
Commission Meeting

of

STATE HOUSE COMMISSION

LOCATION: Room L103
New Jersey State House
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: November 13, 2017
9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

Amy E. Melick, Chair
Senator Bob Smith
Senator Dawn Marie Addiego
Assemblyman Reed Gusciora
Assemblyman John DiMaio
David Ridolfino
Beth Schermerhorn



ALSO PRESENT:

Robert J. Shaughnessy Jr.
Commission Secretary

Gary A. Kotler
Commission Counsel

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Diana Rogers Director Housing and Economic Development City of Trenton	15
Anne LaBate Representing Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton (Stakeholders ACT)	17
Iana Dikidjieva Co-Chair Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton (Stakeholders ACT)	19
Jeffery Laurenti Representing Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton (Stakeholders ACT)	22
Tyrone Gaskins Board of Trustees Partnerships for Trenton	24
George Sowa Chief Executive Officer Greater Trenton	26
Paul Perez President Board of Trustees Partnerships for Trenton	28
Timothy J. Lizura President and Chief Operating Officer New Jersey Economic Development Authority	30
Kevin M. Brown Executive Director Juvenile Justice Commission Office of the Attorney General Department of Law and Public Safety State of New Jersey	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
John E. McCormac Mayor Woodbridge Township	65
James McManimon Business Administrator Ewing Township	69
James A. Darrar Technical Support Relocation and Property Management Division Division of Right of Way and Access Management Capital Management Program Department of Transportation State of New Jersey	84
Shirlene Scott Pension Benefits Specialist Division of Pensions and Benefits Department of the Treasury State of New Jersey	100
Robert E. Kelly, Esq. Deputy Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Department of Law and Public Safety State of New Jersey	103
APPENDIX:	
Amendments to Agenda Item submitted by State House Commission	1x
Testimony submitted by Peter Kasabach Private Citizen	7x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
E-mail, addressed to State House Commission from Jean Public Private Citizen	9x
pnf:1-108	

MR. SHAUGHNESSY (Commission Secretary): Members and public, please -- we're going to begin now.

Thank you for your patience.

Welcome to the State House Commission meeting of November 13, 2017.

We are in compliance with the Open Public Meeting Act.

I'm going to quickly call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

AMY E. MELICK (Chair): Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: I understand Senator Smith has called and will be here briefly. He indicated that he's going to be running a few minutes late.

Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.

MS. MELICK: Great.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Moving on to, first, Old Business.
Approval of the June 12, 2017 State House Commission meeting minutes.

May I have a motion to approve those minutes?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So moved.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Any opposed? (no response)

Any abstentions?

SENATOR ADDIEGO: I guess we have to. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I abstain; I just wasn't here.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Abstain.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes, we weren't here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator; and thank you,
Assemblymen. I appreciate it.

I neglected to mention that the State House Commission has received certain comments from Jean Public, dated November 11, 2017. They have been distributed to the members this morning prior to the meeting and they will be made a part of the State House Commission records.

MS. MELICK: So just to clarify, the statement from last meeting is not public yet, now. We didn't get enough votes, or *did* we get enough votes?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Are you talking about the meeting minutes?

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. KOTLER (Commission Counsel): They will be published.

MS. MELICK: Oh, they can be published?

MR. KOTLER: Yes.

MS. MELICK: Good.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you for that clarification, Counsel.

We're going to hold No. 2 for the present moment, and we'll be moving on to No. 3, under Old Business.

This is RPR 07-14A through RPR 07-17D, East Jersey State Prison, Block 908, Lot 10, Woodbridge, Middlesex County.

This project was previously approved by the State House Commission at the meeting of June 16, 2014, as the direct sale of 15.5 +/- acres of land and improvements, located at the East Jersey State Prison, to Woodbridge Township for a restricted use. This sale was authorized by P.L. 2013, chapter 198 -- the Act approved on January 17, 2014. The Act requires the sale and conveyance to be for a nominal value, and be executed subject to restricted use in accordance with the terms and conditions to be approved by the State House Commission.

The Township proposed a site that is to be occupied -- initially, to be occupied by up to 100 apartments and a recreational use. The Township is committed to allocating up to 25 percent of the housing units to the developmentally disabled population of the State of New Jersey.

The property was sold, as encumbered, directly to Woodbridge Township for \$1 and other good and valuable consideration. Deed restrictions were placed on the property.

Subsequently, the Township requested the deed restrictions, saying that the use of the property included an *indoor* soccer complex, be changed to an *outdoor* recreational complex. This request was approved by the State House Commission at its meeting of October 26, 2016, and a corrective deed was recorded in confirmation.

It is now requested by Woodbridge Township that an amended and restated deed be permitted so that the number of apartments be increased to 101 from 100 units; the outdoor recreational *complex* be changed to an outdoor recreational *field*; the revisions to the above deed restrictions be approved; and reduce the time period of the reverter on the property.

More specifically, upon completion of construction of the apartments and the outdoor recreational field, and receipt of all final certificates of occupancy with respect thereto, Woodbridge Township shall submit to the State of New Jersey, by December 31, 2019, evidence of compliance with all covenants, conditions, and restrictions set forth in the new amended and restated deed confirming such compliance. Upon its confirmation and approval, the New Jersey Department of Corrections as grantor, shall execute and provide to Woodbridge Township, for recording in the land records, a document which will permanently extinguish the State's rights of reverter as set forth in said recorded, amended, and restated deed.

It is further requested by Woodbridge Township that the State agree to subordinate its reversionary interest in the deed to the proposed New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency for the future affordable housing and supportive housing project. Financing for the future project

will include tax-exempt bond financing, along with other financing subsidies from the HMFA which, by State statute, requires their financing hold a first lien position on the property. Without the subordination of the reversionary interest in the deed to HMFA financing, the HMFA financing will not proceed.

So there are a few brief items, which I will read into the record, rather than reading the whole deed.

I would like to just correct two matters with respect to this agenda item No. 1.

The agenda lists that there will be four-bedroom units as part of this project mix. There will no longer be four-bedroom units offered; only one-, two-, and three-bedroom units.

And two, the proposed and amended deed in your packages, in the second paragraph on page 2, states that, at the October 2016 meeting, the Commission approved a corrective deed allowing the Township to construct an indoor recreational complex in lieu of an indoor soccer complex. The Commission actually approved the construction of an *outdoor* recreational complex. This will be corrected prior to any new deed being executed.

So with those few changes, I ask if there are any members who have any comments or questions with regard to this matter.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; hearing none-- I appreciate it, Assemblyman.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Any member of the public wish to be heard? (no response)

Hearing none, then we have a motion to approve; thank you, Assemblyman. I appreciate that.

Is there a second on that motion?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second; thank you.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay. That item, under Old Business, No. 3, is approved.

Moving on, I think, to the last item under Old Business -- No. 4 on the agenda under Old Business. This is the final item under Old Business until we go back to No. 2.

Project RPR 17-09, 101 Haddon Avenue, Block 1397, Lots 3 and 4, Camden, Camden County.

This action was approved by the State House Commission at its meeting on June 12, 2017, as the direct sale of the property located at Block 1397, Lot 3, also known as 101 Haddon Avenue, in Camden, Camden County to the Camden County Improvement Authority for \$13,950,000. However, the conveyance of Lot 4 -- which consists of 19,450 +/- square feet of landlocked parking -- was inadvertently omitted from that request.

It is now requested that Block 1397, Lot 4, also known as 101 Haddon Avenue, be sold directly to the Camden County Improvement Authority as part of the consideration initially approved by the Commission.

Does any member have questions or comments on this matter?
(no response)

Hearing none, does any member of the public want to be heard? (no response)

Seeing none, we'll then call for the roll.

May I have a motion?

Motion, please.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second--

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second; pardon me.
Motion and second; we have both. Thank you.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved; thank you.

Moving on to New Business.

First, No. 5 under New Business is project RPR 17-03, Marie Katzenbach School for the Deaf, Block 341, part of Lot 1, Ewing Township, Mercer County.

Treasury, on behalf of the Department of Education, requests approval to convey a 0.257+/- acre parcel of vacant land on the grounds of the Marie Katzenbach School for the Deaf to the Ewing/Lawrence Sewer Authority, for the construction of a new sewer pump station. The construction will increase the sewer capacity, directly benefiting the State and the neighboring region.

Since this will directly benefit the State, the property will be sold for \$1.

Does any member have any questions or comments on this matter? (no response)

Hearing none, does any member of the public want to be heard on this matter? (no response)

Seeing none, motion, please.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Motion to approve.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second; thank you very much.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

On to No. 6 under New Business.

RPR 17-11, Stockton University, Block 875.04, part of Lot 1.01, Galloway Township, Atlantic County.

Treasury, on behalf of Stockton University, requests approval to grant an easement on the grounds of Stockton University to Atlantic City Electric Company. The easement is necessary to convert existing

overhead utilities to underground utilities. The easement area consists of approximately 7,180.04 +/- square feet of land.

Since this action directly benefits the State, the easement will be granted for \$1.

Any members have any questions or comments? (no response)

Hearing none, any member of the public here want to be heard on this matter? (no response)

Seeing none, may I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Motion to approve.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator.

We have both.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

On to No. 7 under New Business.

Project RPR 18-03, Kean University, Block 104, part of Lot 1, Union Township, Union County.

Treasury, on behalf of Kean University, requests approval to grant an easement on the grounds of Kean University to Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc., doing business as Elizabethtown Gas Company, for the installation and maintenance of gas lines necessary for the construction of a new residence hall. The easement area consists of approximately 10,000 +/- square feet.

Since this action directly benefits the State, the easement will be granted for \$1.

Any members want to be heard on this matter? (no response)

Any members of the public interested in being heard on this matter? (no response)

Seeing none, may I have a motion on No. 7?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to approve.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second; thank you, Senator.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

Okay, we're moving on to No. 8 under New Business.

RPR 18-04, Trenton Office Complex, Block 202, Lot 6, City of Trenton, Mercer County.

Treasury requests approval to lease 3,170 +/- square feet of commercial space, located at the Trenton Office Complex, to the Community Health Law Project, a nonprofit entity, to be used for office space.

This lease will be for a term of three years, with one, one-year renewal option. The annual rent will remain at the previous rent of \$57,000 per year. The lessee will be responsible for all utilities supplied to the leased premises.

Does any member of the Commission have any questions or comments? (no response)

Hearing none, any member of the public want to be heard with respect to this matter? (no response)

Seeing none, may I have a motion, please?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to approve.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman; thank you, Senator.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved; thank you so much.

We're moving on to No. 8 now; pardon me, No. 9.

Let me be clear: No. 9 on the agenda.

RPR 18-05A, Block 3503, Lots 7.01, 7.02, 7.03, part of Lot 7, Trenton, Mercer County.

Treasury requests approval to lease approximately 1.106 +/- acres of vacant land to the New Jersey Economic Development Authority as part of a lease/leaseback for financing the construction of a new Health building.

The lease is to be for a term of 30 years.

This is up for consideration.

Does any member of the Commission have any questions?

Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: And I will direct my comments to both No. 9 and No. 10.

I have grave reservations about this proposal. I do have a map.

(refers to map behind him)

This is the City of Trenton, and this is where the Transit Center is. This is where the Trenton Master Plan would like to -- in the green right here -- would like to be developed. And yet, the proposals for the new State building can't be further from the Transit area, can't be further from where the City master plan is.

I think the summary in here is in error -- that this *is* consistent with the City master plan; it is not. And my disappointment stems from that there was no consideration for lands other than State-owned lands; that it's not Transit orientated; that it ignores the Trenton master plan; that there is no public-private partnership involved; and that since it will take away taxable land, it would be devastating to the Trenton tax base.

