authority was
wrongfully subverted and the public interest damaged, to say nothing of the credibility of this agency.” Do you know if that was the story that you reviewed?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall.

SENATOR GILL: Do you recall reading about this?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall, no.

SENATOR GILL: Then on November 7, the Wall Street Journal publishes a story identifying David Wildstein as the official who ordered the lane closing. Did you get any information with respect to that story in the news clippings that are provided to you?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall, no.

SENATOR GILL: Now, on November 25-- And before I continue, you were the Director of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MS. RENNA: I was.

SENATOR GILL: And as Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, it was your job responsibility to supervise the 10 members of the IGA staff, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And those 10 members were divided into two teams of Regional Directors, and they were responsible for interacting and communicating with mayors and locals governments, on the local level, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And I think previously you indicated that your position was a pass-through for information, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.
SENATOR GILL: And that-- Okay, so on-- I’ll go back. On November 25, Bill Baroni testifies in front of the Assembly Transportation Committee. All the while there are reports about political retribution regarding the lanes. And then on December 7, David Wildstein resigns. On December 12 the Assembly Transportation Committee subpoenas documents from Mr. Baroni, Mr. Foye, Mr. Wildstein, and other Port Authority figures. Were you aware of any of these events at that time?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: I’ll be finished in a little while.

So that on December 12, according to Mr. O’Dowd’s interview memo, we know that the Governor had a private meeting with Bill Stepien, his campaign manager, and a separate private meeting with Mr. O’Dowd, his chief of staff, where the Governor, according to Mr. O’Dowd’s interview memo, discussed the Fort Lee closures. Mr. O’Dowd’s interview memo also states, “By that time, December 12, there was speculation in the press that the lane realignment was political retribution.” It goes on to say that “following the conversation with the Governor, O’Dowd, executing the Governor’s directives, spoke to Ms. Kelly and instructed her to look for any e-mails, texts, etc. regarding the lane closings.”

Now, were you aware of that when it took place?

MS. RENNA: No, I wasn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Okay.

Thereafter, on that same day, you had a conversation with Ms. Kelly, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And would that be December 12?
MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And in that conversation you testified that Ms. Kelly asked you to delete Exhibit 20, which is your e-mail.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. Now, when she asked you to delete-- Let me rephrase that. Did you-- Would it be correct to characterize the issues in the e-mail as relating to governmental business?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Now, what was your reaction when Ms. Kelly, on December 12, asked you to delete what was governmental information, which was the e-mail? What was your reaction?

MS. RENNA: I thought it was strange. It’s the only request like that I’ve ever received.

SENATOR GILL: And you knew that it was a governmental e-mail you were deleting?

MS. RENNA: Yes, which is why I preserved a copy

SENATOR GILL: Well, I’m going to get to why you preserved (indiscernible).

And you didn’t delete the e-mail immediately, did you?

MS. RENNA: No, the next day.

SENATOR GILL: It took you 15 hours, until the next day, on December 13, before you deleted the e-mail, correct?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And you didn’t delete the e-mail until you forwarded your e-mail to another one of your personal accounts.

MS. RENNA: Correct.
SENATOR GILL: And was that the account where you kept your Banana Republic coupons?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Now, why did you wait 15 hours before you deleted the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: Because I wanted to sleep on the request; I thought it was odd. Not to mention the fact I have three stepchildren to pack lunches for and get to school the next day. So when I came in during the course of work the next day, is when I did the deletion and preservation of the e-mail.

SENATOR GILL: So you deleted it in order to misrepresent to Kelly that in fact you deleted it. And you kept it in order to preserve and protect any interests you may have in the e-mail.

MS. RENNA: Yes, not just any interests I had; but any global issue that came out of the request to delete it. I’ve never been asked to do that. I thought it was the right thing to do.

SENATOR GILL: You thought it was the right thing to do -- to delete it?

MS. RENNA: I did. And preserve a copy.

SENATOR GILL: And preserve it and not tell anyone.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: Okay.

Now, were you aware that on December 13, the same morning that you deleted the September 12 e-mail to Ms. Kelly, that Ms. Kelly actually provided a copy of your e-mail without her response of, “Good,” to Mr. O’Dowd following their senior staff meeting?
MS. RENNA: I was not aware of that.

SENATOR GILL: And that Ms. Kelly also forwarded your e-mail to Mr. Wildstein?

MS. RENNA: I was not aware of that either.

SENATOR GILL: Did you know that Mr. O’Dowd gave your e-mail, provided to him by Ms. Kelly, to the Governor prior to the Governor’s conference on December 13?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know if that’s accurate or not.

SENATOR GILL: I didn’t ask you if it was accurate; I asked you if you were aware.

MS. RENNA: I wasn’t aware.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. Now, to the accuracy of it -- I will refer you to Mr. O’Dowd’s interview memo. And in that interview memo he states that’s so.

MS. RENNA: Thank you.

SENATOR GILL: If you want to check that out.

MS. RENNA: Thank you.

SENATOR GILL: You’re welcome.

Now, I’m on January 9 -- and we’ll frame this a bit so we-- The Bergen Record reported that Ms. Kelly e-mailed Mr. Wildstein, stating the infamous, “Time for some traffic problems in Fort Lee.” It was on that day that you decided to come forward with your e-mail and the fact that Ms. Kelly had asked you to delete your e-mail September -- had asked you to delete your September 12 e-mail, correct?

MS. RENNA: Correct.
SENATOR GILL:  Okay. And also on January 9, the Governor held a press conference announcing Ms. Kelly’s firing, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And it was January 9 when you first spoke to Melissa Orsen, the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff. And you spoke to the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff and you told her about the September 12 e-mail and the request to delete.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And then you-- On that same day, Ms. Orsen -- who is the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff -- directed you to talk to Regina Egea who, I might add, by that time was named by the Governor to be his next Chief of Staff. Did you go to Regina Egea and say that there’s a September 12 e-mail, and tell her what it was and that you had been directed to delete it?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And did you tell either of those two persons -- the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff and the Governor’s named new Chief of Staff -- that you also kept a copy?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I did.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And then Ms. Egea then directed you to speak to Chris Porrino?

MS. RENNA: Porrino (indicating pronunciation). Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Porrino.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And he was the Governor’s Counsel. Was that correct?
MS. RENNA: Incoming Chief Counsel at that time, yes.

SENATOR GILL: Incoming Chief Counsel.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And you went to the Governor’s incoming Chief Counsel, and you told the Governor’s incoming Chief Counsel about the September 12 e-mail, the contents of it, and that you were requested to delete it.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And that, in fact, you had not deleted it.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And at that time you still were not aware that on December 13 the Governor and Mr. O’Dowd knew of your e-mail prior to the Governor’s press conference.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: During the almost 30-day period -- from December 13, when the Governor knew of your September 13 e-mail, until January 9, when you decided to come forward -- did Mr. O’Dowd ever question you about the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: No, he didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Did the Governor ever question you about the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: No, he didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Did Mr. McKenna ever question you about the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: Mr. McKenna was no longer working in the Office of the Governor at that time.
SENATOR GILL: I didn’t ask you if he was working; I asked you what he said. Did he ever question you about the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: No.

SENATOR GILL: Did anyone ever question you about the e-mail during that timeframe?

MS. RENNA: No, they didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Now, I just have a couple more questions. Following the-- And then you spoke to Mr. Porrino-- How is that pronunciation?

MS. RENNA: Porrino.

SENATOR GILL: Thanks a lot. I’m glad he doesn’t have a first name that I would have to try, too.

For two hours, the night of January 9, correct?

MS. RENNA: No, that’s false.

SENATOR GILL: Is it false, or is it incorrect?

MS. RENNA: It’s incorrect.

SENATOR GILL: Okay, correct me.

MS. RENNA: I spoke to him on whatever the Friday night was. It was not January 9; it was whatever -- January 11 or 12. Whatever that Friday evening was -- that’s when I spoke with him.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. So that I won’t either be false or incorrect, would it be January 11?

MS. RENNA: Whatever that Friday was.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. So it is the month of January, whatever that Friday was.

MS. RENNA: Correct.
SENATOR GILL: Okay. And before you spoke to the Governor’s Chief Counsel, you convened a meeting with your Regional Directors in IGA, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Why did you convene that meeting before you talked to the Governor’s Counsel?

MS. RENNA: I thought it was appropriate to communicate with the staff. I wanted to be able to give a full picture to the best of my ability when I did have the opportunity to talk to Chris Porrino. So in calling them in, I sort of wanted to gut-check my memory on things and ask them if there’s anything they thought I should bring up in the larger picture of things.

SENATOR GILL: And what did you discuss with them, and what did they discuss with you?

MS. RENNA: I told you what I just discussed with them, and--

SENATOR GILL: You discussed with them -- you said you had a “gut-check.”

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: Other than a gut-check, what did you discuss in order to check your gut?

MS. RENNA: I asked them if there were any other mayors or elected officials of any sort that could be upset with the Administration for reasons that I wouldn’t have known of. Now, I didn’t think that was the case, because I would have known, I believed. But I wanted to make sure, because if that was the case, I wanted to, again, give a full picture to Chris Porrino when I spoke to him.
SENATOR GILL: And did you ask any of the Regional Directors if they were aware of any allegations of governmental retribution or retribution by anyone in the government?

MS. RENNA: No, I didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Did you ask the Regional Directors if they knew anything about the lane closures?

MS. RENNA: No, I didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Did you ask the Regional Directors if they had any conversations with anyone in the Governor’s Office -- other than you, because you’re their supervisor -- with respect to any issues of governmental retribution?

MS. RENNA: No, I didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Now, you indicated -- or at least in the Mastro report you stated --- And you can tell me if this is correct or not, so if you want to get the report, Counsel--

MR. KLINGEMAN: We have it, Senator.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. It says that you stated that you thought you wanted to have the meeting because you wanted to know what could come out of the woodwork when you were talking to the Regional Directors.

MS. RENNA: Yes, correct.

SENATOR GILL: And so come out of the woodwork -- are those your words, or are they the interviewer’s words?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall.

SENATOR GILL: You don’t recall if you said “out of the woodwork” or not?
MS. RENNA: I don’t recall that, no.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And do you recall that in your report-- And I understand that in this Mastro report there was no mechanism for you, or any of the interviewees, to correct the interview before it became part of the public record, correct?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And there was no mechanism supplied that after it became part of the public record that you could be able to contact the attorney’s office and have an addendum placed on this, correct?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: So that is why I want to know, and will not simply adopt what’s there.

Now, on the evening that you spoke to the Governor’s Chief Counsel for two hours, what did you discuss with him and what did he discuss with you?

