
Commission Meeting

of

NEW JERSEY COMMISSION ON CAPITAL BUDGETING AND PLANNING

LOCATION: Committee Room 11
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: September 28, 2007
10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

B. Carol Molnar, Chair
Anthony F. Annese, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Guy R. Gregg
Gary Brune
Jack Donnelly
Mary Alice Messenger
Rosemary Pramuk
David Rousseau
Paul Stridick



ALSO PRESENT:

James F. Vari
Executive Director
New Jersey Commission on Capital Budgeting and Planning

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>
Eddy A. Bresnitz, M.D. Deputy Commissioner/State Epidemiologist New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services	3
Steven Sutkin Acting Director Division of Property Management and Construction New Jersey Department of the Treasury	8
John Geniesse Assistant Deputy Director Budget, Property and Building Management Division of Property Management and Construction New Jersey Department of the Treasury	13
Bernard McLaughlin Deputy Director Property Management Division of Property Management and Construction New Jersey Department of the Treasury	16
Jenifer Osborn Chief Property Manager Division of Property Management and Construction New Jersey Department of the Treasury	18
Norma Blake State Librarian New Jersey State Library	21
Brigadier General Maria Falca-Dodson Deputy Adjutant General New Jersey Department of Military and Veterans Affairs	34
Edward Sain Director Installations New Jersey Department of Military and Veterans Affairs	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX:	
Testimony submitted by Eddy A. Bresnitz, M. D.	1x
Testimony submitted by Steven Sutkin	8x
Testimony submitted by Norma Blake	15x
Testimony submitted by Brigadier General Maria Falca-Dodson	19x
lb: 1-23	
rs: 24-44	

B. CAROL MOLNAR (Chair): I'd like to call the meeting to order. In accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law, the Commission has provided adequate notice of this meeting by giving written notice of time, date, and location. The notice of the meeting has been filed at least 48 hours in advance by mail, and/or faxed to the *Trenton Times* and *The Star-Ledger*, and filed with the Office of the Secretary of State.

We will now take a roll call.

MR. VARI (Acting Executive Director): Ms. Messenger.

MS. MESSENGER: Here.

MR. VARI: Mr. Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Paul Stridick for the Commissioner.

MR. VARI: Stridick (pronunciation).

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: Here.

MR. VARI: Mr. Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Here.

MR. VARI: Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Here.

MR. VARI: Chairwoman Molnar.

MS. MOLNAR: Here.

MR. VARI: Okay. We have six members present, but not enough to take action on (indiscernible).

MS. MOLNAR: Okay, thank you.

Next I'd like you all to join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(participants recite Pledge of Allegiance)

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

The next item -- we'll skip down to our Executive Director's report.

MR. VARI: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just have a small report today. You may recall at the first meeting there were some follow-up questions to the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture. Both Departments responded to our questions.

The first one concerning the Department of State: They had requested \$75,000 to refurbish the seating at the Planetarium. Assemblyman Gregg requested an estimate to replace the seating, since the Planetarium is approximately 40 years old. The Department of State has responded to that request, and estimates to replace all 149 seats would cost \$156,000, primarily because the cost is \$400 per seat, and they would also incur an estimated cost of \$25,000 to remove the old tile flooring, which would be the asbestos flooring.

On the Department of Agriculture -- which they responded to Mr. Brune's questions -- his questions concerned the Federal grant for a mobile lab and the date that that grant would have to be -- the ending date to use that grant. The grant from the Federal Homeland Security amounts to \$90,000, and it has to be obligated or expended by June of 2008. So the total cost for the mobile lab is 338,000, and then with the \$90,000 grant there is a State cost of 248,000 which is what the Department of Agriculture requested in their capital--

There were also questions concerning the Horse Park. You may recall that the Department requested some money for a roof at the Horse

Park -- I think in the neighborhood of \$56,000. Mr. Brune's question concerns the amount of fees that are generated at the Horse Park. They amounted to, in the last fiscal year, \$411,000; but expenses at the Park for payroll, repairs, maintenance, and utilities totaled \$435,000, and that's why the Department of Agriculture is requesting capital funding for the roof.