I would urge and beg my colleagues on this Commission to put this on hold to allow further public input. This is the end of the Christie Administration; I think that this decision should be reserved for the incoming Administration. And I think that we should all want a beautiful State Capital. We have an opportunity to really use the top City planners -- or urban planners, not just to throw darts at a map and that decides where we put these buildings.

So I would urge everybody to put this on hold, or vote “no” for both No. 9 and No. 10. I think the City of Trenton deserves more.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Is that a motion to put it on hold?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to hold.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: To table?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: To table; I’m sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Do we have any other comments or questions with regard to this from the members? (no response)

Okay; so we have a motion--

Oh, any member from the public want to be heard on this?

D I A N A R O G E R S: (off mike) Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: (off mike) What order are we going in? Representatives from the Mayor’s Office?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes; that’s fine, that’s fine.

Thank you so much.

And please identify yourself, for the record.

MS. ROGERS: Sure.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you so much.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you.

My name is Diana Rogers, and I am the Director of Housing and Economic Development for the City of Trenton.

And I am actually here today asking for this Commission to support Nos. 9 and 10. As was stated, the City has done a significant amount of work on our master planning process, *Trenton 250*. And while

there are some who would believe that this is not consistent with our master plan, we want to have folks look at the entirety of development in the downtown, and not at just one specific project. We do believe that this project will begin to spur economic development in the downtown.

When we look at our Transit Center, we are currently working with the Office of Planning Services on our Trenton Opportunity Zone, which looks at taking the valuable land around the train station and putting a plan together to address that land. But for this particular project -- the State office building projects -- we do believe that it also allows for a significant investment into the downtown. It allows for development on, also, real estate that will begin to have others look at planning efforts that have already been in place; planning efforts that not only look at bringing office -- keeping State workers in the downtown, which we wholeheartedly support, but also taking buildings that are obsolete at this point and building new buildings -- Class A buildings -- in our downtown.

And while we do respect some of the discussion around some of the other possible sites, we are looking at and working with others to address other possible sites.

And so, again, we're not looking at this as a singular effort; but we're looking at the overall development in the downtown. And if you have the opportunity to take a look at our *Trenton 250*, you will also look to see that we are looking at building density in the downtown. And so we would not want to take the train station area and just put office buildings that are State-owned at the train station; but have an opportunity for the State to build their office buildings on their land; and take the prime real estate that is around the train station -- that would create density, that would bring

residential development, commercial development, and office development; and allow that to be for private development. And we do believe that this project offers an opportunity to do all of that in the downtown.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you for your comments.

MS. MELICK: Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

MS. MELICK: They're somewhere.

A N N E L a B A T E: Good morning.

My name is Anne LaBate; I'm a Trenton resident, and I own a commercial real estate business in downtown Trenton.

I also serve on the board of the Trenton Downtown Association and the Trenton Parking Authority; though, of course, this morning I speak only on my own behalf.

And I have prepared remarks, just because that's easier.

Urban development is difficult and complex. The Christie Administration, in conceiving a major urban development project in Trenton, has somehow attempted to deny that reality and look, instead, for a simple solution at every turn.

They decided it would be simple to limit locations that they considered for this project to land that the State already owns. And yet development professionals can readily show that land acquisition costs in projects in struggling urban centers are a minor fraction of the overall project cost.

Trenton has available development sites in our downtown core that have gone begging for buyers. They offer better locations; but because of this initial simple decision to only use State-owned land, these sites were never considered.

The State-owned sites are located at the fringe of our downtown and will take State employees further from our retail corridor and the many small businesses that depend on their patronage to survive.

The locations chosen do not conform with the master plan of the City of Trenton; the maps clearly show that. The City's plans call for State office development in an area identified as the *downtown core*. Both of these sites are outside of the downtown core designated area. The City's master plan calls for mixed-use development because that approach has been shown to add vibrancy to urban downtowns, while enhancing safety and overall livability. Both of the buildings proposed are single-use structures; again, because that is far simpler.

Also quite troubling -- these sites do not facilitate the use of public transit and the significant public investment made in our train station. Instead, the Administration has most recently decided to add to their plans the construction of a massive 1,500-car parking structure in a location that is not zoned for a single-use structure of this sort.

There is a clear preference by this Administration to have New Jersey taxpayers pay for State employee parking, rather than plan for more use of Transit. If built, this structure is certain to be vacant more than it is occupied because there is no plan for the type of mixed-use project that is key to successful urban development.

Many of our residents and business stakeholders participated in focus groups, surveys, and plan reviews as a part of the *Trenton 250* master planning process. We recognize that Trenton desperately needs to attract private investment and private employers, and our master plan lays a framework that could make that happen. The Administration State office building proposal would trample on those plans.

While we understand that the State can ignore local zoning, there should certainly be a compelling reason to do so.

I am a part of an organization called *Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton*. We advocate for a return to the drawing board and reconsideration of this project. We respectfully request that you vote “no” today on the proposal before you.

I can share these remarks, if that’s helpful.

I also was asked to bring remarks from another resident, Peter Kasabach, who is a 25-year resident of the City of Trenton -- prepared remarks that I can either read, or simply distribute; whatever.

Okay; thank you for your time.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you. We’ll take your comments -- verbatim comments into the record; and Mr. Kasabach’s will be distributed as well, and made part of the record.

Any other members of the public--

Thank you.

I A N A D I K I D J I E V A: Hello; thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Iana Dikidjieva; I’m speaking to you as a fairly new resident of Trenton.

And part of what I think the present Commission needs to understand about Trenton -- because other than Assemblyman Gusciora, I don't actually see very many of you hopping around in our downtown-- (laughter)

To build on what Anne just said, I am also Co-Chair of the Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton. And this project is not just misguided from a general urban planning perspective, but it is absolutely the wrong thing for Trenton right now, as it is.

It's possible that three years ago, four years ago, when they were making the decision to build single-use State office buildings -- similar to what we were building in the 1970s, and similar to the sorts of decisions that actually made Trenton have a lot of the problems that it currently has -- maybe that sort of logic that the EDA has consistently presented to us, when we have spoken to them since the beginning of the year -- maybe at that time that made sense, where you couldn't really see very much development in Trenton. You couldn't really get a sense that young people were moving to Trenton. You couldn't see the 20-plus businesses that have actually opened in our downtown at that time yet.

But now you see that. At this point, Roebing Lofts has gone from not even being approved to, actually, being mostly occupied. People are moving in. You see other projects; you see, as I said, close to 20 businesses have opened in our downtown. When we say that scattering State office workers further to the fringes of downtown, away from where the businesses are, we're not talking abstractly; we're talking about new businesses that are actually exciting, and cool, and want to be here. We

were not talking, at the time this decision was made, about how Starbucks is, literally, two weeks away from opening on Warren Street.

So possibly, in the context that our colleagues from the City of Trenton and from the EDA-- The logic undergirding this, that the only development possible in Trenton is if the State of New Jersey continues building the types of things that it's always built, that are the simplest to build -- which is single-use things that are meant to keep Trenton away from the actual State office workers, surrounded by parking; single-use things; not working with a private developer; not doing anything complicated, just build anything for the sake of building it -- that logic may have operated, but it's no longer real.

So I ask all of you to please vote against this, because this type of State rearrangement of its footprint in our Capital City happens, really, only once a generation. And we recover from these bad decisions for a full generation.

So I am asking you, please, make the decision, or make-- I'm sorry; one more point. (laughter) If the EDA had actually started listening to us at the time that we raised a lot of these concerns and said, "You can, it is possible, to build this well" -- you know, we're not arguing against \$135 million of State money coming into downtown Trenton; not at all -- but it's possible for it to be building something good, and not something detrimental to our downtown. It's possible to work with a private developer, get the same office space needs met, and actually also build a sort of mixed-use thing that also fosters more people living here -- because more people do want to live here -- and creates the sort of, like, mixed day- and-night community that we really need in a vibrant downtown; which we see

the EDA approve at every single one of its meetings, you know, every single month, for every place that is not Trenton.

So we only ask for the same kind of development, that everyone knows is the catalyst for more development in cities, to be applied to our Capital City -- which is all of your Capital City as well.

I think I'll stop there. (laughter)

Thank you all for your attention.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Any other members of the public interested in being heard?

Sir, please step up and identify yourself; thank you.

J E F F R E Y L A U R E N T I: Thank you.

Hi, there. My name is Jeffrey Laurenti, a resident of Trenton. Unlike Iana, not a recent one, but 67 years; and a member of the self-described stakeholders group that has been involved in the broad-based citizen-led planning processes that have been incorporated into the duly adopted Trenton master plan.

Let me also congratulate the members of the Legislature here for their being returned to Trenton for the next two years. I had an earlier incarnation; I've been associated with these State processes. And while I am pleased to meet Senator Addiego for the first time, I had been hoping that Senator Cardinale might be here, since he was here when I was here 40-some years ago. (laughter)

SENATOR ADDIEGO: I'll be sure to tell him that. (laughter)

MR. LAURENTI: Okay, thank you, Senator.

I emphasize the role of the stakeholders' group in Trenton's municipal planning, because it is the failure of the Economic Development

Authority to respect its own statutory mandate -- to underwrite only projects that comply with municipal master plans -- that is the most egregious failing of the outgoing Administration's proposal for the convoluted lease/leaseback of these two State building sites. I might add that it also ignores the EDA's statutory responsibility to support projects that maximize use of public transportation, since the sites in question are all more than a half-mile radius from the Trenton Train Station and the River Line; and that it ignores the EDA statutory mandate to promote public-private partnerships in mixed-use developments. Just as an aside.

We are gratified that the Governor has recognized the need to update the office space in which the State workers in downtown Trenton must work. But this significant State expenditure needs to be made consistent with Trenton's own plans for its future, in a way that maximizes the City's prospects for redevelopment rather than create office buildings scattered around the outer edges of the downtown as an afterthought; as something of mere convenience. Alas, this proposal to place these new State office buildings at various points, with no concentration for redevelopment impact, is not only a missed opportunity to leverage the State's largest expenditure of money for State office construction in a generation, but it is at odds with every public policy objective that the Economic Development Authority is mandated to advance.

This is a case of a State government -- and it's not the first, of course; and it will not be the last, I am sure -- imposing a plan for its own bureaucratic convenience without input from the citizenry of the affected city. Trenton City Council will be holding a hearing on November 21 -- in just a week -- to hear from the citizenry of this town and from leaders in the

urban redevelopment field about how to maximize the redevelopment potential of major new State office construction in Trenton. And for that reason, I would hope the Commission would support Assemblyman Gusciora's motion to table this for its next meeting, after the State has had the benefit of hearing what people in the City, for the first time, will have the public opportunity to present to their own local officials.

Thank you all.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you for those comments.

Any other public members-- Yes, sir; please step up and identify yourself.

TYRONE GASKINS: Good morning.

My name is Tyrone Gaskins. I am the Board Secretary for Partnerships for Trenton.

I believe the individuals who have spoken have done a pretty good job of outlining what some of the gaps we believe are in the State's plan. It is clear, through a cursory review, that the plan demonstrates its contrary posture to the Capital District Plan, to the *Trenton 250* master plan, and to the type of development that we believe would be more undergirding in terms of building revitalization in the City, and particularly building the social capital of the people who live here.

While we understand that there may be some tradeoff in terms of getting -- the City getting the land that the Tax buildings will occupy for development, it's a token. It's a token in comparison to the realigning of an agreement with the State that creates ratable, with the support of the State, and that promotes a more realistic return on the municipal investment in terms of the State's use of City land, the infrastructure, and public services.

We still, as you have heard, have had a lot of problems in terms of trying to figure out what the parking is going to be -- how does that impact the human environment, the human environment for the people who live here in the City; and that works in the interest of the people who live here? And how does where the positions -- where the buildings are located help Trenton's revitalization?