MS. RENNA: I discussed everything I discussed with Gibson Dunn.

SENATOR GILL: Now, we already know you don’t want me to rely on Gibson Dunn because everything’s not accurate. So would you tell me what you discussed with him? Or should I simply adopt what’s in the Gibson Dunn report as sum and substance of what you told the Governor’s Chief Counsel?

MS. RENNA: So the conversation really lasted about two-and-a-half hours. And we discussed, first and foremost, the e-mail. We sort of went backwards, if memory serves me correctly. So we discussed Exhibit 20
-- the messaging in it, the response, and the forwarding of the e-mail to preserve it.

We discussed a little bit of the managerial style of Bridget; the managerial style of how the department was run; and the inner workings, the day-to-day operations. Chris Porrino, at the time, was not Chief Counsel yet, so he was completely unfamiliar. So it was sort of IGA 101, you know -- filling him in as to what it was.

SENATOR GILL: So you’ve made an assumption that he was unfamiliar. And so when you talked to him, what did you know his title to be?

MS. RENNA: He didn’t have a title at the time. He was incoming Chief Counsel.

SENATOR GILL: So he was incoming Chief Counsel without a title.

MS. RENNA: He wasn’t on staff yet, but yes.

SENATOR GILL: So he talked to him, and he wasn’t on staff. Why did you talk to him if he was incoming Chief Counsel, but not really have a title and he wasn’t on staff? Why did you talk to him for two-and-a-half hours?

MS. RENNA: Because he was incoming Chief Counsel.

SENATOR GILL: And was there a Chief Counsel who was on staff at that time?

MS. RENNA: No. The next day, or that Monday, he was going to start. This was 7:30 at night on Friday night.

SENATOR GILL: So there was no Chief Counsel.

MS. RENNA: Correct.
SENATOR GILL: Because the Chief Counsel--
MS. RENNA: --was starting on Monday morning.
SENATOR GILL: Let me finish the question and I’ll let you
finish the answer.

Who was Chief Counsel before Mr. Porrino?
MS. RENNA: Charlie McKenna.
SENATOR GILL: And Charlie McKenna had been named as
the -- or nominated to be the Attorney General, correct?
MS. RENNA: No, that’s incorrect.
SENATOR GILL: Okay. What happened to Charlie
McKenna?
MS. RENNA: He’s heading up the SDA now.
SENATOR GILL: At this time, when we have the incoming
Chief Counsel, there had been a Chief Counsel immediately before that, correct?
MS. RENNA: Correct.
SENATOR GILL: And so who was that Chief Counsel?
MS. RENNA: In the interim it would roll to the Deputy Chief
Counsel, whose name is Paul Matey.
SENATOR GILL: I didn’t ask you in the interim. Who was
the Chief Counsel? Who was the last Chief Counsel before the incoming
Chief Counsel?
MS. RENNA: Charlie McKenna.
SENATOR GILL: And Charlie McKenna-- Had Charlie
McKenna been nominated to any other position?
MS. RENNA: I don’t recall the timeline on that.
SENATOR GILL: Do you recall of Charlie McKenna had been nominated to be (indiscernible)?

MS. RENNA: I believe he had but, again, I don’t recall.

SENATOR GILL: And what position do you recall, no matter what timeframe, that he had been nominated for?

MS. RENNA: I’m sorry, Senator. I don’t recall.

SENATOR GILL: Okay.

MS. RENNA: He’s at SDA. He was appointed-- I’m just not following your line of questioning. I apologize.

SENATOR GILL: Oh, no, I apologize--

MS. RENNA: He’s at SDA.

SENATOR GILL: --if it was confusing.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Okay, we’ll move on.

MS. RENNA: Okay.

SENATOR GILL: You say you don’t know, you don’t know. I have just a couple more questions.

And the reason I asked you about-- And what did Mr.-- What did the Governor’s incoming Chief Counsel say to you?

MS. RENNA: He asked a lot of questions, as lawyers do.

SENATOR GILL: And I know as lawyers do we ask a lot of questions. What were some of the questions that he asked you?

MS. RENNA: A variety of things, again, as I previously stated. We started with this e-mail, we sort of worked backwards. I explained--

SENATOR GILL: Did he ask you why did you delete the e-mail?
MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And did he ask you why you preserved the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: Did he ask you if you had ever received any requests to delete government e-mail before?

MS. RENNA: I don’t believe he asked that question.

SENATOR GILL: Did he ask you if you knew anything about the issue of government retribution?

MS. RENNA: Yes, he did.

SENATOR GILL: And did he ask you if this was the first time you were aware of such allegations from anyone with respect to this issue?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I believe he did.

SENATOR GILL: And did he ask you if you had provided this e-mail or any communications to anyone other than himself?

MS. RENNA: He did ask that question.

SENATOR GILL: Did he ask you if you had provided this information to the Governor?

MS. RENNA: No, he didn’t.

SENATOR GILL: Did you tell him that you provided the information to the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall if I told him that or not.

SENATOR GILL: Did he ask?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know why he would have, no.

SENATOR GILL: Well, I don’t know why you wouldn’t tell him. So we can speculate on both things, but we’ll--
MS. RENNA: It’s not an important fact.

SENATOR GILL: Oh, it’s not an important fact?

MS. RENNA: No.

SENATOR GILL: Respectfully, that somebody asks you to delete a governmental e-mail; you go to the-- You think that it’s important enough that you save it to protect yourself later and then you go to the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff to tell the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff. You go to Ms. Egea, who was what capacity?

MS. RENNA: Incoming Chief Counsel -- incoming Chief of Staff.

SENATOR GILL: Incoming Chief of Staff to whom?

MS. RENNA: Governor Christie.

SENATOR GILL: To the Governor. And then you have a conversation with the incoming Chief Counsel. So maybe it is unimportant.

Now, the reason I’m asking-- And did he-- Did the Governor’s Chief Counsel indicate to you that he would take this information to the Governor?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall that; I just don’t remember.

SENATOR GILL: And the reason I’m asking you this -- other than to get a fuller understanding -- is because the record will reflect that Mr. Porrino -- help with me the pronunciation.

MS. RENNA: Porrino.

SENATOR GILL: Porrino -- the Governor’s Chief Counsel -- was never interviewed by Mr. Mastro. So that was also the reason why I’m exploring with you.
And this is my last question. You testified that you wanted to get your September 12 e-mail to the Governor before his January 9 press conference, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And why did you want the Governor to have your September 12 e-mail before his January 9 press conference?

MS. RENNA: Because it’s important that he has all the facts at his disposal before he goes before the press.

SENATOR GILL: Because if he doesn’t have-- So you wanted to make sure that the Governor knew that on September 12 you had a conversation -- was it September 12? -- that you had a conversation with Mr. Ridley, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And that Mr. Ridley relayed to you that the Mayor of Fort Lee was complaining about lane closures, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And you wanted the Governor to know that Mr. Ridley also related that the Mayor of Fort Lee considered the actions -- or there was a feeling in town that it was government retribution for something, correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR GILL: And you thought that was important for the Governor to know before his press conference so that he could have all the facts before him.

MS. RENNA: In light of January 8, correct -- yes.
SENATOR GILL: Okay. And at the point where you-- And to whom did you give the e-mail?

MS. RENNA: Regina Egea.

SENATOR GILL: And you gave it to Regina Egea when?

MS. RENNA: In the morning -- first thing in the morning.

SENATOR GILL: Of January 9.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: But you had already told Regina Egea about this some time ago, correct?

MS. RENNA: No.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. So the first time you told Regina Egea about it was on January 9?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And you gave it to her what time on January 9?

MS. RENNA: It was first thing in the morning.

SENATOR GILL: So is first thing in the morning 9:00?

MS. RENNA: Approximately.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And when was the Governor’s press conference?

MS. RENNA: I don’t recall; I’m sorry.

SENATOR GILL: And when you gave it to Regina Egea, at that point she was the Governor’s Chief of Staff, correct?

MS. RENNA: Incoming Chief of Staff.

SENATOR GILL: Incoming Chief of Staff. And did-- What did she say to you, if anything, when you gave her the September 12--?
MS. RENNA: She didn’t say much. I explained it to her; she said Counsel’s Office will likely want to speak with me further about it. I said I was willing to speak to whoever I had to.

SENATOR GILL: And at that point on January 9, when you gave the September 12 e-mail to Regina Egea so that the Governor could have it before his January 9 press conference, you were not aware that the Governor had had this e-mail for 30 days?

MS. RENNA: No, I was not aware of that.

SENATOR GILL: No further questions. Thank you.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you.

Assemblyman Greenwald.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Thank you, Senator.

Ms. Renna, let me first thank you for coming in today. I know it’s not easy. I appreciate you coming here to testify. Obviously, a tremendous amount of people have received a request to come in and testify -- subpoenas -- and your willingness to do so, I think, does a couple of things: one, it helps clarify some of the record; and two, it sends a message to others that this is a process to try to find out what happened here.

And I think it’s also important that what we’ve learned today in your testimony is that in spite of numerous interviews the work done by the Mastro report -- you’ve clarified certain things today -- correct me if I’m wrong -- that are not accurate in that report. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And that we should not be taking that report necessarily on face value. If this has happened to you on
a number of occasions within the report, I would imagine that it has happened to other people as well. So this is a very important process.

I also want to state for the members of this Committee and for the public that I have had a very long working relationship with you that I have found very rewarding. You’re a remarkable young woman, and it does not surprise me that you took the courage to come here today and testify. And I want to thank you for that, again, as well.

MS. RENNA: Thank you, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Christina, I just want to run through a couple of things with you, okay? You okay? All right.

The purpose of-- Take a minute; you okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF COMMITTEE: She’s all right.

MS. RENNA: I’m okay; go ahead.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I know you’re tough. Listen--

MS. RENNA: Sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Look, part of-- While you’re just taking a second, part of the reason why this is important is because it takes a lot of courage to stand up. These are very powerful and influential people, and the impact of this report-- For you to stand up and say, “This isn’t accurate,” a lot of people would just say, “Eh, maybe it’s not that big of deal.” I think you learned a valuable lesson through this process, and that you don’t just let those things go. So again, I want to applaud you for what you’ve done here.
I wanted to really listen to you when you were testifying so I didn’t take “notes” from you. So I don’t want to put words in your mouth, so if I’m saying something that’s not accurate I’d appreciate it if you would clarify it for me as well.

I’m going to paraphrase a little bit, so if I’m off in the tone or tenor of this, let’s have that conversation.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: There seemed to be a group of mayors, from within the Intergovernmental Affairs department, that members of the Department -- which is in the Governor’s Office -- were assigned to do outreach to and facilitate relationships. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And occasionally you would be notified, and your department would be notified, that there were some mayors who they would want you to not interact with. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Not in a proactive outreach way.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Not in a proactive--

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And I think you’ve said -- and, again, I want to make sure I’ve got this right -- that the feeling of the tenor was that maybe those mayors were under “investigation.”

MS. RENNA: Not exclusively.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.

MS. RENNA: I don’t think that that’s a fair characterization. I gave that as an example really of the mandatory directive language, specifically.
ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.

MS. RENNA: But also painting a broader picture that just because we didn’t always have -- weren’t always given a reason as to why we might not be as proactive with some as we are with others, it wasn’t just for no rhyme or reason. There were occasions that there were very legitimate reasons. And I think it’s been portrayed that it was just, almost, a vindictive--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Sure.

MS. RENNA: And I just-- I used that as an example to say the spectrum was broad.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: But there was at no time, when this issue around Fort Lee was going on, that you thought the Mayor of Fort Lee was under investigation, did you?

MS. RENNA: I mean, I wouldn’t know one way or the other.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right.

MS. RENNA: Personally, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: This was not one of those examples, right?

MS. RENNA: Personally, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right. But there was clearly some tenor -- and again, I’ll go through some of the e-mails specifically if you need me to -- but there was clearly this give-and-take amongst Bridget Kelly and you that was kind of wrapping around this young man Evan who was working with you -- or for you. Why was he reaching out to the Mayor, did he have authority to reach out to the Mayor, who approved him to reach out to the Mayor? Is that accurate?
MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: What was the concern within the Governor’s Office about reaching out to the Mayor?

MS. RENNA: I have no idea.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.

The other thing I think that’s important to point out is, if there was a major tragedy going on -- because you indicated in your testimony today that there was, in the midst of some of this when the e-mails were being exchanged and you were getting phone calls -- it was a very hectic time because you were also dealing with Sandy recovery and communities affected by and ravaged by Sandy. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I assume if one of the mayors who was on the -- I’m going to call it the do-not-call list. I don’t know what you guys called it, but whatever the list was called -- it’s like in Harry Potter: the names that can’t be spoken (laughter) -- but this list was a list of some kind and some nature that we were not to call. If one of the towns and one of the mayors who we were not supposed to call was going through a horrific event like Sandy, we would avoid this protocol and we would obviously reach out to the mayor. Because it’s not really about the mayors, it’s about the constituents for which they serve, and we all serve, and that your office serves.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. And who made that decision? Who overrode this protocol within the office? Was that you? Would you say, “That’s a political nonsense thing. This is too important.
We’re going to make the call.” Who would make that call to say, “I know we’re not supposed to call this mayor, but something serious happened. Somebody has to call the mayor.”

MS. RENNA: It would just be conversed about amongst the IGA leadership -- whoever that was at the time: you know, me-- It would be, really, honestly, a no-brainer. I mean--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay, yes. You would think, right?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. So the only thing that you said today that I would disagree with slightly is, this was not just a traffic issue. This bridge is the most populated bridge -- one of the most populated bridges in the country.

SENATOR WEINBERG: The most.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: The most. Again, I want to be careful what we all say. I thought so, but it is the most populated bridge in the country. This was not a traffic accident that took place, and we were trying to get recovery personnel out there to clear the lanes. This was an issue that was going on, not for an hour or two, but for days. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. At some point, when you get an e-mail that says, “The Governor” -- I apologize, “The Mayor is extremely upset about the reduction of lanes -- three to one -- it’s not only causing a horrendous traffic backup, but first responders are having a terrible time maneuvering the traffic because the backup is so
severe,” I don’t know what’s going on in the office at the time, but the moment I hear *first responders* all the games end.

So when you get an e-mail back from Bridget Kelly that says, “Good,” is it your indication that it’s “good” that the Mayor reached out, is it “good” that they’re having traffic problems, is it “good” that the first responders can’t respond, is it “good” that someone thinks it’s for political retribution, is it “good” that the Mayor looks like an idiot? What was the “good”?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: What’s your conjecture? What do you believe the “good” was about? At this point now, when you now know-- You’ve had the exchange around Evan that, why is someone reaching out to him? There’s an issue going on. This is a bridge that is on the terrorist watch list. This is during the week of September 11. It’s the anniversary of one of the most horrific tragedies, with Pearl Harbor, in our country’s history. What is going through your mind?

MS. RENNA: I-- You know, candidly, it was not an out-of-the-ordinary response. And I know we’re looking at it through this lens now--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Sure.

MS. RENNA: --but it just wasn’t an out-of-the-ordinary response.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: For Bridget Kelly?

MS. RENNA: For Bridget, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.
So in the Gibson Dunn report, you made a comment today -- which I agree with, in my dealings with Bridget Kelly-- And let me say this to you. I think my dealings with Bridget Kelly are very similar to yours before whatever your relationship was took a turn. She was appointed originally as a legislative liaison to our body. She was a professional young woman; she conducted herself, in my opinion, with the greatest professional responsibility; she was very attentive to our needs; she never made me feel Republican or Democrat. But I can tell you this, and I said this publicly before: On the numerous times that she dealt with me around public policy -- which is the only issue she ever dealt with me on -- she never once would interact with us and we would say to her, “Well, here’s a revision that I think is a compromise that will get this done and gather the support of the number of legislators we need to pass this. And this is what I believe will solve the problem, and this is what will pass and become good law if the Governor’s Office is interested.” I never once got the answer of, “Great, go ahead and do it.” The answer was always, “Let me go back to the Governor’s Office and check.” Now, does that sound like Bridget Kelly to you?

MS. RENNA: It sounds like Bridget Kelly because she was constantly checking before she made a decision (indiscernible).

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right. So again, I don’t want to put words in your mouth, but what you said today is Bridget was not a decision maker. Is that correct?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. And listen, that is not a criticism. In any office, in any structure, in any corporation, any
business, any government entity there is a chain of command. And I would-- And I had defined Bridget Kelly in the past, and I will do here today: She was a soldier who took orders and executed upon those orders, and had people who responded to her and she would relay those orders. I think you were in that chain of command. Is that an accurate statement?

MS. RENNA: I believe so, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. So Christine, my point would be on this. When it starts to come to the attention-- Here’s why this Committee is-- In my opinion, my humble opinion, the purpose of this Committee is to do a few things. I believe with absolute certainty there was an abuse of power. The purpose of this Committee is to find out who orchestrated and who was the architect of this abuse of power, how deep did it go, who gave the order, and why.

Do you believe that Bridget Kelly broke from what was her persona, her responsibility, and for whatever reason in the exchange of e-mails around Evan to you, broke from her normal course of action, and that Bridget Kelly orchestrated and was the architect of the theory around a study and to take it from three lanes to one? Do you believe that?

MS. RENNA: I wouldn’t say she was the architect, but she was instrumental in the process.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.

MS. RENNA: I believe that, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. Now, at the time, in the early part of September when this took place, you weren’t aware of this. My understanding is, from hearing you today and looking at the e-mails, you heard about this in the news like everyone else.
MS. RENNA: I probably heard it in the news slower than everyone else because it didn’t get covered in South Jersey nearly as much as it did elsewhere.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: That’s a whole separate issue, Christina, that I’ve been talking about for a long time. (laughter)

MS. RENNA: I was very much out of the loop on how severe this actually was.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right. So the reality is, though, that if she did not orchestrate it or was not the architect, but was instrumentally involved, and you did not know in the early part of September, the question has not been asked today: At any time between that early part of September and as you sit here today, do you know who was the architect of it, and who worked with Bridget Kelly to order the shutdown of the lanes?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know directly, no. I mean, I think we all have theories, but I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. All right, when you say we don’t know directly, it’s not that you have heard from other people who have knowledge? You honestly, as you sit here, have no knowledge and do not know?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. But you, like everyone else sitting in this room, has a gut feeling on what that may be?

MS. RENNA: I mean, I think because of where I am positioned I can make an educated guess on this.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay.
MS. RENNA: But that’s all it would be, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. I don’t know if it’s a fair question, but I’m going to ask you. What is your educated guess?

MS. RENNA: I think it’s exactly what I just stated -- that I think that Bridget was not an architect, but I think that she was participating in whatever this was.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. You also say on the last page of your report -- which I think is a very interesting statement -- “Renna described the IGA operation as Bill Stepien’s brilliant brainchild that represented ‘fantastic government 99 percent of the time.’” What did you mean by that statement?

MS. RENNA: I mean it was fantastic government 99 percent of the time. I mean, it was just-- I was enormously proud to work for IGA, coming not from the political world but from the business world. It was a fantastic experience, and that’s what I meant by that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And I assume that the experience around the George Washington Bridge would represent the other 1 percent.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. My gut is that your office epitomized the age-old adage that good public policy and good government is good politics. And that if you serve your constituents and your community regardless of political persuasion, that that is good government and that that will inure to the benefit of those departments of the leadership of those governments, and that ultimately will be recognized. And if that, in fact, happens, it’s good politics.
MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. The problem with this department -- whether unbeknownst to you or not -- is that people at some point, when the election got closer, crossed the line between good government and what was good politics; because there is no other explanation. This gentleman was not under investigation; there was no reason to turn off the lines of communication to this Mayor. I mean, you get a letter from a Mayor that is talking about, “First responders can’t do their job,” somewhere the politics took over and superseded. And the lesson in this -- and whether a crime was committed or not -- is that, that 1 percent and the weight of that 1 percent far outweighs the 99 percent of getting it right 99 percent of the time. And that’s the tragedy here.

MS. RENNA: If, in fact, that’s what this was; we don’t know if that’s what this was. But--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Well, you know-- And again, Christine, we don’t. But here’s the problem. And again, in the Gibson Dunn report, your interactions with Kelly that evening where Kelly says, “You know, Christina, if someone tells me something’s okay, who am I to question them?”

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: We know it was. What we don’t know is why and who. That’s what we don’t know. But it’s-- We know she was not someone who would issue an order like this. We know that she was someone who took orders and executed upon them. We know that she stated to you, in real time, in that moment when you called her “erratic” -- I would call that conversation, reading the transcript, almost
frantic. “You know, Christina, if someone tells me something is okay, who am I to question them?” That is an honest statement that she made from her gut, when I would tell you she was scared and nervous. And she may have said to you, “I don’t need vindication,” but she sure as hell was looking for vindication.

And my concern is that the breach of trust to the public in a situation like this is the damage that has been done; that Governor Christie -- when he was a U.S. Attorney and talks so often about -- that the abuse by elected officials was worse than that of drug dealers because it was a breach of the public trust. And that’s what this is.