I am not an urban planner; I wouldn't purport to be one. But I do know that Trenton's economic success cannot be created outside of the bubble of the people who live here, until folks who are making decisions determine that they're prepared to build the social capital of the people who live in the City. This City will continue to struggle, and the people who are coming into the City will continue to have distorted views about the folks who live here.

So we are very much looking forward to the meeting at the City Council, and interested in having more of the residents whose lives will be impacted on a day-to-day basis speak their minds. And we strongly advocate that the plan, as currently designed, be given additional consideration to the impact of businesses; and more emphasis on identifying how that plan can support the human environment and the people who live here.

We support Mr. Gusciora's tabling.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much, sir.

Any other members of the public want to be heard?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes?

Assemblyman, hold on one minute, okay?

G E O R G E S O W A: All right; good morning.

I'm George Sowa; I'm CEO of Greater Trenton; and I wanted to speak on -- regarding these buildings.

Are they perfect? No. But I could tell you, as a *recovering developer*, as I like to say (laughter) -- I've been a developer for over 30 years, most recently for the Subaru North American headquarters in Camden, New Jersey, an \$118 million project under construction as we speak. Prior to that, in New Brunswick, I've been involved in two \$50 million-plus public-private partnerships in New Brunswick. And again, I can tell you, I certainly understand development.

And again, these buildings are not perfect; but perfection can be extremely elusive. And one of the things that they always struggle with-- And I can tell you, in not a single project that I've ever been involved with have I had everyone come out and say, "Boy, you knocked it out of the park and this is a fantastic project." As a matter of fact, you usually have about 40 percent of the people opposed, no matter what.

And after the project is done, people come out; they understand it better. Because change is difficult; it's absolutely difficult. But we also need to have catalysts in the City. And there are some who were opposed to the Subaru building in Camden. That building became a catalyst for a whole bunch of other things to happen within the city. And again, perfection can be extremely elusive.

So one of the things, as it relates to this-- And you heard about the parking garage. You know, mixed-use can be within a single structure, or it can also be in the totality of a site. And by freeing up this site that is

about 20 acres right on the river, right on Route 29 -- again, that garage now can become a smart-use type of project where, during the day, it could be used by State workers and others in proximity; and at night and on the weekends, that same garage can now be used for residential which, ultimately, we would like to see happen there, because it does make sense.

And a lot of things that you hear from ACT do make sense; you know, again, we're not opposed to what they're saying. But again, these two buildings by themselves represent not the end but, hopefully, the beginning of development in this City. And again, if this is the best and the only thing we have going on in the City at this point, we should turn the lights off. Because there is so much potential here, and we need to make sure we capitalize on it.

But again, these buildings by themselves are not perfect; but they're certainly not so bad that I suggest to you they're going to be the death of the downtown. My bigger fear is, as trying to promote the City to private sector developers, if we do stop these buildings, what do we tell developers that only have time and money? And when we say that the State can't build on State-owned ground in a City where they really don't need approvals -- what do I tell developers? Again, they have time and money they don't want to waste either. And if these buildings get stopped, it's a tough discussion to have with developers because, again, they'll check off Trenton and just say, "You know what? We're going to wait," and waiting could be very, very tough to do.

As far as real estate taxes on this ground -- it's currently owned by the State; it does not pay taxes. So it's one that -- again, it's an opportunity to try to leverage State-owned ground now and try to put that

ground into service. And it will be generating taxes in the future, if we get this right.

And again-- So I suggest to you, these buildings aren't perfect; but I also suggest to you they're far from so bad that they should be stopped.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir.

Any other comments?

Yes, sir.

MR. SOWA: (off mike) Thank you.

PAUL PEREZ: Good morning.

My name is Paul Perez, and I am the President of Partnerships for Trenton, which you have already heard from. We're a community nonprofit that works with the local residents of Trenton, mostly, and the people who are going to be affected the most by what we're talking about here this morning.

We can talk about developers, we can talk about taxes, we can talk about the fact that we're missing the public-private partnerships that make sense; the fact that we're neglecting to pay attention to the statutes; the development of different plans, plans that come together for the redevelopment of the City; a \$130 million investment -- everything that you've heard this morning. To the local people, guess what? It just sounds like garble. What you don't hear is that these people -- and you know it very well -- live in a city that is probably one of the worst cities right now in the entire state. And we have an opportunity to do something right for the people of this City.

If there's a developer who doesn't think that it makes sense to build in Trenton, go build somewhere else. Because we don't want those kinds of neighbors and, more than likely, you're not going to hire our people.

What we want you to do at this moment is pay attention to the fact that we have an opportunity to get this right. We don't have to rush and make a decision, and we don't have to speak about technicalities. We just need to speak about what makes sense. We have an opportunity to stop this wrecking ball; we have an opportunity to stop this train wreck.

We'll end up with another building that's filled by day and empty by night. And we will still have the same struggling government that every one of your constituents has to pay taxes to keep alive, because you're not taking this opportunity to allow us to make our own money.

That's what we're asking you for. That's why I'm here to support our Assemblyman.

You know, I wish I could bring them all here to hear what's going on and watch what's going on. Because honestly, they just are too busy surviving. They have their heads down; they're surviving. They count on us, on our Assemblyman, to represent us when it comes to decisions like these. We can see the two armies that are standing, going at one another. But when those armies are finished fighting, we still live on the battlefield.

So please, please listen to what's going on here. Take the opportunity. I'm not going to tell you to do one thing versus the other. The only thing I'm going to ask you to do is take a pause; take a pause. There's a new Governor coming in. Take a pause; allow everyone to take a clear and concise look at what is going on around you. We are not in a

hurry. We've been suffering for a long time; we know how to do that. But we are asking you to promise us and help us; and help us understand that there are better times coming.

So please, please support my Assemblyman on this.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir.

Anyone else interested in being heard?

Yes; please come up and identify yourself.

TIMOTHY J. LIZURA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman (*sic*).

Tim Lizura, President and Chief Operating Officer of the New Jersey EDA. My staff in here are available to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

I might also note that this is a step in the process of several other reviews of the project, including the DEP environmental impact review; the CCRC's review of an environmental impact statement; as well as the Space Utilization Committee, which still has to review the actual lease. This body is looking at the land conveyance to the EDA, which is the beginning of a process which winds up with the State leasing the completed building back from the EDA. So that's the Space Utilization Committee's purview; this is the disposition of real estate to the EDA to begin that process.

So there are several other reviews that might be worthy for the members to know -- the kind of the totality of where the project stands now.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much.

SENATOR SMITH: I have some questions.

Mr. Lizura, why would you go forward in the last 60 days of this Administration? What's the rush?

MR. LIZURA: Well, I think the -- my answer to that would be that real estate development is a process which requires you to advance every day. It's an extended, protractive process which started -- this project started several years ago, with an analysis of space demands from the State that it completed for a leasehold -- private leases. Once it concluded that those spaces were too expensive and not available, then the beginning of the process for new construction began. And then the feasibility for where those facilities could be built, the budgeting process, the programming for that process. So while it seems like it's being pushed, it is actually very methodical; and the process which takes quite a few months-- And if you don't continue to advance along that, you can get mired down into a process that never gets completed.

So while I think--

SENATOR SMITH: What if you got into next year and the new Governor decided this was the wrong location. What happens then?

MR. LIZURA: Well, I-- You know, with continued processes along the way, the Governor can certainly make a decision to stop anything, right?

SENATOR SMITH: Why not wait for the new Governor?

MR. LIZURA: Any time that extends the schedule today, extends the schedule that the State can move into the buildings and be completed--

So two things happen: time and money, right? So the projects get more expensive, and with a delay, any delay -- six months, two months,

whatever it might be -- will extend the period of time where the State could move in and take occupancy. They have some real estate concerns that are pressing; the Taxation building, specifically, is a challenging building to occupy. One of the things that was considered was a renovation of the Taxation building. It was concluded that you couldn't renovate a building with people in it; they would have to move out, do a full renovation, and that would be more expensive than new construction.

So the decision to do the leases is really integral with a series of, kind of, real estate demands at the State House. So extending the timeframe will extend, today, the approvals; will extend the completion date. It will extend the budget, because time costs will go up; and those will be the impacts.

SENATOR SMITH: So tell me the -- tell me about the public process that EDA went through to solicit opinions from either the people -- the officials of Trenton or the public of Trenton.

MR. LIZURA: So we've worked very closely with the City--

SENATOR SMITH: Are they supporting the project?

MR. LIZURA: They are supporting the project.

SENATOR SMITH: The Mayor and Council are supporting the project.

MR. LIZURA: The Mayor and the Mayor's Office are supporting.

SENATOR SMITH: Did they ever have a public hearing on it?

MR. LIZURA: They have a public hearing scheduled; and when the projects' designs are complete, we will provide a courtesy review, as we do with all the State office buildings, to the town planning board.

SENATOR SMITH: Why not wait until after the public hearing occurs? I mean, there may be something that comes out at the public hearing that is problematic.

MR. LIZURA: The public hearing doesn't have -- other than what has been discussed, doesn't have the plans, right? So the plans are continuing to be developed, and they'll be presented once they're in a position that they are complete, such that a planning board can look at them. So the public's discussion is a little conceptual, other than the site location. The discussion over the actual design of the buildings really can't happen until we've completed the designs of the building. We've advanced the programming and feasibility as far as we can today, with the resources we have, in order to try to get a conceptual budget put together. That's really what we have at this point.

SENATOR SMITH: Why would you-- Before you have a conceptual design, why would you seek to acquire the property? Maybe you need a bigger building, or a bigger piece of land. You don't know that until you have a design.

MR. LIZURA: Well, no, we have a design. We have the massing of the building, we have the program from the Treasury Department over how many people need to be in the buildings. We've actually grown the buildings twice since the beginning of this process. So I think we're comfortable that the buildings can accommodate the program the State has asked to look at.

But the question of, you know, finishes of the exterior of the building, the setbacks, the curvature -- you know, the things that people will

comment on at a planning board -- those things don't get -- aren't really finalized until we're ready with the final set of plans.

SENATOR SMITH: How do you respond to all the witnesses who have come forward this morning and who are basically expressing the fact that they feel that various organizations and the citizens of Trenton have been shut out of the process?

MR. LIZURA: Well, I would -- I would disagree with that. We've had lots of conversations; we've brought people in with our design team--

SENATOR SMITH: Who?

MR. LIZURA: The Trenton stakeholder group -- the ACT group. We've modified some of the programming of the buildings already. For instance, we took out any cafeterias in the building so that those State workers would get to the street-level retail, as they have suggested.

You know, one of the things that's happening with this process is the State is looking to bring several hundred more employees back to the City from leases that are outside the City. So they're trying to roll those leases into these buildings at the same time, which goes to schedule.

SENATOR SMITH: Have you made any contact with the new Administration to see if they have any concerns about this--

MR. LIZURA: I have not, personally, sir.

SENATOR SMITH: --or whether they endorse it?

MR. LIZURA: I have not personally.

SENATOR SMITH: You don't think it would be prudent to do that?

MR. LIZURA: Well, somebody may have, but I have not.

SENATOR SMITH: No further questions.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I have some questions.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Tim, I've never met you, and I live in the City of Trenton; I'm also the representative. I don't think you've contacted the other Assembly person or the Senator either.

All right, great; you're tearing down the Department of Treasury. What do you propose to put in its place? What's going to be in there after it's gone?

MR. LIZURA: Thank you for that.

That's actually an overstatement. We initially proposed that the Taxation building would be demolished as part of this budget.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes, but you're tearing it down, you're moving it. What are you putting where the Department of Transportation (*sic*) property is right now?

MR. LIZURA: Taxation; taxation.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Taxation; yes.

MR. LIZURA: We're actually-- We've recommended, and we worked with the State to put that building out to RFP to bring a private developer in to reposition that building. So our first--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: So you don't have anything in there-- Nothing's going to be in that plot after the building is torn down.