Are you aware that on Page 5 and 6 in one of the Mastro reports, the report states that “Bridget Kelly canceled the meetings that IGA had set up between the Jersey City Mayor Steve Fulop and high-ranking members of the Administration; between several commissioners in EDA, CEO Michelle Brown.” Do you know why Kelly would have done that?

MS. RENNA: I don’t, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. Mayor Fulop-- There was no fear he was under investigation?

MS. RENNA: Not to my knowledge.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right. There was-- But again, it’s all in this same timeframe and window.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I think, again, certainly clearly indicating that at some point people above you who were in charge of this operation took what was a good government entity and started to blur the line between government and politics.
Do you understand Bridget Kelly to have the power to determine with whom Administration officials could meet? Was that her authority to do so, or did she have to go to someone else?

MS. RENNA: No, that was her authority.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. So she could independently make a determination of who you all could meet with.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. Do you know what the ground rules were for that?

MS. RENNA: It varied. I mean, in this instance, it was not abnormal for any newly elected mayor for IGA to put together what we called a Mayor Day, which was sort of State Government 101 for newly elected mayors. So this is in that vein.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: But that chart that she had on her wall of mayors wasn’t newly elected mayors.

MS. RENNA: The chart on her wall?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: I thought there was a chart that she had on her wall of-- Go ahead.

MS. RENNA: Yes, what Gibson Dunn presented me with?

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Yes.

MS. RENNA: That was a list of mayors, constituency leaders, a variety of people.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Right. It almost sounds like a lineup of people who she would want to review, meet with, and she was trying to develop relationships with -- but it almost sounds like it’s a good and bad list. Not that you would know, but when you look at it--
MS. RENNA: I would not characterize it as a good and bad list. It was a mixed bag of individuals. There were, like I said, mayors, there were constituency leaders, there were State Legislators, there were Republicans, there were Democrats. There were people who endorsed the Governor, there were people who did not endorse the Governor. So I don’t know if I agree with that characterization.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay, that’s fair.

On Wednesday, August 7, Tab 10, at 5:59 in the evening, it looks like from your personal e-mail you sent to Bridget Kelly a list, under the subject “Bergen D’s.”

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: And they’re all-- I’m assuming -- I know most of them -- but I’m assuming because of the subject line they’re all Democratic mayors in Bergen County.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. Why did you send that list to Bridget Kelly?

MS. RENNA: I have no idea.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Is it routine for you to send a list like that?

MS. RENNA: She requested it, but she didn’t tell me why she needed it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. Did she request a list like that often?

MS. RENNA: No, I think this is the only list I can think of.
ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Was there any follow-up from that list?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: No interaction with IGA to follow up with Mayor So-and-so? Okay.

On Tab 6 -- I’m sorry, Tab 9 -- there is Evan’s recap, which I think is from your personal e-mail as well, and it says under Mayor Sokolich-- Do you have that in front of you?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: “The Mayor seems supportive of the Administration and willing to help as needed. But there is a bleak outlook on any public endorsement. Today Fort Lee will go live with their own emergency radio broadcast. That sounds really good. They will immediately start providing over 300 hand-cranked radio units to residents and businesses with an emphasis on seniors and special needs. That sounds like a very good public policy initiative. This will put Fort Lee in an exclusive group of municipalities in the nation with its own dedicated emergency radio station. Sounds like great public policy. Mayor Sokolich is also very proud of the new development on a vacant 16-acre parcel just south of the George Washington Bridge -- a major focus of Mayor Sokolich’s 2011 reelection campaign. This multimillion dollar development will encompass luxury apartments, restaurants, a public park, and movie theater. Sounds like a great public policy for the state in a very important region of the state.”

And then he says he was “shocked the Governor didn’t participate in groundbreaking.” Why was he shocked?
MS. RENNA: Because they had a very good relationship.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREENWALD: Okay. This e-mail, unintended -- and I know it comes from your private e-mail -- in my mind, crosses the line between the good public government services of the department and the first line that, “it looks bleak that he will do a public endorsement.” If the purpose of this agency is to do good government and good relations, it should never have been tied to this public endorsement. And I think it starts to show the turn, on June 6, that the office and the department started to change its focus away from good government and start to direct itself inappropriately towards the good politics, in not allowing one to take care of the other on its own through its natural progression.

Christine, I just want to close with where I started. This is very hard. And you should be commended for being the first and the bravest, I think, to come forwarded and have this conversation. And your testimony today is very helpful, I think, to tell us that we still don’t know the whole story regardless of the Mastro report; that the Mastro report is not accurate in and of itself. The level of inaccuracies, we don’t know.

But the truth of the matter is we still don’t know what is at the core of this Committee, which is while we know there is an abuse of power, who was the architect of this and why was it orchestrated? But you deserve a tremendous amount of credit for being someone who was willing to come in and acknowledge that the whole story is not out there and there is more to tell.

So thank you very much. I appreciate you being here.

MS. RENNA: Thank you.
Chairwoman, thank you.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you, Assemblyman. Senator O'Toole, do you have any questions?

SENATOR O'TOOLE: No.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Any other questions from--

One quick follow-up question to Assemblyman Greenwald’s. Maybe I have more than a passing interest in Democrat mayors in Bergen County. But you said you didn’t know why. What did she ask you for?

MS. RENNA: A list of all the Democrat mayors in Bergen County.

SENATOR WEINBERG: And that was it?

MS. RENNA: That was it, yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, all right.

Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Thank you, Ms. Renna, for coming in today. I know this must be difficult.

I wanted to start off by asking you about a statement here in the Gibson Dunn report about Stepien’s top 100 towns list. Are you aware of that?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So you say that the focus of the regional team for four years was good government across the board.

MS. RENNA: Yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Nonpartisan.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Now, tell me if the Gibson Dunn report did not accurately portray what you said. But if you read the following lines, it says, “It was implemented,” this good government across the board, “was implemented by managing constituent relations with every elected official at both the local and county level.” But the T-100 towns list -- I guess that’s the top 100--

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: --was Stepien’s brainchild. It says that you did not know how Stepien came up with the list. You said that the list was not based on town size, so it wasn’t the top 100 towns. But you recall being told anecdotally that “Stepien was a brilliant mastermind of voting data and had compiled a list of key towns whose support for the Governor could grow.” That does not sound like good government across the board, if I may. It sounds like using voting data to decide who IGA should concentrate on. Why would voting data be used to decide who to concentrate on? Does that sound like good government?

MS. RENNA: Well, I don’t know that that’s accurate. I mean, I heard that anecdotally. That may not be the case at all. I’ve heard lots of things about how the top 100 town list was constructed. And I go on further in my memo to explain that it’s a true mixed bag of towns, of political parties, rural, suburban, urban, you know--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: But when you heard that anecdotally, did that not cause you to be concerned that maybe you were concentrating not on good government but on towns that political analysts
using voting data had determined would be the best towns to mine, going forward, so that the Governor could be successful in his reelection campaign? Did you ask anyone? Did you do anything with that information?

MS. RENNA: I mean, I may have been concerned if I heard it was exclusively built on that list, but that’s not my understanding at all. And again--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You asked nobody? You did not question anybody?

MS. RENNA: I felt the top 100 town list was a really helpful tool for me personally to be used day-to-day. You know--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: But when you see a list that makes-- It’s not the top 100 towns in terms of population, it doesn’t seem to have any rhyme or reason. And you’re told anecdotally it’s based on voting data to help the Governor grow his popularity, wouldn’t you want to know what that top 100 list was based on?

MS. RENNA: Not necessarily. I mean, listen, IGA’s job was relationship building. This was simply a way for us to focus our efforts on really where to start. With so many municipalities, this was our jumping-off point. And if you look at the list, and you look at the list of towns, there are towns whose administrations wouldn’t answer our phone calls if we tried -- and we tried all the time.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Let me-- I’m sorry--

MS. RENNA: There are Republican towns that we -- those administrations don’t want to interface with the Governor.
ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Who gave you the top 100 list?

MS. RENNA: I just got it when I started in IGA. I don’t remember who specifically gave it to me.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Did it change from time to time?

MS. RENNA: After Sandy we added 17 towns to the list. So it became a top 117.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Who was in charge of updating that list, or who had the authority to change it?

MS. RENNA: Bill added the 17 -- Bill Stepien added the 17 new towns to it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Was Bill, at the time that he added towns to it, was he on the campaign side or was he part of government?

MS. RENNA: No, he was in government, and largely the towns were added because of the implications from Sandy.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay, let me ask you this. Speaking of Bill Stepien, what was the-- How did the coordination work between Bill Stepien, when he was running the campaign, and Bridget Kelly as your boss? Would they coordinate activities, to your knowledge?

MS. RENNA: I am quite certain that they were not coordinating activities.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay. And why is that?

MS. RENNA: Because I know, because Bridget told me that she was not on speaking terms with Bill Stepien.
ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay.

I want to go back to some things that happened starting last August, and give you an opportunity to clarify anything that might be incorrect. I’ve known you for a long time; I think of you as a straight shooter and someone I respect.

MS. RENNA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And I don’t think of you as a wallflower. I think of you as a woman of action, smart, sharp. So there is some areas of the testimony that puzzle me, quite frankly, and I want to go back over that.

So back in August of 2013, you were aware that Bridget Kelly apparently had a problem with Fort Lee’s Mayor, but you say you don’t know what that was.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You knew about the George Washington Bridge lane closures, at least by September 12 -- which was kind of when it was happening or at the end of when it was happening. So you knew about that, correct?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You knew that Mayor Sokolich was very displeased about this.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And you knew that Bridget Kelly’s reply to the Mayor’s displeasure was, “Good.”

MS. RENNA: Correct.
ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So given all that information, did you do anything with it?

MS. RENNA: No, I didn’t.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: That surprises me. Also, since you know Bridget Kelly’s relationship with David Wildstein -- which you said was very close and chummy -- and then you start seeing the news coverage, didn’t you start wondering about all of these pieces of the puzzle, and wondering whether the Governor’s Office actually had some involvement in the lane closings?

MS. RENNA: I never thought the Governor’s Office had involvement with the lane closures, which is why, on January 8 when this happened, I was completely shocked by what happened.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: When I say the Governor’s Office, I don’t necessarily mean the Governor; I mean Bridget Kelly is in the Governor’s Office, Deputy Chief of Staff.

MS. RENNA: Correct. And I never felt that she had anything to do with this until January 8. I mean, I was very shocked.