MR. LIZURA: We're hoping to bring a private developer in who would reposition it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: You're hoping; okay.

MR. LIZURA: We've put an RFP out.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: And now you've also proposed to tear down the Department of Health, which I call the *World's Fair buildings*, which are historic. Nonetheless, you're tearing down the Department of Health. What are you putting in its place?

MR. LIZURA: That is part of a redevelopment plan as well. That whole site is--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Just name the building; what's going to go in there.

MR. LIZURA: That will be--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Nothing; you have no plan.

MR. LIZURA: That will be parking; that will be parking lots until additional development happens.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Parking lots. So you've proposed to put parking lots where there are already parking lots; more parking lots.

MR. LIZURA: No, where the buildings are today.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Well, I'm really disappointed that you didn't include the legislative delegation or the people in the City of Trenton. And I don't know if you even used an urban planner -- I doubt you did -- because I can't see an urban planner with any credentials not looking at the master plan, or putting the buildings in the master plan area near a Transit Center, or proposing mixed-use; which seems to be something that building designers plan for.

And the only thing the EDA has done in the last eight years is propose a renovation of the State House and a bridge to nowhere. Please don't do us any more favors.

SENATOR SMITH: I have a couple more questions, based on some questions by Assemblyman Gusciora.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: So if the board moves forward today, when does demolition start?

MR. LIZURA: The new buildings have to be constructed before you demo anything. So the demolition of the Health and Ag building is the last part of the process, because we have to build the new building so we can move the people out of that building into that building. So it is several years away.

SENATOR SMITH: So the demolition-- Several; okay.

MR. LIZURA: Similar to Taxation.

SENATOR SMITH: The first time I heard you say *private developer* -- how is the financial structure of this set up?

MR. LIZURA: So this is a financing structure we've used on several occasions; probably, almost, maybe, 10 times at this point.

The effective-- We're-- The EDA plays a role, here, as basically a merchant builder, where we, in this case, acquire the land from the State for \$1. We immediately lease it back to them through a leasing agreement. That leasing agreement serves as the development blueprint to issue bonds based on a rent that's under the lease. Those bond proceeds are used to construct the buildings. At the end of that lease, the State gets those buildings back for \$1, and the land back for \$1. So there's really no

economic conveyance, other than the structural financing and development capacity that we bring to the table.

SENATOR SMITH: So the developer has no long-term interest? It's just the construction itself.

MR. LIZURA: The private developer I spoke of was on the Taxation building, bringing a private developer in to reposition that building. There is no private developer in this; the EDA plays a role as construction manager for the State, and the State occupies the building

So there's no private developer in this particular transaction. The private developers would come in once these buildings were completed and the Taxation building became available for redevelopment.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. Any specs on the building then released for possible bidding by developers?

MR. LIZURA: Right now we're working with an architectural and engineering firm, and a construction management firm that does pricing, along with design. We haven't put any construction out to bid yet.

SENATOR SMITH: Who is the architectural firm?

MR. LIZURA: We have two firms. We have--

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Ballinger.

MR. LIZURA: Ballinger is one; and the other is--

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: (off mike)

HDR.

MR. LIZURA: HDR, which used to be (Indiscernible).

Torcon is one of the constructors; and Turner (indiscernible).

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. And do you follow a public bidding process for construction?

MR. LIZURA: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Any other members have any questions or comments?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I'd just like to make a comment.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio; thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Effectively, the EDA is just to get around the bonding laws of the state to do it themselves, it would seem to me.

Any idea of the yearly cost back to the State, and the impact on the budget? I think a new Administration would want to know that before it was committed. I don't disagree with-- On the financial end of it, that's where my interests is. Do you have any idea what the annual cost would be to the State?

MR. LIZURA: Well, not until we issue the bonds. But we have a \$220 million total construction development budget for 450,000 square feet, plus or minus.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Over both?

MR. LIZURA: Combined buildings -- for a full development budget, which includes furniture, equipment, teldata, move; I mean, really, the whole -- everything you need to move into those buildings. So the financing, then, happens over 20 years at a tax-exempt rate. So that's the other value of this proposition -- is not only does the State own the building for \$1 when they're done, the entire project is financed through tax-exempt bonds. So if you had a private developer, obviously you couldn't have that benefit.

This is generally accepted as the lowest cost alternative for real estate for the State. It's ownership, it's tax-exempt bonds, it's no property acquisition. When it looks at the total cost of occupancy, this provides the best value for the State. Anything other than that would wind up having taxable financing, there would be profit involved in it, a private developer. So when the State looks at trying to balance all of its considerations, fiduciary is clearly one of them. They want the lowest cost occupancy; they also want to be able to provide modern office space to accommodate the workforce of the future. The other effort here is we're shrinking down the square footage of the occupancy for both -- the two occupants of the building on a per-square-foot basis. So they're trying to both provide facilities, line up timing for all the other leased spaces, as well as the lowest cost.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So based on those numbers and where the cost of the borrowing would be, can you give us an annual cost?

MR. LIZURA: I can; I can, just not at the moment. I don't have it. That will be part of the Space Utilization Committee lease. Again, this presentation really was for the dollar lease to us and the dollar lease back. The Space Utilization Committee would get a full presentation on what the cost is for the occupancy. Because the lease piece of it is the piece that underpins the bond.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Okay.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Any other members have any questions or comments? (no response)

Any other members of the public want to be heard on this matter?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Just one sentence.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I would just urge us to put this off. I don't know what the rush is. I think this project is too important, and I would urge-- As residents of the State of New Jersey take some pride in our State Capital, I think it's clear that this project was not well-thought out; and we're just asking for a couple of months to get further input before this project goes on. I'd appreciate you tabling this, both proposals, No. 9 and 10.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: So I understand we have a motion to table on projects No. 9 and 10. Counsel has just advised me we need to vote separately on the projects, though.

So is there a second to table--

SENATOR SMITH: Second.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second. I seconded it; yes, I did it earlier.

Sorry, Senator, I didn't mean to--

SENATOR SMITH: No, that's--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, so we have a motion and a second by the Assemblyman to table No. 9; so we're on No. 9 on the agenda.

Any further comment, or questions, or--

SENATOR SMITH: Just one thing.

A quick summary: Really, what is the rush? Sixty days does not make-- An eight-year, two-term Administration, doing this right in the last 60 days in an Administration seems a little crazy. It's clear from the

testimony that this will have a significant financial impact on State government and future budgets. The public has indicated that the process really stunk; that they really haven't had an opportunity to get their voice heard on this. And as a matter of fact, the first hearing on it in Trenton is next week.

I have to say again, what's the rush? So that's why I'm going to vote for the motion to table when it comes my turn.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, thank you very much.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: If I may just follow up.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: My concern isn't so much that it's at the end of an Administration; my concern is that it just doesn't appear as though it's ready to move forward. It just seems that there are more pieces here that need to come together before this moves forward. So I just wanted to stress that that is not my concern -- that it's at the end of this Administration.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I just will double down.

That \$450 million of cost does not include the overall cost of borrowing (indiscernible), I don't believe. So I want to know the number that we're committing to. I think, in fairness, going forward, we're committing the future Legislature and Governor to something we don't even know what it is yet. So to err on the side of caution, I don't think is a bad thing.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: And I don't want to seem ungrateful for the Governor's proposal; anytime that you want to come into the City of Trenton and spend money, we're all for it. But I think it should

be done right; and I think, again, it should take some pride in the State Capital and make sure that it's done as a Capital District.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay. With that--

SENATOR SMITH: You know, I have a question for Mr. Shaughnessy.

We have a total of how many members here today?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Well, we have, I believe, seven members, if I'm correct, I think; which is everyone.

SENATOR SMITH: Counting-- Is Mr. Kotler a member?

MR. KOTLER: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: He's Counsel to-- Right; yes.
(laughter)

MR. KOTLER: Sorry about that.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. Then I don't even have to ask my question. (laughter)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: So the numbers are -- it's seven we have present today.

So there's a motion to table on No. 9; and we have the motion and a second.

I'm going to call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. KOTLER: This motion does not pass.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; so we have 4-3; the motion does not pass.

Thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: What do you mean? It does pass.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Pardon me; the motion *does* pass.

Thank you; I misstated. (laughter)

The motion to table--

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Passes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: The motion to table passes; let's be clear.

MR. KOTLER: No, no. We only have four votes to table; we need a total of five to approve any action.

SENATOR SMITH: All right, so let me ask you a question. This is the question they didn't ask. Suppose you have the same vote on the project; does it go forward?

MR. KOTLER: No.

SENATOR SMITH: Game, set, match.

MR. KOTLER: But that would be a different motion.

SENATOR SMITH: Motion to deny -- or whatever the appropriate -- whatever is the appropriate motion. (laughter)

MR. KOTLER: That would be a motion to approve.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion to approve?

MR. KOTLER: Motion to approve, as we do in all these measures.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Understood.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: (Indiscernible)?

SENATOR SMITH: Well, I think what Counsel is saying is that we have to do a motion to approve, and then have insufficient votes for the motion to approve to go forward.

MS. MELICK: If the motion to approve is not approved, does it have the ability to come back?

MR. KOTLER: I believe it does.

SENATOR SMITH: You know, we have frequently just said, "This is right for the next meeting," or "It's not appropriate for this meeting." Do we need to--

SENATOR ADDIEGO: So-- Because we're just saying, right now, that right now it's not ready--

SENATOR SMITH: Right.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: --so we're not actually saying it's a bad project--

SENATOR SMITH: Right.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: --we're saying it's just not ready.

SENATOR SMITH: Right.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: So if we vote to deny it, then it doesn't come back; but if we vote to table it, it can come back. Is that -- am I understanding that correctly?

MR. KOTLER: No; it's actually the opposite.

You can ask that these applications be withdrawn by Treasury so we wouldn't have a vote on it.

SENATOR SMITH: Is Treasury here?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: Can they be asked? Clearly, there is insufficient support for this going ahead today. Do you really want to--

SENATOR ADDIEGO: I think we just don't want to put it in a position where it can't come back. So how -- what's the best-- Who has the right answer as to how to best proceed here so that we're not--

SENATOR SMITH: Killing the project.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: --killing the project; we're just saying, "Let's put it on hold."

MR. KOTLER: This is not a courtroom matter where there's the double jeopardy, entire controversy-type of argument. So I believe this can come back.

SENATOR SMITH: So what is the right way to go forward?

MS. MELICK: Are you saying that we need to do a whole -- try a hold again -- the whole vote?

MR. KOTLER: That would be okay with me.

SENATOR SMITH: All right; then let's get a fifth vote.

So do you want to do a motion to adjourn? Their suggestion is, go for a motion to adjourn again--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to adjourn.

SENATOR SMITH: --in a second.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Adjourn the meeting?

MR. KOTLER: No, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: We have a whole list to go.

(laughter)

MS. MELICK: No, we're going to hold this--

MR. KOTLER: This application.

SENATOR SMITH: Let's table it; it can be *untabled* at our--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Right; what's the best way we can do it?

I don't think you want a vote on record; then it's going to be "no."

MS. MELICK: Right; we don't want it to end--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: And I don't know if you guys want to be on record making a motion to approve.

MS. MELICK: --but at the same time the City says it supports it. So it's a tough one.

MR. KOTLER: The members have held discussions; perhaps there may be a change in position that they want to consider. So if there's another motion--

SENATOR SMITH: --to table. Do another motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to table.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Can we just make it a hold? Can we just hold the matter?

SENATOR SMITH: Yes, you would think.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: I think that's what we had said, that's what we were getting at. Let's just hold it.

MS. MELICK: But the--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: So the motion to table failed.

Is there another motion to table -- or rather, hold the matter?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to hold the matter.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: So there's a motion now to hold No. 9, and a second.

I'll call the roll.

MR. RIDOLFINO: What is the difference between what we just voted on?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: You need to just go with it.
(laughter)

MR. KOTLER: It's a *reconsideration*.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, that motion to hold the matter has passed.

May I hear Counsel?

MR. KOTLER: Yes; upon reconsideration.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

So we are now going to No. 10--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to hold.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: --and there is a motion to hold by Assemblyman Gusciora.

Is there a second to hold No. 10?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion; and second, Assemblyman DiMaio.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: I'm sorry; what were we--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: This is a motion to hold the matter for
No. 10.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: All right; yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes; thank you, Senator.
Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: The motion--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: This is a motion to hold No. 10.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator.
Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; the motion to hold No. 10 has
passed.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: And continuing in that vein, I'd like to
make a motion to hold No. 11 -- same issue.

MR. KOTLER: Let's introduce it, please.

SENATOR SMITH: What's that?

MR. KOTLER: We should introduce it.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; still on New Business -- No. 11.
It's project 18-06, the former Woodbridge Developmental Center, Block
875, Lot 1.01, Woodbridge Township, Middlesex County.

Treasury, on behalf of the Department of Human Services, requests approval to lease 9 +/- acres of surplus property, located on the grounds of the former Woodbridge Developmental Center, to the New Jersey Economic Development Authority as part of a lease/leaseback for financing the construction of a new facility in North Jersey.

The lease will be for a term of 30 years.

That's No. 11 up for consideration.

Does any member want to be heard on this?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I have some questions on it.

SENATOR SMITH: Before we even go to the motion? All right.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Obviously, this is replacing an existing facility, or is it expanding capacity for the Juvenile Justice Commission.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes. Is there someone from the JJC here, the Juvenile Justice Commission?

KEVIN M. BROWN: (off mike) Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Would someone please step up and introduce yourself.

Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, everyone.

My name is Kevin M. Brown; I'm the Executive Director of the Juvenile Justice Commission.

I'm here today just to talk specifically about the need to move towards more developmentally and therapeutically appropriate centers, as opposed to the somewhat inefficient centers that we've had in the past.

Just looking to try to secure the finance to support the building of three new regional facilities. With the building of the regional facilities, we're also looking at making sure that those facilities are more easily accessible to families, family engagement, more closely connected to transportation centers, produce better outcomes of the young people. We understand that those in our charge have been involved in the law enforcement, have been involved in the court system, and rightfully have entered into juvenile justice. But the one thing that we're trying to move towards is better outcomes for them once coming into our systems. And we know that the present, larger facility that we have now was built in the 1800s. It was formerly an orphanage for young people, built in the 1800s, which not only does not operate as efficient as it can, but sometimes isn't fiscally responsible in what we have to do for the upkeep of that facility as well when it comes to capital improvements and things of that nature.

So we're just basically looking towards a system that not only is more efficient and produces better outcomes for young people, but also engages those individuals so that hopefully, prayerfully, young people entering into the Juvenile Justice system are still seen with a rehabilitative not, necessarily, a punitive model; that they're better because of us, and not in spite of us.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir.

SENATOR SMITH: Did you get the answer to your question?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: The question I had is -- the amount of people being detained now -- is it growing or shrinking?

MR. BROWN: No, and that's the thing. With the juvenile arrests down, with the interventions that we're using on the front end of

this system, predispositionally, the number of residents actually at our facilities is a lot smaller. And so it is inefficient to have larger, congregate care-type facilities. So what we're looking to do is actually design smaller facilities, more regionally located closer to the families that we serve, where we can probably house more than 50 or so, plus or minus. Last year, the actual average number of residents in our larger secure-care facility is roughly 144 residents -- built and staffed, at this point, for at least up to 200 or so. So if our numbers are going down and we have a facility on 900 acre -- the larger facility in Monroe Township is 900 acres -- we're talking about smaller facilities with a bed capacity, plus or minus 5 or 10, for about 50; in three different areas of the state.

So yes, our numbers are going down; and we want to have smaller facilities to meet the needs of those individuals across the state, as opposed to one larger, congregate care facility which isn't really accessible to families and public transportation.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir.

Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I have some questions.

The second half of my life I lived in Mercer County, the first half of my life I lived in Jamesburg. So I am familiar with the facility--

MR. BROWN: I hope not--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: --and used to play basketball there.

But in any event, what is wrong with Jamesburg? Why can't you just reconfigure the existing campus? It's large enough that it could house a smaller inmate population. I just don't know why we want to

expend taxpayer dollars to close that facility down and then branch out in three other sites.

MR. BROWN: Well, sir, it's not only specifically what is wrong with it. I dare not say that; all of our juvenile justice systems that I am ultimately responsible for can be improved. But what's mainly an issue for us right now is that congregate care in terms of-- We recently passed legislation in New Jersey, largely supported by Senator Pou with S-2003, that really looked at adolescent brain development and things that are going on with young people. And in looking at the research, those individuals in large congregate care don't do any better; oftentimes, that system itself leads to reoffending. So you're trying to get smaller, or more regional, and therapeutic in not only the size of the facility, but the services in the facility.

So having been at--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: But why can't you get smaller in Jamesburg?

MR. BROWN: But to answer your question, sir -- to answer your question, one thing that's wrong with Jamesburg is it's not conducive to family engagement. Now, having been to Jamesburg, and you know how the facility itself sits off of State Hill Road in Monroe Township. There's not even much public transportation that gets there. So one of the things that we've been doing is working with family support organizations to say, "How do I better engage the family while the young person is placed out of home.?" Well, many of the families don't have vehicles; many of the families would have to rely on public transportation. There is no public transportation that runs to the training school where most of the residents

reside. So even in trying to work towards rehabilitation and reentry family engagement, the smaller regional -- even in doing our research and going out with Treasury, looking at many facilities throughout the state -- one of the things we took into account is location and close proximity to public transportation. So that is one of the main problems with Jamesburg -- always has been, always will be -- is the inaccessibility to families in terms of visitation. Just for a young person to have their family visit. If you don't own a car, you have a hard time getting there.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Well, you had a facility in Ewing on Route 31 that you closed.

MR. BROWN: That's a County-run facility, sir. The Juvenile Justice Commission--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: That wasn't run by JJC?

MR. BROWN: No. The Juvenile Justice Commission oversees detention centers and enforces what we call *manual standards* to make sure that they're compliant with what the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act says we should do. But those facilities are run by the county. So the facility on 31, Parkside Avenue, is a County detention center.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: So where are the three locations that you propose?

MR. BROWN: What we're proposing is one in Woodbridge, one in Ewing Township, and one in Winslow Township, which is off the grounds of the old Ancora facilities.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: So you realize that the Ewing facility is vacant now.

MR. BROWN: No; but the Ewing facility that we're looking at isn't--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I know; you want to take open space and--

MR. BROWN: And build; yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: --build. Why don't you just use the existing County facility that's vacant?

MR. BROWN: We've looked at county facilities in general, in terms of the possible retrofitting of those facilities and trying to determine whether that would be suitable. To get the end result of the more therapeutic developmentally appropriate lines of sight, number of pods, number of staff -- we feel it would more beneficial to build new and not have to deal with, to a certain extent, some of the issues that come along with County, State -- being that being a County property.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: And why can't Jamesburg be the Woodbridge one?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Well, Jamesburg presently, sir, if you've visited the facility itself, and its--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I actually taught there a semester.

MR. BROWN: Okay; well you know how widespread it is, in terms of--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: It's a beautiful campus.

MR. BROWN: It's a beautiful campus, but it's an inefficient campus, sir, where we're spending millions of dollars putting roofs on buildings, millions of dollars repaving concrete, millions of dollars just for

the overall upkeep of a facility which decades ago or several years ago, housed 400 or 500. Then, in the last couple of years, 200; last year, 2016, we averaged 144 residents. So there's a number of facilities or number of structures that are actually closed and that's our way of being efficient. Why have heat, electricity, and water running to buildings where there aren't many residents there.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: My final one is, I spoke with the Mayor of Ewing this morning and no one had ever contacted his Administration. And I'm wondering why you didn't contact Ewing to tell them you had proposed a site on a fairly large parcel of land in Ewing.

MR. BROWN: Well, most of the contacting and even the direct relationship, with even the Woodbridge Mayor, was somewhat outside of my purview, sir -- in terms of me, personally, contacting him.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Well, don't you think that's important so that you get community acceptance of your--

MR. BROWN: I very much so believe it's important, sir. But in terms of the authority for who the contacts were being made by -- was outside my purview.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: Do you know if it happened or it didn't?

MR. BROWN: I'm not certain if it happened with Ewing--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: It didn't happen.

MR. BROWN: --I'm almost certain it did happen with Woodbridge. Based on what the Assemblyman is saying, I assume it did not. But in Woodbridge, I'm certain it happened with someone other than myself.

SENATOR SMITH: And that person is not here?

MR. BROWN: Not that I'm aware of, sir.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Sir, one thing, I think in the members' packets -- there's typically a letter to the mayor in each municipality that is sent out, and that's by statute.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes, it says they have two weeks to respond.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Right; it's a short time.

SENATOR SMITH: Right.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Correct.

SENATOR SMITH: It's dated November 1.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes, that's correct.

SENATOR SMITH: I don't know if you can get an awful lot of public input in two weeks when you're just notified of a proposal. I mean, in the planning and zoning world, if we're going to do anything we have to notify people by certified return receipt; then we have a public hearing; people come in and say what their opinions are. And I can't imagine any mayor getting a letter saying, "You have two weeks to respond; and by the way, we're having a hearing very soon thereafter," is in a position to actually get any good public input.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Right. That's by statute.

SENATOR SMITH: Have you considered--

MS. MELICK: Right. But this says October 3. I mean, it's been more than a month -- to Ewing.

SENATOR SMITH: I see a November 1 letter--

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Well, that's Woodbridge.

SENATOR SMITH: --from Mr. Shaughnessy to Mayor McCormac. Am I wrong?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No, that's correct, sir.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. And you know, I don't want to be a harpy, but this public process for State projects really stinks. You know, you should be getting the input of the people in the town, and the officials in the town. And you can't say we're going to ram and jam this through without having some significant public input.

Have you considered the impact on our detention facilities around the state as a result of the Bail Reform Act?

MR. BROWN: Why, certainly, sir. But the bail--

SENATOR SMITH: So--

MR. BROWN: Yes, but the Bail Reform Act, for the most part, effects the adult system. And everything that took place, sir, in the determination of the Bail Reform Act, not only, somewhat, mimicked some of the detention reform efforts that had taken place in the juvenile system, meaning--

SENATOR SMITH: But that's not the point. The point is, is that you have detention facilities around this state that are now -- they have been built and planned for a different system, and now many of them have a much lower population. So you have the potential for other sites around the state, which you probably have not looked at.

MR. BROWN: No, sir. We looked at them extensively.

SENATOR SMITH: Are you sure?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I'm very much sure. Actually, sir, I spent some time traveling, with members of Treasury, visiting closed detention centers. We visited the facilities; we've actually driven throughout this state looking at State-owned property, in terms of where we might build new facilities. But the first place we started was visiting some of the closed facilities that exist now. And what you have to look at is not only what those facilities are, but how they were built, you know. The old tier system of prisons is not what's appropriate for the development and therapeutic-- I'm just saying, sir, that's what some of the detention centers--

SENATOR SMITH: I'm not suggesting that you put juveniles into an adult--

MR. BROWN: No, I'm saying that's what--

SENATOR SMITH: --facility. I'm saying I think you now have a whole bunch of facilities around this state that are underutilized and should have a very intense review, rather than building new or building on sites that are already not in a community.

MR. BROWN: And we did that, sir. We visited those detention centers. And many of them were-- We even looked at the years of when they were built. And based on -- and Ewing being one of the more recent, the one on Parkside Avenue that was mentioned earlier, on 31 -- being one of the most recent built. We looked at that. Some of the other detention centers that have closed -- they were built so long ago it was almost replicating *the* prison model, which isn't conducive for rehabilitation for young people.