Even with the ask of the deletion of the e-mail, I just thought she was being paranoid and she was nervous. And I know that she can be insecure. And so-- And I don’t know the degree of her -- during this conversation -- elaborating or being overdramatic. I don’t know; I’m not privy to the conversation. So I walked away from that thinking the request was strange, the request was inappropriate. But, in the same breath, I still didn’t think she was involved. I just thought she was being paranoid.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I want to get to that later. I want to go back to-- So you did nothing with that information.
MS. RENNA: No, I did nothing with the information.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So then you decided, apparently unilaterally, to stop communicating with the Mayor of Fort Lee and told Evan Ridley--

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: --not to do anything until you were able to clarify what was going on.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And then you said you never followed up.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: This I find so strange because weeks go on -- no follow up; months go on -- no follow up. Newspaper reports -- did you follow up?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No. There are resignations; people are resigning from the Port. Still you’ve never gotten to Bridget Kelly to ask, “What’s going on, and can we still talk to Mayor Sokolich?”

MS. RENNA: And I understand, again, in retrospect how that looks. But the work environment was enormously fast-faced; it was round the clock at this point. And this was-- You know, no one-- I think I can say that everyone just didn’t think this was as severe of an issue until it was -- until we realized it was. And I know I feel guilty of that. Just once David Wildstein and Bill Baroni resigned, that’s really when my antenna went up -- at that point. Beyond that, you know, the Governor is asked about a zillion things in the news all the time. And it was just a part of a fast-paced
work environment. I mean, I know in retrospect it sounds crazy, but that really is the answer.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Do you regret not doing something?

MS. RENNA: I-- Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So then the Governor, on December 2 apparently -- I think I have the right date -- asks all his staff if they know anything. Who asked you?

MS. RENNA: No, it was senior staff. He asked senior staff.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Nobody asked you?

MS. RENNA: No one asked me.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay. So he comes out and says he knows nothing about this because he’s been assured by his senior staff that everybody’s been questioned. When he comes out with this, you still know that you have this e-mail, right?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You don’t say anything.

MS. RENNA: I didn’t at that point, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Ten days later you get this odd phone call at night, and you’re asked to destroy evidence, basically. I mean, I know you said it was odd. Did you think that it was slightly illegal?

MS. RENNA: I don’t want to-- The answer is I was scared of overstepping over Bridget. This is a very severe implication. If I ended up being wrong, I thought I would lose my job. I just-- I didn’t want to-- If I went to Counsel’s office with the e-mail, I had no doubt that whoever was in Counsel’s Office would go to Bridget Kelly and say, “Why does Christina
“Renna want five minutes with me?” Just because a lot of people -- I mean, especially in Counsel’s Office -- didn’t know me very well. So I was fearful; I was fearful of getting her caught up in something that I didn’t know if she was involved in or not, and I was scared of if it ended up being false, violating her trust and never being able to get that back. I mean, there is a lot of things that went into it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So you were fearful for your job and not fearful that--

MS. RENNA: Not necessarily for my job, but for crossing Bridget.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Why were you so fearful of Bridget Kelly?

MS. RENNA: Well, she was my boss, and she was senior staff. And I am very proud of the work I did, and was progressively promoted over four years several times and increased responsibility. But I was never a decision maker, and she was.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I’m sure that most people are afraid to cross their boss, but at the same time you characterize Bridget Kelly as someone who wasn’t -- didn’t seem to be a great leader and looked for approval from people. And you don’t believe that she could have been the architect of closing the bridge. So I’m trying to rectify in my mind how you would feel that she’s somewhat weak and looking for approval, and at the same time you’re afraid to confront her with anything.

MS. RENNA: Maybe I can’t describe it either.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay, fair enough.
So if she wasn’t the architect, do you think David Wildstein could be the architect for closing a bridge?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I mean, would he have the ability to do that by himself?

MS. RENNA: I believe he would have the ability, yes; but I’m not positive.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So is it your feeling that David Wildstein and Bridget Kelly acted alone?

MS. RENNA: I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Do you have a theory on that?

MS. RENNA: I have lots of theories.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Do you want to tell us any?

MS. RENNA: I’ll take a pass. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So you said you wanted to make sure that the Governor had all the information on January 9 -- to make sure he went out there-- Why in God’s name didn’t you want the Governor to have all the information on December 2, or December 12, or back in September when you had information that seemed to lead to something suspicious going on here?

MS. RENNA: I honestly don’t think I was even still all that focused on this, come December 2. This was not necessarily an issue in my purview; this was not-- This e-mail had come in and went in September, there was no follow-up. It was just not on my forefront.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Not even when someone calls you at 8:45 at night and tells you to destroy a document?
MS. RENNA: Well, that’s when things shifted -- or right around this time was around the same time that David Wildstein was being subpoenaed and they were resigning. This was all around that time period when I stated that -- I really started to take note of what was going on. But up until that time, as I said previously, we fielded 30 calls a day from angry mayors about something. And I’m not saying that this is just any pothole or any graffiti on an overpass -- it’s not. But the pure volume of incoming we received is enormous.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Can you tell me about your conversations with Bridget Kelly on January 7, 8, 9 -- anything that you discussed on those three days or since then. And is there anything she said -- no matter how seemingly unimportant -- that might shed light on who else was involved or how this all happened?

MS. RENNA: The Gibson Dunn notes do a good job with recapping that.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Well, since in some ways they do a bad job on other things, I’d like to hear it directly from you, if you don’t mind.

MS. RENNA: On January 7, Bridget and I met for nearly two hours -- about an hour-and-a-half -- on IGA personnel positioning. With term two starting she was picking my brain on who I thought would be good fits in certain areas of different departments, and asking my opinions of certain staff members who worked for me and things like that.

During the course of that conversation she made an offhanded comment to me about being happy the Fort Lee situation was dying down -- which I didn’t react to at all. I just said, “Yeah.” You know, I just sort of
nodded in agreement. And she made a comment that she had been hiding under her desk any time someone walked in with questions, nervous about the Fort Lee situation. She was happy it was dying down. So that was just a passing comment; there was no further conversation on it.

January 8 happened. The morning of January 8, I started working with Bridget on a few things starting at 6:30 in the morning -- 6:30, 7:00 in the morning -- on a few things.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And where were you? Were you in her office, or your office, or somewhere else?

MS. RENNA: When? On January 7?

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: January 8.

MS. RENNA: January 8.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: At 6:30 in the morning.

MS. RENNA: Oh, no. This was just home.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay.

MS. RENNA: Okay -- answering e-mails, text messaging, working on a few things. Going in, my entire commute into work we were working on a few work things. And then around 8:00 she said she had to jump on a conference call. And then somewhere between, I think, 8:30 and 9:00 the story broke. So I had been working with her pretty consistently throughout the morning, and then the first phone call came maybe 45 minutes after the story broke -- 45 minutes to an hour. She called me on my office line crying.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You were now at the office.

MS. RENNA: Yes, I was at the office at this point.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay. And she was where?
MS. RENNA: She was in her car. She said she had pulled over to the side of the road. And she was crying. And I told her I saw the article. And she apologized. She said, “I’m so sorry, Christina.” I asked her if she was coming in to the office, and she said no. And I asked her if she had talked to the Governor, and she said no. And then she-- Another call came in, so she let me go.

Maybe an hour after that, maybe, she called me back again on my office line. She sounded a little bit more calm, but I think she was still crying at this point. And she said that she needed help deleting her Twitter feed because people were tweeting mean things about her. And she said, “You should go on your Twitter feed because people are tweeting mean things about you,” because I was a friend of hers, we had had some tweets on her-- So I went on, she gave me her password to her Twitter feed. I tried to pull it up with her log-in information and deactivate her account. I tried about five times and, for whatever reason, I couldn’t get it to deactivate. So I explained that to her, and then I tried to reset and send her something so she could deactivate it. All I know is that it ended up coming down; I didn’t take it down, but it ended up coming down later in that day.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Do you know if there was any potential evidence on that, that you were now taking down? You were now being asked to delete something else. Did you think that there could be some evidence on there?

MS. RENNA: Honestly, it didn’t cross my mind. She very-- She only used the Twitter account to really watch what other staff members were doing on Twitter. She didn’t use it very regularly. She didn’t tweet
regularly. It was more, I think, a mechanism to watch what everyone else in IGA was tweeting to make sure they weren’t doing anything inappropriate.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Did she, at any point, say, “I didn’t do any of this. This is terrible”?

MS. RENNA: She didn’t, no. And I didn’t ask. I didn’t ask.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And was that the extent of your conversations on January 8?

MS. RENNA: No. So then she called me back again and was much calmer a little bit later in the day and was just trying to act normal. She was seemingly just business as usual. She communicated to me that her daughter, who had just turned 17, was chased to school by reporters and she was upset about that. So at that point she got a little emotional. And she just was trying to work normal, asking me about the State of the State address and how our RSVPs for ticketing were coming in. She provided me with a new e-mail address for her and asked me to send an updated State of the State list to a new e-mail address. And she asked me not to share it with anyone else in IGA -- which I agreed to.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: What time was this on January 8? In the afternoon, late afternoon?

MS. RENNA: Assemblyman, the day is such a blur I really couldn’t tell you. I think it was later in the afternoon -- maybe mid-afternoon.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: But it’s your testimony that she was acting as if she was going to continue in employment and moving forward with her tasks and her duties.
MS. RENNA: I hung up the phone thinking she was in denial. That was the impression I got.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: At that point, when you talked to her and she was still talking about the State of the State and invitations, did she indicate or did you ask her whether she had talked to anyone in the Administration -- either the Governor or the Chief of Staff or any Counsel? Had anyone talked to her and said, “Hang tight. This will be fine.” Or, “Get in here.” Anything?

MS. RENNA: The only question I asked her was earlier in the day -- and I did ask if she had talked to the Governor. And she did say no. But beyond that, I didn’t ask any of those questions, and she didn’t offer any of that information--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay.

MS. RENNA: --that I can recall.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I’ll try to wrap up quickly because I know we’re getting late.

Let’s go to the-- Is there any other conversation on January 8?

MS. RENNA: Not on January 8. There was--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: January 9?

MS. RENNA: There was a conversation on January 9.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Can you tell me about that?

MS. RENNA: The conversation on January 9 was, she called me before the Governor’s press conference -- maybe an hour before the press conference -- crying, telling me that she had been fired. She was hysterical, she could barely get the words out. I was crying. And she just said, “I don’t know what I’m going to do.” And I believe I asked her again
at that point if she had talked to the Governor, and she said, “He won’t talk to me. I talked to Chris Porrino.” And she said a few times, “I don’t know what I’m going to do.” And she apologized a lot, and then she said, “You can’t trust anyone, Christina.” That’s what she basically closed the conversation with. “You can’t trust anyone, Christina.”

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Have you spoken to her, texted her, e-mailed her, or any communication since?

MS. RENNA: After that conversation ended, she text messaged me with, “I’m sorry to tarnish IGA.” I wrote her back, trying to comfort her, of course. And she texted me back, saying that we were an amazing team and an amazing group of people. And I just told her to hang in there, and that’s it. I have not talked to her since.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You have never-- She never offered an explanation of her actions or anyone else’s?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Have you-- Can you tell us why you left the Governor’s Office?

MS. RENNA: I was contemplating leaving beforehand, especially in light of my conversation with Bridget on January 7. And I had already been exploring some opportunities in the business sector -- to go back. So I just felt the time was right and, like I said, I’d been contemplating it really all of December already. And it just made sense.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Has anyone from the Governor’s Office or anyone related to the Governor’s Office discussed with you your testimony before the Gibson Dunn panel or before this panel at any time?
MS. RENNA: No, not at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I thank you for your time and I appreciate your appearing here today.

MS. RENNA: Thank you, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Thank you, madam Chairwoman.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Assemblywoman Caride.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Good afternoon, Ms. Renna.

MS. RENNA: Hi, good afternoon.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: I know it’s been a long day for you so I’m going to try to be brief.

MS. RENNA: That’s fine.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: And you’re doing a very good job at that.

I want to go to Tab 13 for a minute. I just want to follow up with something that you had -- the way you had answered a question for Assemblyman Greenwald.

MS. RENNA: This is the one with the curse word.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: No, no -- Tab 13. The one--

MS. RENNA: Oh, it’s not. Okay, I apologize.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: No, no. I wouldn’t do that to you. (laughter)

MS. RENNA: I was a little worried.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: No, it’s the one where Assemblyman Greenwald went over the Evans (sic) recap from Christopher Stark.
MS. RENNA: Correct, yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: I have (indiscernible) on my paper, here. Let me see something. Tab 9, I’m sorry.

Assemblyman Greenwald had asked you about Mayor Sokolich’s statement about he was shocked that the Governor didn’t participate in the groundbreaking.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: And you had responded that they had a good relationship.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Who had a good relationship?

MS. RENNA: I think Mayor Sokolich thought that he had a good relationship with the Governor because on one or two occasions-- I mean, he had been at Drumthwacket for a holiday party and things of that nature. So I knew Mayor Sokolich thought he had a very good relationship with the Governor and was very proud of that relationship. Even though he wasn’t planning to endorse, he actually really personally liked the Governor, was my understanding. So that’s really what I meant by that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Now, these recaps -- what was the purpose of the recaps by your Regional Directors?

MS. RENNA: The purpose was basically to make sure they were doing what they said they were doing. So if they took a meeting on the road -- they were out on the road all day -- this was proof of the job that they did, and it’s a way for, obviously, me to stay on top of all the issues
around the state. And these recaps, they were always submitted to Bridget for review as well -- so she was always kept in the loop about things.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: So it had to really do with the purpose of your office, which was proactively reaching out on a nonpartisan--

MS. RENNA: Correct. I mean, this is a good example of just the kind of random government issues that were raised with IGA. This is just one Regional Director; we had four. So it gives you a sense of the volume.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: But now, you’ll have to forgive me, because I’m a little bit confused as to where does the office work stop and where does the campaigning start? And in this particular recap, it says there is a bleak outlook on a public endorsement. So it seems to me that there is a combination of the two -- of campaigning work, or endorsement work, and public policy or outreach work.

MS. RENNA: I mean, I can’t speak to why Evan led with that in this recap. I just don’t know why he did. But just for big picture purposes, this was not a surprise. We knew Mayor Sokolich was not endorsing from March or April, and that was absolutely fine. And we continued a great relationship with him. As you can see, in June we had a proactive meeting with him where he was going through the whole list of items going on in town. So--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Well, that’s another thing that confuses me also. If you knew back in April -- March -- that he was not going to come out and endorse, why was your office still being proactive?

MS. RENNA: Because we were always proactive with everyone.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: So then why would Mr. Ridley need permission or approval to speak with him in August?

MS. RENNA: Well, that’s why it was confusing to me, because just because a mayor was not endorsing does not mean in any way, shape, or form IGA cut contacts, stopped contact -- never. And Mayor Sokolich is a great example of that. And these recaps are a great example of that.

You know, as it relates to-- I lost my train of thought, actually; so I’m just going to stop there.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: With regards to the endorsements, was your staff instructed to have separate meetings with the mayors and the elected officials to discuss possible endorsements, say, after hours, in the evening, or on the weekends?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: And then go in during the week to see the mayors and discuss business? Is that what they were instructed to do?

MS. RENNA: Any meeting with a political purpose to it that would help in a volunteer capacity of campaign initiatives were done in the evenings. There were a lot of dinner, grab a beer after work, after-hours types of things.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: So Mr. Ridley-- What area of New Jersey does he live in -- south, middle, or north?

MS. RENNA: Where does he live?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Roughly.

MS. RENNA: I’m not sure, but his region is the northern region.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: So he would be expected to then drive back upstate to Fort Lee and discuss possible endorsements, or perhaps go up to North Jersey and discuss possible endorsements with potential mayors after hours?

MS. RENNA: Well, he wouldn’t be expected; he would voluntarily do that if he wanted to. I mean, it’s purely a voluntary decision. No one was mandated to participate in any of this.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: And, again, this recap report -- it shouldn’t really have that information then? Is that what--

MS. RENNA: I’m sorry, I didn’t hear the question.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: The recap report -- it shouldn’t contain information with regards to potentially endorsing or not endorsing the Governor?

MS. RENNA: I mean, it could; I would say that this didn’t happen frequently in the team’s recaps. So that’s why I said I really can’t speak to why Evan led with it. It was my understanding that it was just a proactive outreach meeting. It’s my recollection he wasn’t-- I mean, we already knew for months he wasn’t endorsing, so this is sort of an oddity that I can’t explain.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: If we could just go to Tab 15.

Now, I know that this e-mail from Mr. Ridley to you is on a Sunday, but it refers to a meeting with the Fort Lee Mayor and it also refers to a meeting with the New Milford Mayor.

MS. RENNA: Right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Would that be based on IGA business.
MS. RENNA: So these were the meetings—This was the meeting that Bridget got upset that he took— that I asked him for recaps to be sure that he actually did attend these meetings that he said he attended. So these were the recaps he provided me.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: But based on IGA business--

MS. RENNA: Based on IGA business, yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Okay. So for example, the last sentence with regards to the meeting with the New Milford Mayor, it says, “Still willing to be a team player,” in quotes. And then, “Help out where possible.” What exactly does that mean?

MS. RENNA: You would have to ask Evan. I mean, I don’t know.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Did you ask him about that?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: And what about the last line, again, with regards to Mayor Sokolich. “Supportive, but no signs of endorsement.”

MS. RENNA: Yes, again, I don’t know why he included that, especially because we had known that piece of information for months.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Did you, at any time, call to his attention that he’s not supposed to mix politics with the policies of the office? Or, I should say, getting endorsements on work product material that had to do with outreach?

MS. RENNA: I would have those conversations when they were necessary to be had. This example here, I don’t feel as though that conversation was necessary to be had. Now, maybe it’s just the way I read
it, but I read it as Evan’s own personal comment, not that this was an action item in a proactive meeting he set up on IGA time. It almost seems like these last two bullet points are just his closing thoughts. I am in no way reading this thinking that that was a topic of conversation. And I would have no reason to believe it would. The team was extraordinarily disciplined as far as when these conversations happened.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: I understand what you’re saying, but when I read this it sounds to me like the last bullet point on each has to do with campaigning. So I would have thought that that would have been brought to their attention -- not to mix the campaigning with the actual work of IGA.

MS. RENNA: Again, these are Evan’s own thoughts. It does not come across to me as an action item of the meeting. I didn’t see any problem with it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Did you ever receive any calls from any of the mayors or elected officials with regards to -- during office hours -- with regards to potentially coming out and endorsing the Governor?

MS. RENNA: It happened on a few occasions where mayors would bring up the subject with staff when they were serving in their staff capacity. Usually when that happened, the meeting concluded and I got a panicked phone call from one of the staff members, scared that this subject was just brought up, that they didn’t bring it up, and that they told them that he would call them back over the weekend or later that night to discuss it; because everyone was so sensitive to lines being crossed. So just because of that, I do know a few examples of mayors who reached out while they
were on state time, and they were very good about reporting it to me right away so I knew, and making sure that those conversations happened there.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: But, again, when Mr. Ridley put them in his recaps, you never brought it to his attention though?

MS. RENNA: Again, I didn’t see this as being problematic.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Okay. Now, I’ve heard your testimony all day today and it sounds to me like you’re conflicted as far as--It sounds like you really care for Bridget Kelly and you had a friendship with her?

MS. RENNA: I did. I considered her a very good friend at one point.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: And then I know that you mentioned that there were some inaccuracies in the Gibson Dunn report. And I’d like to call your attention to Page 3 of the report. And based on what you just said -- that you felt that you guys were friends -- isn’t it inaccurate in this report that it says that you speculated that the real reason behind-- In regards to your relationship with Bridget Anne Kelly, it says, "Renna speculates that the real reason behind the move was Kelly was intimidated by you, and that she treated you at arm’s length.”

MS. RENNA: The arm’s length comment is something I did say; I say that a lot. Being intimidated by -- I don’t recall if I used those words or not. And I don’t know if that’s accurate. I mean, at the time that I gave this interview with Gibson Dunn I was still going through, I think, a wide range of emotions with all of this, as clearly I still am today, embarrassingly. But, you know, I couldn’t figure out why Bridget wouldn’t embrace me as a professional more when she became Deputy Chief of Staff, when she knew
the good work I did. It was very confusing to me. And instead she pushed
me away, especially in 2013. I inaccurately told Gibson Dunn I felt like it
sort of did transpire around my wedding. Upon further reflection, I don’t
think that timeline’s right. I really think it’s more of a 2013 timeline.

But the relationship changed, and that was hard for me on a
personal level because I did consider her to be a good friend. And I didn’t
know why she was keeping me at arm’s length, especially because not only
did I feel as though I did a good job, but I thought I did well by her and I
helped her. And I really enjoyed the job I was doing too.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: I don’t have anymore
questions.

Thank you very much.

MS. RENNA: Thank you, Assemblywoman.

SENIATOR WEINBERG: Thank you.

Senator O’Toole.

SENIATOR O’TOOLE: Thank you, Chairs.

Good afternoon, Christina.

MS. RENNA: Hi, Senator.