So even if we tried to retrofit those buildings, they weren't built with what's going on now in juvenile justice. But we did visit them; we

visited all of those places, and we visited several other sites throughout the state.

SENATOR SMITH: Have we received any comments from the other mayors or towns where these proposals are being proposed for?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: To my knowledge, no, Senator Smith. However, the Woodbridge Mayor is present. But we have not heard anything before this.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: The Business Administrator from Ewing is here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; thank you very much.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Did you hear anything from Winslow Township?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: I did not; no.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Okay.

SENATOR SMITH: Is there anybody from Winslow present? (no response) Apparently not. But I would posit again that the public notification process, and the input of the public and the local officials is severely deficient on this issue. And again, why are we rushing?

So I might have other questions, but not at the moment.

MR. BROWN: Well, if I may, sir, why are *we* rushing-- Just as some of the things have been said in the past. When you're looking at a reform effort to change what the system looks like, we didn't just say that -- you know, last night, we decided to come up with this plan.

I'm just saying, sir, we've done endless research on what it takes to build not only facilities, but provide services for those in our charge. And we do know now that with the changes in juvenile justice, we have the right

individuals in our care. With the reform effort now, we have older individuals who, in other states, would be in adult facilities. So even though juvenile arrests are down, the individuals in our charge, sad to say, have earned their way to be placed out of the home. But it's how we treat them and what we do for them once they're placed out of the home.

Many states, sir-- I travel all across the country looking at juvenile justice throughout this nation. Many states, by the time you hit your 18th birthday, you hit the eject button; you automatically go to an adult facility. In juvenile justice in New Jersey, my average age is over 18 years of age. I don't have little boys and girls with shoplifting, and stealing a bike, or whatever. I have young men and women, some who have done some pretty serious things, being housed in our facilities. And we've done a good job keeping them out of the adult system. But how we treat them and what we provide for them while they're in our charge -- we should be doing a little bit differently. And that's all I'm asking.

SENATOR SMITH: So what is the cost of the three new facilities?

MR. BROWN: We're looking at bonding issues somewhere around \$175 million for three.

SENATOR SMITH: Is there any reach-out to the incoming Administration about this?

MR. BROWN: Not on my behalf. (laughter)

SENATOR SMITH: Well, I'd have to repeat Assemblyman DiMaio's comment -- that when you are going to have that kind of impact on future State budgets, at least you should have the support-- I mean, if we were four years ago, we would know that the current Administration was

supporting this move, supporting whatever the costs were, etc. But if you're saying there's been no reach-out to the incoming Administration -- which is 60 days away -- isn't that another defect in this process?

MR. BROWN: There's been no reach-out on my behalf, sir.

SENATOR SMITH: To the Department of Corrections; anybody?

MR. BROWN: No, I work within the Department of Law and Public Safety--

SENATOR SMITH: Has there been any reach-out from--

MR. BROWN: --and what I would say is that within the Department of Law and Public Safety, that's the Attorney General, the Gov's Office; working with Treasury and OMB.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay, so it's not your responsibility.

MR. BROWN: Right; yes, sir.

SENATOR SMITH: I got it. With that being said, I'm making the point that reach-out should have been made if you're talking about \$175 million in bonds and the impact on the State budget.

MR. BROWN: And what I would say, sir, is I'm not clear whether--

SENATOR SMITH: You don't know whether it happened or it didn't.

MR. BROWN: Exactly.

SENATOR SMITH: I understand.

MR. BROWN: And the election is just a week away--

SENATOR SMITH: I understand.

MR. BROWN: --and I couldn't forecast what may or may not be happening, in terms of who wins or whatever.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I have one question.

Conversely, has the Administration in Monroe Township been given notice that we're closing the facility?

MR. BROWN: Sir, what we're asking at this time--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I was just asking--

MR. BROWN: No, but what I'm saying--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: --if Monroe Township's--

MR. BROWN: What we're asking at this time, sir, is a projection of what will take years to do. So it's not like tomorrow, you know, we're worrying about closing a facility. We're talking about can we build three new facilities that are better for kids, families, and outcomes which can be years away in terms of the actual--

SENATOR SMITH: Actually, that's not the case.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Absolutely.

SENATOR SMITH: You're asking to convey land.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: All right. Nobody knows whether the new Administration will say that's where the location of these new facilities should be.

MR. BROWN: You're correct. That's what's being proposed and requested.

SENATOR SMITH: But the land has, then, already been conveyed; it's too late. EDA then has the property, and they really

shouldn't have it unless there's some concurrence by the leadership of the new government.

That's all I have to say.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; thank you, Senator Smith.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: So I just want to confirm. Monroe Township has not been consulted.

MR. BROWN: About a closure?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Not that I'm aware of.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Okay, thanks.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, do any of the members of the Commission have any questions or comments?

SENATOR SMITH: Of this witness?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Of this person, yes.

MR. BROWN: Am I under oath? (laughter)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; does any other member--

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Mr. Brown, thank you very much for your helpful comments.

MR. BROWN: I appreciate it.

M A Y O R J O H N E. M c C O R M A C: Thank you, Mr. Chairman (*sic*).

My name is John McCormac; I'm the Mayor of Woodbridge Township.

First, I would like to thank you for your support on resolution No. 3. The Avenal Woodbridge Development Center in Avenal was closed

many years ago. We've always had an affinity for that special needs population, and thanks to your action on No. 3 we're able to build a 100-unit apartment facility, of which 25 will be the type of clients who were displaced there. So we're going to welcome them back to Woodbridge with open arms.

As for No. 11 -- I, as Mayor of Woodbridge Township, did not know that this morning this resolution was on the agenda. I have had several conversations with Treasury over the past several weeks; and in particular, we have been talking about purchasing the Woodbridge Developmental Center site; it's about 50 acres. We have been in negotiations for probably close to two years. We had an arrangement to buy it for \$5 million, and that was actually supposed to be the second resolution that was on today. But that was pulled, in our discussions with Treasury last week, when they told us that they wanted to use seven to eight acres of that site to put up this facility.

So that was a surprise to us about 10 days ago. But again, we did not know the action was going to be on this morning; we just knew that our resolution to buy the 50 acres was going to be pulled.

We have plans for that site to move a grammar school, that's a hundred years old, on about six or seven acres. We also have plans for a medical office facility on several acres; and then a warehouse. And we've had some discussions with developers about how that all could be put together.

We are not here to say NIMBY; we're not here to say *not in my backyard*. But we want people to understand that Woodbridge Township is already the home for East Jersey State Prison, and we are already the home

for the sex offender facility. Both of them are located within a stone's throw of this site, in the Avenal section of town. I think that should be considered as we try to rejuvenate and rehabilitate that section of town. We have a project to put luxury apartments up near the train station with a theater, an arts center. It's a very significant project that we're very, very bullish about.

The State has said they want a site in the North, and a site in the Central, and a site in the South. Based on Ewing and Winslow, it appears we're the North site, and we're nowhere near the North. We've never been considered the north; we're the central part of the state. The largest population of the state is obviously up north, and we would be the closest to that -- which doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Again, we've never been considered north.

I question -- I asked if anybody has done a study of how three buildings could be operated cheaper than one. There is no such study that's been done. I can tell you, as a former State Treasurer, that \$175 million in bonds will spin off about \$12 million to \$14 million a year in interest and principal that has to be factored into any analysis that says three buildings, plus debt service, compared to what's being built or what's on now. I don't know how that financial analysis would work out, but it doesn't sound like it would.

I would suggest that if it's a 900 acres site, that that can clearly be used to build a new site, state-of-the-art, on land the State already owns. And the advantage there is -- Assemblyman Gusciora would know -- is we keep the jobs there. The people who are working in Jamesburg-- We're 40

minutes to the north; I don't know quite how far Ewing and Winslow are away, but a lot of those jobs would certainly be in danger.

Avenal is not necessarily a great transit site. There's one train that runs, maybe, every two hours. So to say that you want to be close to a transit site and put it in the Avenal section of Woodbridge really doesn't make a whole lot of sense. And again, we have not had input into this process so far, and we would like to have a chance to make all these points.

Also, if we were going to buy the land for \$500 million, and now there's this facility on it, certainly we wouldn't have interest in the rest of the land for a school or a medical facility. And any loss of income from the sale of the land would certainly have to be factored into the fact -- the financial analysis.

This is right next to a neighborhood of houses -- old, 50-year-old (*sic*) World War II, post-war housing. And again, it's in a town that's already done our fair share. We have a 3,000-inmate population prison, and we have a several hundred client population in the sex offender unit. Woodbridge Township has done our job -- done enough; Avenal has done enough.

I would ask you that the same arguments that were made for Nos. 9 and 10 -- that this is being rushed. We have not been properly consulted; we have not been given a chance to make our cases as to why this shouldn't be located there. We would like that opportunity. So I would ask that you would consider tabling -- or whatever it is you just did -- not voting on this today, and give us a chance to make our case either in the next 60 days with this Administration, or after 60 days, with the new Administration.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mayor.

Any other members of the public here who want to be heard?

(no response)

Okay, hearing none, any other members of the Commission have any questions or comments?

SENATOR SMITH: I thought the Business Administrator of Winslow was here.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Oh, no; Ewing is here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Ewing; Ewing.

SENATOR SMITH: Or Ewing.

Is there anything you want to say?

J A M E S M c M A N I M O N: (off mike) I was going to wait until we got to No. 13, but I'll be happy to--

SENATOR SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry. You're early.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Do you want to just do it now? Because I would like to do a motion to hold Nos. 11, 12, and 13 just to save everybody time.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; I think it's appropriate.

Please step up and identify yourself; thanks.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Sorry to cause trouble on my first day. (laughter)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No, not at all.

SENATOR SMITH: You're not going to be allowed back.
(laughter)

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes, it's over.

MR. McMANIMON: Good morning.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning.

MR. McMANIMON: Thank you.

Again, my name is Jim McManimon, and I am the Business Administrator for Ewing Township.

I spoke with the Mayor this morning. We do not have any recollection or any receipt of any letter from the State of New Jersey indicating that this 22-acre parcel was under consideration for the Juvenile Justice group.

Now, we have in the past, as a town, worked with the JJC in other areas of Ewing Township. I think that they're actually up in the old -- I still call it the *Corvette Shopping Center* on Olden Avenue. So we have had past dealings.

We're not opposed to what Mr. Brown is suggesting as a need for the juvenile population. Just that Ewing township was completely unaware of this. And we have had an update to our master plan not too long ago and our planner is actually the president of the statewide planners Association and I reached him on my way down here -- not as long a drive as the Mayor of Woodbridge; I am seven miles away from here.

I would just ask that you all consider just deferring this until we can, as a town, look at it with our planner and in consultation with the Juvenile Justice Commission and the State Treasury.

Any consideration would be appreciated.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. McManimon.

Okay; next with regard to No. 13, Ewing Township, correct?

MR. McMANIMON: Correct.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, thanks.

As a result, any further questions or comments?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion to hold--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, so we're--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: --Nos. 11, 12, and 13.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; I think, by Counsel, we have to take them separately, Assemblyman. But I appreciate that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I have to go vote on the Speaker, and I was just wondering if I could leave my votes, hold or no.

MR. KOTLER: How about the rest of the agenda?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Oh, "yes;" but I'll be right back. I have no problems on anything else (laughter); I promise, I think.

MR. KOTLER: You intend to come back?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I intend to come back; I'll leave my stuff here. I just have to go vote on the Speaker for next year.

SENATOR SMITH: Well, which is more important? The State House-- (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: (off mike) This is, but I left my vote; as long as I can leave my vote. (laughter)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Hold my interest; you're in charge.

SENATOR SMITH: All right. (laughter)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Okay, where were we?

SENATOR SMITH: Second on the motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay. So we have -- the Assemblyman has made a motion to hold No. 9--

SENATOR ADDIEGO: No. 11.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Oh, pardon me; No. 11. And Senator Smith has seconded that motion, correct?

I'll call the roll, please.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MR. KOTLER: Excuse me; we need to take a vote separately for each one? Just so it's clear.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Loud and clear; thank you.

MS. MELICK: I can't believe I'm going to do it, but I'm going to say "yes."

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora has left his vote "yes."

And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter has been held.

And let me be clear on the agenda item.

Okay, No. 11 has been held by motion, and second, and a vote.

No. 12 is RPR 18-07, Ancora Hospital, Block 6801, part of Lot I, Winslow Township, Camden County.

Is there a motion with regard to that matter?

SENATOR SMITH: I'll make the same motion to all of them.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith, motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second; thank you, Assemblyman.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora has voted "yes" in the affirmative.

Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That is No. 12, and that matter has been held as well.

And then on to No. 13, which is RPR 18-08, Stuyvesant Avenue, Block 322, Lot 75 and part of Lots 3 and 74, Ewing Township, Mercer County.

Do we have a motion with regard to that matter?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith, motion to hold.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Motion to hold.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion to hold.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora is in the affirmative, "yes."

And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That is with regard to No. 13 on the agenda; motion to hold is approved.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Can I-- I do need to go. Can I leave my votes for the rest of the agenda as "yes"? Is that okay?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: I'm just counting; that's all we're doing. (laughter)

MR. KOTLER: Yes.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Yes? We're good? Just leave them as "yes"? Or do you want me to wait for Reed to get back?

MR. KOTLER: No; it's-- Is anyone else planning to leave early? Any of the other members?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: No, I'll stay.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: So I will leave my votes as "yes" for the rest of the agenda.

MR. KOTLER: Okay; so -- but under the Judicial Pension section, there's an appeal.

SENATOR ADDIEGO: Whatever Senator Smith does, I'm with him. (laughter)

SENATOR SMITH: It's called a *proxy*.

(members talk amongst themselves)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Commission members, we are returning to Old Business.

We skipped the order, but No. 2 is the adoption of resolutions by the State House Commission for Green Acres hearings. The Commission is considering for approval the adoption of resolutions relating

to Green Acres hearings to be held by the Commission. Notice for this agenda item was published on September 20, 2017.

At the last State House Commission meeting, the resolutions were read in their entirety. After some discussion, several recommendations for amendments were made, particular to paragraphs 1, 2, and 3. And they are now incorporated, in clean copy, in the members' binders.

So we're asking for consideration of this matter and a vote.

Do any members have any further comments or questions on No. 2 under Old Business?

SENATOR SMITH: Uh, no. We are going to open it to the public, yes?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: We are; this is open session, an open public meeting; yes, sir.

So do any public members here today want to be heard with regard to No. 2 under Old Business, the adoption of resolutions by the State House Commission for Green Acres hearings? (no response)

Seeing none, then may I have a motion?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator Smith.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second; thank you, Ms. Melick.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative, correct?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That's yes.

Senator Smith, yes?

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora said "yes," he's going to vote "yes."

And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; No. 2 under Old Business is concluded and unanimously approved.

Thank you very much.

We're now back to New Business, and we are on No. 14 on the agenda.

Project RPR 18-10, part of Block 17, Lot 1, Newark, Essex County.

Treasury requests approval to convey approximately 2.10 +/- acres of vacant land to the New Jersey Performing Arts Center, or its wholly-owned subsidiary.

The property will be sold via direct sale for the appraised value of \$133,969.

That matter is up for consideration.

Do any members of the Commission have any questions or comments with regard to that? (no response)

Hearing none, any members of the public here want to be heard? (no response)

Seeing none at this point, I know that members and representatives for New Jersey PAC are here; I appreciate their attendance, should there have been any questions. Thank you.

So I'll ask for a motion on that.

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith, thank you.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Deputy Chief Counsel, thank you.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative, "yes".

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora also in the affirmative.

Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is unanimously approved; thank you.

We're on to No.--

MS. MELICK: No. 15.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No. 15; thank you. Bear with me here.

These are actually moving on to DOT requests, Department of Transportation requests, with respect to No. 15.

Project Route 70, Block 817, Lot 12, Brielle, Monmouth County.

DOT requests approval to issue a license to AT&T and Verizon for the purpose of erecting a temporary wireless communications facility, consisting of a 140-foot ballast monopole, while the Borough completes a reconstruction of the water tank. The proposed parcel is approximately 2,500 square feet of land located along Route 70 eastbound, milepost 59.2, at Old Bridge Road in the Borough of Brielle, Monmouth County.

The license will be for a term of two to three years, dependent on the time needed to complete the water tank reconstruction while the Borough replaces their water tower, with an annual rent of \$37,400 per year.

Any members have any questions or comments on this matter?

(no response)

Any members of the public here wish to be heard? (no

response)

Hearing none, may I have a motion?

MS. MELICK: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion; second?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much; motion and second.

Any further discussion? (no response)

Any members of the public here? (no response) None?

Thank you.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego has been marked in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora -- he's in the affirmative as well.

Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

On to No. 16 -- Route 15, Block 1152, Lot 3, Rockaway, Morris County.

DOT is requesting approval to issue a license to Verizon for the purpose of erecting a wireless communications facility consisting of a 150-foot ballast monopole. The proposed parcel is approximately 2,500 square feet of land located at the New Jersey DOT maintenance yard along Route 15 southbound, milepost 3.0, in Rockaway, Morris County.

The license will be for a term of 5 to 20 years, depending on renewal options, but not to exceed a term of 20 years, including renewals, at an annual rent of \$37,500.

That matter is for the Commission's consideration.

Do we have any members here having questions or comments?

(no response)

Hearing none, any members of the public here want to be heard? (no response)

Hearing none, or seeing none -- I need a motion.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion; thank you.

Second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora -- yes, in the affirmative.

Assemblyman John DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

On to No. 17 on the agenda.

And I note that Assemblyman Gusciora has returned in person.

(laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No. 17--

MR. RIDOLFINO: He'll regret that. (laughter)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

No. 17 -- Maple Avenue, County Route 642, Parcel VX332B, Block 22.2, Lot 9, Township of Haddon, Camden County.

DOT is requesting approval to sell a property identified as Parcel VX332B of the Maple Avenue, County Route 642, project. The property is an irregular-shaped lot with an area of approximately 0.21 acres that is vacant and is adjacent to the requestor's property. The requestor is the only interested adjoining property owners, Samuel and Rosemary Giumarello; it's G-I-U-M-A-R-E-L-L-O. They have expressed interest to acquire the property for assemblage to their adjacent business property to allow them to have additional parking spaces for their customers.

The property will be sold via direct sale to the only interested adjoining owner for \$47,000, which is the appraised value.

Any members have questions or comments on that matter? (no response)

Hearing none, any members of the public want to be heard? (no response)

Seeing none, may I have a motion?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Second?

MR. RIDOLFINO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

On to No. 18. We have two final requests by DOT. No. 18 is Project Route S49, Section 6, Parcel VX10A2, Block 22.02, Lots 1 and 1.01, Middle Township, Cape May County.

DOT is requesting approval to sell a property identified as Parcel VX10A2 of the Route S42 (*sic*) Section 6 project. The property is a rectangular-shaped lot with an area of approximately 1.2 acres that is vacant and is adjacent to the requestor's property. The requestor, and only interested adjoining owner, Pier 47, Inc., has expressed an interest in acquiring the property for assemblage to their adjacent business property to have additional parking space for their boats.

The property will be sold via direct sale to the only adjoining owner for \$196,000, which is the appraised value.

Do any members have any questions or comments on that matter? (no response)

Hearing none, any members of the public want to be heard?

Yes, there is a member of the public; please come up and identify yourself to the Commission.

This is on No. 18, correct?

JAMES A. DARRAR: Yes.

I just want to make a correction.

James Darrar, Property Manager Supervisor for the DOT.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. Darrar.

MR. DARRAR: In the body, you mentioned it's *Route S42*, but in the heading it's *S49*. I just want to make sure that was corrected in the records.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That is a typo, and thank you for clarifying that.

So it's *S49* instead of *S42*. So we will reference *S49* in both things.

MR. DARRAR: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. Darrar; we appreciate that.

MR. DARRAR: You're welcome.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; with that clarification, do we have anyone from the public want to be heard, since Mr. Darrar came up and clarified? (no response)

Does anyone else want to be heard on that matter? (no response)

May I have a motion?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, Senator Smith.

Second?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second; thank you, Assemblyman.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative.
Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, No. 18 is approved; thank you.

Final DOT matter is Project Route 21, Section 4C, Parcel VX21B, adjacent to Block 617, adjoining lot 1.01, Newark, Essex County.

DOT is requesting approval to sell a property identified as Parcel VX21B of the Route 21 Section 4C project to the only adjoining owner, Riverside Arms Urban Renewal, LLC., for assemblage to a proposed residential development. This is a vacant piece of excess surplus land with an area of approximately 2,347 square feet.

The property will be sold by direct sale to the only adjoining owner for \$46,000, which is the appraised value.

Any members have questions or comments about that matter?

(no response)

Any member of the public want to be heard? (no response)

Hearing none, may I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you; motion and second.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego has left her vote in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved. Thank you very much.

So now we're to the DEP requests.

No. 20 on the agenda: Crosswicks Creek Park, Block 27, part of Lot 27 -- that's both Block 27 and part of Lot 27 -- Upper Freehold, Monmouth County.

DEP requests approval to allow the diversion of 0.844 +/- acres of parkland within the Crosswicks Creek Park, in connection with Monmouth County's Sharon Station Road project. The proposed diversion involves the conveyance of 0.461 acres of additional right-of-way in fee to allow for the widening of Sharon Station Road and the conveyance of a 0.383-acre easement to accommodate a jug handle designed for accessing

Crosswicks Creek Park, Union Transportation Trail, and an active, preserved farm located to the west of Sharon Station Road.

To compensate for the diversion, the County proposes to dedicate, for recreation and conservation purposes, a 1.162-acre parcel of land to be added to Crosswicks Creek Park, located south of the diverted area, in the Township of Upper Freehold.

Any members have any questions or comments on this matter?

(no response)

Any members of the public here to be heard? (no response)

Hearing none, may I have a motion?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No. 20 is approved.

Moving on to No. 21 -- DEP requests.

Preakness Valley Golf Course, Block 604, Lot 18, Township of Wayne, Passaic County.

DEP, on behalf of the County of Passaic and the Passaic County Parks Department, requests approval to allow the disposal of 0.247 +/- acres of the County-owned Preakness Valley Golf Course to CLAC, LLC. This disposal will allow the County to convey a non-contiguous, orphaned piece of property to an adjoining business, Vision Research, Inc., a lessee of CLAC, LLC, to be used to create additional parking spaces for its employees.

To compensate, the County has acquired two parcels in Woodland Park Borough, totaling 1.13 acres, that will be added to a portion of the Morris Canal, held as parkland by Woodland Park Borough. In addition, the County will receive a \$35,000 cash payment from the purchaser to be used by the County Parks Department for operating, maintenance, or capital expenses related to its parkland.

Any questions or comments from the members on this? (no response)

Any member of the public want to be heard? (no response)

Hearing none, may I have a motion, please?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you; motion.

Second?

MR. RIDOLFINO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; No. 21 is approved.

On to No. 22 -- Municipal Beach, Block 18, part of Lot 12,
Borough of Mount Arlington, Morris County.