SENIATOR O’TOOLE: How are you? I think I’m the last one
if the Chair has a follow-up. So I’m going to try to make it brief. You’ve
been here all day, and we’re trying not to keep you here too long.

We’ve heard some comments from some of the Committee
members about the accuracy or inaccuracy of the Gibson Dunn report.
You’ve read that 16-page summary?

MS. RENNA: The 16-page summary? Yes.
SENATOR O'TOOLE: Okay. And when you were-- You sat down with four of the lawyers from Gibson Dunn with your lawyer?

MS. RENNA: I did.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: It was a voluntary sit-down?

MS. RENNA: It was.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Okay. How much time did you spend with the five lawyers, including your own, at that time?

MS. RENNA: Nearly four hours.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Okay. And you have reviewed it. And other than the couple of corrections you made today with regard to the Sandy towns -- from 16 to 60 -- and the other correction about the directive, are there any other things that stand out that are a departure from what you remember telling them, or the actual truth as you recall it?

MS. RENNA: Not at all. I mean, I think--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Excuse me, if I may. I believe I asked that question and Ms. Renna’s counsel said it is not fair to ask her to recall that; and, therefore, I ask that it be done after the meeting when they have a chance to actually review it and send it to us in writing.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Are you comfortable with that? I'll ask the counsel, and ask through the Chair. Are you comfortable answering that question? If you’re not, then you don’t; if you are comfortable, answer it. If not, I'll move on.

MR. KLINGEMAN: If it would help expedite things, I’d be happy to have the witness answer the question as it’s been posed.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Right, thank you.
MR. KLINGEMAN: What I wanted to avoid, with respect to the Chairwoman’s question, was some kind of gotcha-type experience where we haven’t gone through the report in anticipation of this hearing with an eye towards correcting every word of it. But to the extent that the Chairwoman’s question was focused on big mistakes, I think it’s more than a fair question. And that’s how I understood Senator O’Toole’s question to be.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, if I may, Counselor, I don’t believe I asked any gotcha questions. I read a line from the report, and it was Ms. Renna who corrected what that phrase said. I had no idea it was not correct until she corrected it.

MR. KLINGEMAN: Of course.

SENATOR WEINBERG: So I did not plan to ask any gotcha questions, and it was you, Counselor, who said -- and I courteously agreed with you -- that Ms. Renna should not answer any questions about what’s in this report until you have a chance to go through it; and then I requested that you put that back to us, in writing, after you have a chance to review it. And I thought that’s how we left it. I just want to make sure the questions are equal.

MR. KLINGEMAN: Of course. And I don’t mean to suggest--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Go ahead, Senator.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: I’ve asked the question, and if the counsel will allow the witness to answer it -- if she can answer it. If she can’t, then I’ll move on. If she can answer the question as posed, through the Chair, I’d like to hear her response.
MS. RENNA: What I have studied, over and over, is obviously my interview, my interview notes, and my interview memo. And there were a few inaccuracies. The largest, as I stated earlier, being the mandatory directives. Language-- That's language that I would never use. But generally speaking I was pleased with the portrayal that Gibson Dunn laid out in my notes. I thought that it was pretty well done. There were some minor flaws that I pointed out earlier. But I feel comfortable only speaking to my interview because it's mine. And I was, overall, not unhappy with what Gibson Dunn did with the information I gave them.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Page 16 of the interview, if you can turn to that page, through the Chair. Midway through, and I'll quote, “First Kelly commented that she felt okay about things because Senator Loretta Weinberg did not believe the Governor’s Office was involved in the Fort Lee traffic issues.” Did you report that to the four Gibson Dunn lawyers?

MS. RENNA: I did.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Okay. Let’s take a step back for those who don’t understand IGA, and I can’t profess that I do. Do you have any historical knowledge of other Governors from, say, Whitman, McGreevey, DeFrancesco, Codey, Corzine -- was there some IGA unit -- whether it’s the same name or a similar name -- to your knowledge?

MS. RENNA: It’s my understanding there was an IGA in -- if not all -- several of those Administrations. In some Administrations it was more -- I’ve heard, because I actually know people who used to work for Whitman in IGA -- there it was more event oriented; it just varied. I heard with Governor Corzine, he just stored campaign staff there to give them a
paycheck in between election cycles; I don’t know if that’s accurate. So I’ve heard a variety of different things have been done with IGA.

It is my understanding -- and the reason why I always use the word *unprecedented* when I talk about the work IGA did -- was that what Bill created with IGA in 2009, going into 2010, was just that: IGA was never set up that way, there was never that level of communication, outreach, and open flow of information in previous Administrations.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Through the Chair, but IGA was not novel to this Administration, from what you just testified to. That other Governors -- including Governor Corzine and others -- had a similar situated office in their office.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: And do you have possession of those records? Do you know are the records stored in any office going back to Whitman, or DeFrancesco, or McGreevey?

MS. RENNA: Not to my knowledge.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Okay.

In your opening comment -- which I did take notes, and I listened very carefully to -- you talked about, with great pride, the 99 percent of the good work that your office had done -- or IGA had done since the time you were there. And you said that the work was carried out in a very nonpartisan manner. Can you just develop that a little bit? I’m trying to understand when a request came in or there was interaction with a county executive, a mayor, a councilmember, a board of education member -- any elected official -- did it matter to you then in you official capacity whether they were a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?
MS. RENNA: No. We were always aware -- I mean, you have a team of people who are aware. But it was never a determining factor in the action we took, that I can recall.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: And you were pretty clear, through the Chair, that strict instructions were given that if anyone were to volunteer for campaigns it was done after hours, before hours, or on weekends.

MS. RENNA: That’s correct, yes.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: The issue of endorsement regarding public policies -- let’s talk about whether it’s pension reform, or if it’s the 2 percent property tax, binding arbitration reform -- would your office, or IGA from the time you were there, ever get involved in receiving supporter endorsements from elected officials supporting public policies advanced by the Governor’s Office?

MS. RENNA: Yes, absolutely; all the time.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: And what type of policies were being endorsed, or supported, or attacked by local officials?

MS. RENNA: For example, we -- with the Governor’s 2.5 percent property tax cap -- we had an aggressive initiative to get mayors of both political parties to sign on to pledge to support the Governor’s initiative. And that was a huge drive and a huge focus of IGA for several months. Going back to my role as Director of Business Affairs, the first role I had -- the Atlantic City Tourism District -- I would talk to the business community in South Jersey to get them onboard for signing on to endorse that proposal. Things like that happened, I mean, all the time.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Through the Chair -- and it’s easier now as we sit here in May, as we slow this tape down, and snapshot each e-mail,
each hour, each call, and try to understand whether you made the right decision or wrong decision. You talked about how frenetic and how crazy your office was. Forget the personal life with the three stepchildren, the marriage, whatnot -- talk to me about how many e-mails in a given day, how many phone calls in a given day you would field when you were at IGA -- either starting at the staff level and moving up to the head.

MS. RENNA: You know, when I first started in the Governor’s Office it was, obviously, slower paced. As my responsibilities grew, it increased, naturally. Then I was given staff members to manage. I’d say by the time I left the Governor’s Office I was getting anywhere between 300 and 500 e-mails a day.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: I’m sorry, you were getting 300 to 500?

MS. RENNA: Yes.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: And how about sending?

MS. RENNA: A fraction of that, probably, depending on the work -- whatever the workload was -- but a lot.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: That was every day.

MS. RENNA: Every day.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: The final question is, I want to finish where you started. The opening comment you had, through the Chair, was that you -- as far as you were concerned -- you knew nothing about the planning, orchestration, or carrying out of the closure of the lanes of the George W. Bridge. Is that accurate?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony.
MS. RENNA: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Thank you.

Assemblyman Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I believe this may be the final question.

SENATOR WEINBERG: No, I might have one afterwards.

(laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I was wrong.

Assemblyman Moriarty, you--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I would just like to make a motion, because I do have to leave shortly to catch a flight. So before I leave I’d like to make this motion that Exhibits numbered 1 through 28, provided to each member of the Committee today, and any documents submitted by Christina Genovese Renna to the New Jersey Legislative Select Committee on Investigation, in response to the Committee’s January 27, 2014 subpoena, be made part of the official public record and attached to the official transcript of today’s meeting.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Second?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Aye.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Seconded by Assemblywoman--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Through the Chair, I do have a question of our legal counsel before we vote on this.

SENATOR WEINBERG: I’m sorry?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Through the Chair, I have a quick question for our legal counsel before we vote on this.
We have sent prior letters on this. We have gotten no updates since the U.S. Attorney’s Office subpoenaed our Committee. We have no idea as to--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Is your question on this motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: It absolutely is pertinent to this motion.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay, go ahead.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: We have no idea, with respect to communications between your office and the U.S. Attorney’s Office: Are we doing anything to jeopardize the U.S. Attorney’s investigation by making these Exhibits part of a public record because we ourselves have been subpoenaed?

MR. SCHAR (Counsel): I don’t think we are.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Is that--

SENATOR WEINBERG: Well, you asked the question, and the attorney gave you an answer.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Right, but it was kind of an amorphous answer. It was “I don’t believe we are.” But--

SENATOR WEINBERG: That’s his answer.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Okay.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Any other questions?

SENATOR GILL: I do, I have one.

SENATOR WEINBERG: On this motion?

SENATOR GILL: Oh, no.

SENATOR WEINBERG: No, okay.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Could we read back the motion, Chair?
SENATOR WEINBERG: The motion is to make -- motion that Exhibits numbered 1 through 28 provided to each member of the Committee today, and any documents submitted by Christina Genovese Renna to the New Jersey Legislative Select Committee on Investigation, in response to the Committee’s January 27, 2014 subpoena, be made part of the official public record and attached to the official transcript of today’s meeting.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Thank you, Chair.

SENATOR WEINBERG: May I have a roll call, please?

MR. BUONO (Committee Aide): On the motion, Assemblywoman Schepisi.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SCHEPISI: Based upon Counsel’s answer, I’ll vote yes.

MR. BUONO: Senator O’Toole.

SENATOR O’TOOLE: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Handlin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANDLIN: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Carroll.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARROLL: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Senator Gill.

SENATOR GILL: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Assemblywoman Caride.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARIDE: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Wisniewski.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

MR. BUONO: Co-Chair Weinberg.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Yes.

Assemblyman Wisniewski.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Christina, I was wrong. This is not the last question, but pretty darned close to one of the last questions.

So I wanted to go back to January 9, 2014. After you spoke to Regina Egea, you assembled your IGA Regional Directors -- and I believe that was Dominick Fiorilli, Evan Ridley, and Chris Stark.

MS. RENNA: And Rich DeRose as well.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And Rich DeRose. And then you asked them what they knew about the bridge issue or related matters.

MS. RENNA: I don’t know that I asked them about the bridge issue, specifically; at least I can’t recall that at this time. I did ask them, and we discussed, any other problematic stories or unhappy elected officials who may use the opportunity, based on the news, to pile on or say something else. Because I wanted to, as I said, bring to Chris Porrino a full picture. So I needed their feedback because they’re the ones who, day-to-day, interfaced with the mayors.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Just now you made a point of saying, “Well, not specifically the bridge issue.”

MS. RENNA: I’m sorry?

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, I had, in my question to you, I said that you asked them about the bridge issue or related issues.
And you qualified your response by saying, I think, “Not necessarily specifically about the bridge issue; just that there were unhappy mayors.” Am I correct in understanding that answer?

MS. RENNA: Right. I mean, at this point I knew who in the office knew -- it was Evan and I. So, I mean, there was-- I just don’t recall asking them directly, “Do any of you guys know anything about the bridge scandal? Okay, now that we’ve checked that box, let’s talk about this.” I just remember asking them about other unhappy mayors who may be out there.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And let me just ask this question, because maybe I’m not understanding what you’re saying. If the issue that broke on January 8 was that Bridget Kelly had sent an e-mail that said, “Time for traffic problems in Fort Lee,” which led to the lane diversion, and you were going into a meeting with Mr. Porrino, and you were interviewing your direct reports, why wouldn’t you ask them, “Do you know anything about this?”

MS. RENNA: I already knew the answer. I mean, I knew--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Well, how did you know the answer if you hadn’t asked them?

MS. RENNA: Because the only person who would be interfacing with anyone in North Jersey, period, would be Evan Ridley. There was no overlap as far as staff went. So Chris Stark in the Shore region would never be having a conversation with anyone in Fort Lee.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But you had in that meeting Dominick Fiorilli, Evan Ridley, and Chris Stark.

MS. RENNA: And Rich DeRose, yes.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And Rich DeRose.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So you said you already knew that Evan Ridley had no knowledge about this?

MS. RENNA: Well, I just assumed, if that was the case-- Chairman, I don’t recall asking them; I very well could have. I mean, again, January 8 and January 9 were complete and total blurs to me. So I’m sorry I can’t articulately answer the question. I would like to; but I just don’t remember.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Dominick Fiorilli, before he worked for you at IGA, he worked at the Port Authority. I think the title was Director of New Port Initiatives.

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: And so he was a person who knew something about the Port Authority -- at least for whatever limited time he was there.

MS. RENNA: Yes, I’m sure.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So in that meeting before you went to Mr. Porrino, did you ask him about how this could happen at the Port Authority, what were the mechanisms that would allow it to happen, how could Bridget Kelly be involved?

MS. RENNA: No, I did not.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Why not?

MS. RENNA: It just didn’t dawn upon me, with everything going on, to ask that question. I was more focused on getting the factual
information I needed to bring down to discuss with Chris Porrino: my e-mail and any other things that may catch the Administration off guard.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: How long was your conversation with those four?

MS. RENNA: Not even five minutes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Not even five minutes. And did you learn anything from that conversation at all?

MS. RENNA: Not really. I mean, we talked about some mayors who may have been unhappy with the Administration for whatever reason, but there were no surprises, if memory serves me correctly. It ended up being an exercise I didn’t need to do because I didn’t learn anything new that I didn’t already know to bring back to Chris Porrino. So it was just sort of a fruitless exercise.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So when you were in that meeting there was some reference to some mayors who had some level of unhappiness with the Administration?

MS. RENNA: Yes, I mean -- but as I said, it was the people who all of us sitting in this room know.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: I know, but for the record, when somebody comes back and looks at this record, they’re not going to know what all of the people in this room know. So if you could tell us--

MS. RENNA: There are lots of mayors -- I wouldn’t use the word lots, so correct that -- there are some mayors and administrations that do not like the Governor or like the Administration and do not want to interface with the Governor or his staff. They are Republican towns like Medford, there are Democratic-run towns like Elizabeth.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: But insofar as this particular conversation on this particular morning--

MS. RENNA: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: --what unhappiness was relayed to you, by these four direct reports to you, about mayors or other elected officials who were unhappy with the Administration?

MS. RENNA: And that’s what I’m saying -- is that I didn’t gain any new knowledge. We were discussing mayors like I just named. And the former Mayor of Atlantic City, things like that. I didn’t walk out of there with any new information. I guess there was no-- No one said to me, that I can recall, “Oh, by the way, I never told you. This mayor is furious.” I didn’t gain any new information.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Was there any discussion about the Port Authority toll increase from Mr. Fiorilli, who had worked there and is reported to have been involved in the toll increases?

MS. RENNA: That conversation was never discussed.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: In that meeting.

MS. RENNA: In that meeting, or by me.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Anything about the ARC tunnel at that meeting?

MS. RENNA: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. Now, after you got done with that you had a meeting with Mr. Porrino.

MS. RENNA: A few days later.
ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: A few days later. And, if I’m correct, your interview memo says that you spoke to Mr. Porrino for about two hours.

MS. RENNA: Two, two-and-a-half hours, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: So I’m trying to understand. Your conversation with your four direct reports was relatively brief. You really didn’t gain a lot of information from Bridget Kelly. What took two-and-a-half hours? Because in your answers to your questions, you basically said there really wasn’t a lot more to talk about.

MS. RENNA: Well, respectfully, we’ve been here for several hours. (laughter) Chris Porrino is a very good lawyer, asks a lot of very detailed questions, and I answered them. I mean--

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: What were the questions?

MS. RENNA: Everything discussed in the Gibson Dunn memo. I didn’t hold anything back with Chris Porrino, didn’t hold anything back with Gibson Dunn, not holding anything back today.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Did he ask you about your interchange with Bridget Kelly about that e-mail that she had asked you to delete?

MS. RENNA: Yes, we talked about that at length.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Okay. And did he talk to you about the do-not-call mayors, or the mayors whose names shall not be spoken?

MS. RENNA: We talked a bit about IGA. As I said, Chris was unfamiliar with it, so I sort of had to explain to him what IGA did day-to-
day. And we did get into some of those details and he did ask some questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN WISNIEWSKI: Thank you very much.
MS. RENNA: No problem.
SENATOR WEINBERG: Senator Gill.
SENATOR GILL: Yes.

Now that you maintain that the Gibson Dunn report is accurate as to your interview, except for the issues that you’ve already raised -- correct?

MS. RENNA: I believe I said that I was largely happy with the portrayal that Gibson Dunn portrayed with the information I gave them. I believe that’s how I put it.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. So I’m not concerned with you being happy; I’m concerned with if you think the Gibson Dunn report is accurate with respect to your interview.

MS. RENNA: Largely I think it’s accurate, yes.

SENATOR GILL: And the part that you think is not accurate you have already stated for the record.

MS. RENNA: I would have to go through again, as we discussed with the Chairwoman, to make sure that I’m not missing anything.

SENATOR GILL: Well, you did answer Senator O’Toole’s--

MS. RENNA: And I said I was largely pleased with the portrayal of my words in the Gibson Dunn interview notes, yes.

SENATOR GILL: Okay, now let’s see how pleased you are with this. If we can go to Exhibit 28, and we will go to Page 18. And I
would like you to take an opportunity to review that -- Section G, January 9, 2014.

MS. RENNA: I’m familiar with it, Senator.

SENATOR GILL: Okay. And in this interview, it did not state that you ever spoke to Melissa Orsen, the Counsel (sic) -- Chief of Staff to the Lieutenant Governor, does it?

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And so if one was to look at your interview, there was no indication or mention that you spoke to the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff on January 9.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And if there was not a crosscheck done with respect to the interview of Egea, it’s in Egea’s interview that Egea states you talked to the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff.

MS. RENNA: Correct.

SENATOR GILL: And do you think that in naming the people you spoke to on January 9, 2014 -- for an interview, to leave out that you spoke to the Lieutenant Governor’s Chief of Staff about the September 13 e-mail and the deletion -- of that request -- and that you saved it to another account -- do you think that is a minor oversight?

MS. RENNA: I do.

SENATOR GILL: Thank you very much.

MS. RENNA: You’re welcome.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Ms. Renna, can you tell me, who is Richard Rebisz, R-E-B-I-S-Z?
MS. RENNA: Rebisz (indicating pronunciation). He was a staff member who worked for me.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay.

I’m just going to make this one comment, because you seem very clear of the lines that were drawn in terms of the way IGA staff dealt with gubernatorial endorsement, call backs, do not call -- whatever the various lists were. And if Mr. Rebisz -- it’s pronounced?

MS. RENNA: Rebisz, yes.

SENATOR WEINBERG: In his interview memo, (indiscernible) 5, it says when he was asked whether he had any conversations with Mayor Zimmer regarding her decision not to endorse Governor Christie, Rebisz responded, “No.” And let’s go back now -- we’re back around the same time, in and around Labor Day 2013. “Renna told him not to bend over backwards for Mayor Zimmer, which Rebisz explained meant that he should not go out of his way to help.” So in other words, it wasn’t “don’t make any proactive calls;” it was to not go out of his way to help her -- or, at least, that’s the way it’s portrayed, perhaps accurately or inaccurately, in the Gibson Dunn.

MS. RENNA: Well, I would respond to that by saying not going out of your way is the same thing as not being proactive. You know, mayor Zimmer had a phenomenal working relationship with IGA for all four years of the first term. Mayor Zimmer could be, respectfully, very-- She had a lot of questions, she had a lot of inquiries, she had a lot of requests. We fielded a lot of calls from her, we worked with her very frequently in a very positive manner. You know, me telling Rich-- I don’t recall telling him not to bend over backwards, but I have no doubt that Rich
is telling the truth, so I don’t want to question that. But, again, since I don’t recall the context in which I said it, I don’t want to speak to why. What I’m telling you is that there are multiple reasons why I could have been implying, maybe, don’t be a proactive with the Mayor.

SENATOR WEINBERG: Okay. On behalf of the Committee, I want to, again, thank you for being here. We’re only 10 minutes late from my promised close of session.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Not bad.

SENATOR WEINBERG: If you had all arrived back 10 minutes earlier from lunch we would have left on time.

I appreciate your patience and, as you know, we reserve the right to be able to call you back. But the meeting will be closed.

Our next meeting is a week from today when we have full expectations that Michael Drewniak will be here.

SENATOR O'TOOLE: Ten o’clock?

SENATOR WEINBERG: Yes.

Thank you very much, everyone.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)