DEP, on behalf of the Borough of Mount Arlington, requests approval to authorize the past disposal and diversions of part of an unfunded municipal park property, known as Municipal Beach. The past disposal and diversions included the fee conveyance of 0.378 +/- acres to an adjacent private property owner in exchange for certain public improvements benefiting the Municipal Beach property, as well as a prior easement conveyance of 0.083 +/- acres from the Borough to the

Musconetcong Sewerage Authority in connection with the construction of a sewer pump station.

In addition, the Borough granted an adjacent property owner a nonexclusive access easement over 0.041 +/- acres of the park, and now proposes to both legalize the easement and expand it by 0.010 +/- acres.

To compensate, the Borough will dedicate, for recreation/conservation purposes, 6.491 +/- acres elsewhere in the municipality. The replacement land is intended to address not only this disposal/diversion request, but also the after-the-fact diversions on Arlington Glen, Block 61, Lot 17.01, a Borough-owned park, which is the subject of a separate diversion application.

Do we have any questions or comments on No. 22? (no response)

Hearing none, any members of the public want to be heard? (no response)

None? May I have a motion for No. 22?

MS. MELICK: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you; a second?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: I'll call the roll now.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego has been marked in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

MR. KOTLER: He's left the room.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Smith stepped out for just a moment from the room.

Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved. Thank you very much.

Continuing to move forward, No. 23 I believe it is.

Arlington Glen, Block 61, part of Lot 17.01, Borough of Mount Arlington, Morris County.

DEP, on behalf of Mount Arlington, requests approval to authorize the past diversion of part of an unfunded municipal park known as Arlington Glen. Two prior easement conveyances, totaling 0.159 +/- acres, were granted by and to the Borough in connection with the construction of two sewer pump stations located in different parts of the park.

To compensate, the Borough will dedicate, for recreation/conservation purposes, 6.491 +/- acres of replacement land elsewhere in the municipality. The proposed replacement land is intended to address not only this diversion request, but also the after-the-fact

disposal/diversions on the Borough's Municipal Beach, Block 18, part of Lot 12, park which are the subject of a separate diversion/disposal application.

Any members have any questions or comments about that? (no response)

Hearing none, does any member of the public want to be heard with regard to No. 23? (no response)

Hearing none, then may I have a motion?

MR. RIDOLFINO: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion; second?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego has been marked in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No. 24 (*sic*) is approved.

We are now moving to the final portion of our agenda today. This is with regard to the Division of Pensions and Benefits requests.

But first, I will need a motion to adjourn as the New Jersey State House Commission and reconvene to sit as the Judicial Retirement System Board of Trustees.

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: (off mike) Bob--

MS. MELICK: Did we do No. 24?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Oh, did I miss one?

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Yes, that was No. 23, the last one.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much; I appreciate that.

Okay, so let me-- Before we take that motion, we're returning to No. 24 on the agenda.

Let's be clear; No. 24 is project Creekside Conservancy, Block 49, part of Lot 5.02, Tewksbury, Hunterdon County.

DEP, on behalf of the Township of Tewksbury, requests approval to allow the disposal of approximately 0.089 +/- acres of Township-owned parkland within the Creekside Conservancy to the County of Hunterdon for road right-of-way purposes. The disposal will allow for the replacement and widening of County Bridge RT-16, which carries County Route 523 over the North Branch of Rockaway Creek in Tewksbury Township, Hunterdon County.

To compensate, the County will provide \$5,328.13 to the Green Acres Program for deposit in the Garden State Preservation Trust Fund to be used for the future acquisition of open space through the Green Acres Local/Nonprofit Program.

Any members have any questions or comments with regard to this? (no response)

Hearing none, any members of the public wish to be heard or comment on this matter? (no response)

Seeing none, may I have a motion on No. 24?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator Smith.

Second?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Seconded by Assemblyman DiMaio.
Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative.
Senator Smith -- yes?

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That is No. 24, and it's approved. And thank you for catching that.

Okay, now may I have a motion to adjourn as the State House Commission and reconvene to sit as the Judicial Retirement System Board of Trustees?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator Smith.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much, Chair.

We're now sitting as the Judicial Retirement System Board.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Any opposed? (no response)

Any abstentions? (no response)

Okay, so we're now sitting as the Judicial Retirement System Board.

First matter is that we need approval of the minutes of the meeting held on June 12, 2017.

Do I have a motion for that?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And do I have a second for that?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Any opposed? (no response)

Any abstentions?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I just have to abstain, because I wasn't here.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Oh, wait a minute; I'm sorry. I should abstain, too.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay. So we have two abstentions on that matter; okay.

And that matter is approved.

MR. KOTLER: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, that matter is approved. Thank you.

Next, No. 2 -- confirmation of death claims, retirements, and survivor benefits.

Do we have a motion on that?

MS. MELICK: So moved.

SENATOR SMITH: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Chair; thank you -- was that the Assemblyman or the Senator?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: That was the Senator.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator Smith.

Okay; any members of the public, by the way, want to be heard on this? (no response)

Hearing none, then,

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego is in the affirmative.
Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

On to No. 3, which is just a receipt of the financial statements
for January, 2017 thru June, 2017.

Do I have a motion for that?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Second?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Any members of the public want to be
heard? (no response)

Okay, so that-- Roll call, right?

Do I have a motion and second on that? We have that?

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego has been marked in the affirmative.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No. 3 is approved.

The final matter, on No. 4, Division of Pensions requests, is consideration of appeal of Superior Court Judge Michael J. Donohue regarding the Division's decision to deny the interfund transfer of his prior service credit accrued in the Public Employees' Retirement System, PERS, into the Judicial Retirement System, JRS.

So that matter is up for consideration.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Would this be-- Just a question.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Sure.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Would this be to overturn the decision, or approve the decision to deny?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: The underlying decision was to deny the interfund transfer, as I understand it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: And are we confirming that,
or--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: You are considering it.

Is there anyone from Pensions here who wants to be heard?

S H I R L E N E S C O T T: (off mike) I'm from Pensions.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; Pensions, come on up, please.

Just identify yourself for the record. And if you would, kindly indicate the underlying Pensions decision.

MS. SCOTT: (off mike) Do I need to sit down?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Whatever you feel comfortable with.

MS. MELICK: She needs to sit, so--

HEARING REPORTER: She needs to sit.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Ms. Fenner; I appreciate it. You serve the most important role here. (laughter)

MS. SCOTT: My name is Shirlene Scott; I am the JRS Administrator.

This is my first meeting, so I'm not sure if I'm actually supposed to be speaking or not. I know that there's other representation here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes, we understand that.

So underlying -- there was a denial of this appeal by the Division.

MS. SCOTT: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

MS. SCOTT: Yes, because it was beyond the 90 days when the form had to be submitted for the interfund transfer -- within 90 days -- and it was not submitted.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

SENATOR SMITH: When was it submitted? How many days?

MS. SCOTT: It was--

MR. KOTLER: Like 120.

MS. SCOTT: No, it was, like-- It wasn't even within the year.

MR. KOTLER: Oh, it wasn't?

SENATOR SMITH: More than a year?

MS. SCOTT: I believe so; let me just-- I might be incorrect.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Is that 90-day an administrative rule, or is that like an IRS rule of some type?

MS. SCOTT: It's actually within the statutes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: New Jersey State statutes.

MS. SCOTT: Yes, it's in the statutes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: To your knowledge, have we ever granted a waiver in the past?

MS. SCOTT: Not to my knowledge, no.

The initial letter was sent to Judge Donohue in January of 2016; and he contacted me--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: For the record, is the Judge or any representative on behalf of Judge Donohue here? (no response)

Hearing and seeing none, then it's a counsel question.

Yes, just note it for the record. Thank you very much.

We also have Counsel here, if there are any questions --
Counsel for the Division of Pensions here, if you will, to explain or answer
any--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I just have one question.

But for the time delay, would this have been approved?

MS. SCOTT: I'm sorry?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: But for the time delay, would
this have been routinely approved?

MS. SCOTT: Without the time delay, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Okay.

SENATOR SMITH: So I have a question for Counsel.

In your experience with Pensions, has there ever been a waiver
granted?

MS. MELICK: He needs to come up.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Smith--

Yes, thank you.

Hold your question for a second--

SENATOR SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: --so we can have--

SENATOR SMITH: Counsel come forward.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Mr. Kelly, come up to the microphone,
please.

SENATOR SMITH: Sorry.

MR. KOTLER: Senator and members, I would suggest we go into Executive Session if we're seeking advice from Counsel.

ROBERT E. KELLY, Esq.: (off mike) I'm here to represent the Judicial Retirement System as Counsel.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay.

MR. KELLY: And so my comments should be in Executive Session, unless you wish to waive the privilege.

SENATOR SMITH: Motion to go private.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, that's up to the Commission.

And there's a motion to go into Executive Session, with regard to advice from the Attorney General's Office.

Is there a second to that motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, motion and second.

Thank you.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Okay, so we're going to have to excuse people for a bit.

(Commission enters Executive Session at 11:37 a.m.)

(Commission returns from Executive Session at 11:44 a.m.)

The doors are open, if members of the public want to come back in.

Okay, Ms. Scott; thank you.

Okay, we're now in open session again, and we're considering the Division of Pensions request, specifically No. 4, the appeal of Superior Court Judge Michael J. Donohue, with regard to this matter.

Do members have any other questions or comments that they want to make before we vote this matter? (no response)

Are there any members of the public, including the Judge or the Judge's counsel, here to be heard? (no response)

Hearing and seeing none--

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: I just want to make a comment.

I just wish there was a middle ground.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Okay, do we have any motion with respect to this matter?

MR. RIDOLFINO: I'll motion to deny the appeal and uphold the decision by the Division of Pensions and Benefits.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, we have a motion.

Do we have a second to that motion?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second; thank you, Chair.

Any further comment or questions? (no response)

None? Okay, I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Addiego---

MR. KOTLER: We're going to pass her.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; we're going to hold the vote on that.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Gusciora.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: That matter is approved.

I believe that concludes the State House Commission agenda. It was a healthy one.

SENATOR SMITH: One new item of business.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: May I have a motion to reconvene as the State House Commission?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Any opposed, any abstentions? (no response)

Okay.

SENATOR SMITH: So some radical new business.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Radical.

SENATOR SMITH: When we have a State House Commission meeting where there's no session, no committee meetings,

what do you say we start at 10:00 a.m.? (laughter) It's a little radical, but a lot of traffic issues get resolved--

MS. SCHERMERHORN: And really radical?

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Have it in a real committee room, instead of, like, this little--

SENATOR SMITH: I don't know why it was here.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: The Legislature wouldn't let us (indiscernible).

SENATOR SMITH: There was--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: We tried to schedule it, and initially we couldn't even schedule or get a room.

SENATOR SMITH: Why; why?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Because they thought there was anticipation of floor activity.

So then we got a larger room, Committee Room 1. And then, after that, they took it back and said, "You are in this room, L103."

SENATOR SMITH: All right. So I'm with you on your suggestion; let's have real committee rooms. But think about the scheduling. Because 9:00 a.m. when there's nothing else going on, let's -- why would (indiscernible).

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I had to leave yesterday to be here today. (laughter)

SENATOR SMITH: What's that?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I said, I had to leave yesterday to be here today.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: You're still traveling by horse and buggy. (laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Well, it was snowing when I left. (laughter)

SENATOR SMITH: We don't have to take any action.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No, no--

SENATOR SMITH: I'm just throwing it out there.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: --it's important; those are good considerations.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: The time is tough.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Some members of the Commission may say, you know, "Don't make me come to Trenton when I don't have to," so it's a balancing act. But the 10:00 a.m. start time is something to be considered, and a real committee room is something very much to be considered.

Thank you very much for those important comments.

A motion to adjourn?

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Second?

SENATOR SMITH: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, Senator Smith.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Thank you very much for your time and efforts.

MS. MELICK: Thank you.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)