That concludes my report, Madam Chair.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Any questions or comments from Commission members? (no response)

If not, we'll move forward with our Fiscal 2009 requests. Our first department is the Department of Health and Senior Services. I'd like to welcome Dr. Bresnitz.

E D D Y A. B R E S N I T Z, M.D.: Good morning, Madam Chair, and I guess Commissioners, and staff, and others. Thank you for inviting us here today to make our presentation. My name is Dr. Eddy Bresnitz. I'm the Deputy Commissioner in the Department of Health and Senior Services, and also the State Epidemiologist. I also have others in the Department: To my left here, I have Mr. Dennis Flynn, who is the Assistant Commissioner for our Public Health and Environmental Laboratories; to my immediate right here, I have Mr. Steve Jenniss, who is the Director of our Environmental and Chemistry Laboratory Services; and to the far right is Mr. John Fasanella, who is the Director of our Administration and Management Division in the Department.

The State laboratories -- which is really a combination of what were always health laboratories, and also environmental laboratories -- has a very simple mission in this state, and that's to protect the health and safety

of the residents of New Jersey. We perform over -- test about 700,000 specimens a year, maybe 4 to 5 million test determinations, and the results of those tests support public health activities and policies, and medical evaluations of individuals, environmental evaluations; and then those results, obviously, lead to appropriate interventions. Our laboratory also is one of about 50 CDC state-certified labs -- part of the laboratory response network that basically tests all bioterror agents in the country. We have a Biosafety lab 3, one of the three, actually, lab sites that compose our public health and environmental laboratories.

First, I wanted to thank the Commission for supporting our recent purchasing, through a master lease agreement, of our newborn screening instrumentation and drug testing equipment. The importance of actually going through a master lease approach was that it actually reduced our request for capital by 1.14 million, compared to our initial submission last month. And I think that this master lease agreement was a good approach to actually address our capital needs, and certainly an approach we could take in the future as -- addressing our really critical needs. Obviously, where possible we try to utilize Federal dollars to support our capital needs, and we've done that in the past. And in fact, compared to our original submission last month where-- There were two pieces of lab equipment that we were able to purchase through Federal dollars, which again takes another \$152,000 off the table. And certainly in the BT area, we've, as much as possible over the last few years, built up our lab equipment infrastructure to meet our needs. But Federal dollars can't support everything that we do, because the dollars, as you know, are very limited and they're very categorical in nature.

As you know, we have been working for -- it seems endlessly -- on moving towards building a new lab. We pretty much are moving forward with that. If, as expected, we have groundbreaking by December of this year, that laboratory will be completed by 2010; and obviously that will be a state-of-the-art lab -- a much needed service to protect the citizens and residents of the state.

And I know some people have said that, "Well, why don't we wait for the new lab to get new equipment?" Well, the fact of the matter is that that laboratory -- any laboratory actually -- has both fixed or built-in equipment, as well as portable equipment. And in fact, the budget for that laboratory includes only built-in equipment and not portable equipment. And we cannot wait to buy new portable equipment to meet our needs today. Much of our equipment, as you probably have read in the documents provided to you, that we're requesting to be replaced is really outdated and failing. Of the 13 items that we're requesting, only one of them is a new item and the other 12 are old; and of the 12, 11 are 12 years old or more, ranging up to 20 years of age. And when I was thinking about coming here, I was trying to think of how to sort of make an analogy that relates to our own personal lives. And I try to think, what do we use every day in our own lives where a 12-year-old piece of equipment would seem old, and I think about a car or a dishwasher. And I try to think, well, many of us have equipment that we use on a daily basis in our homes that are that age and that we don't replace on a regular basis. Certainly when it gets to the point where it can fail at any given time or when it costs too much to repair, we replace it. And we're not talking about public health or equipment that's relevant to public health, obviously, we're talking about

failing or old equipment. When it comes to public health issues, it's even more critical.

As I mentioned, the new laboratory will have both built-in and portable equipment, but the new lab is only budgeted for the built-in equipment and not the portable. So we really don't have any other viable sources of funding. I mentioned the Federal Government sources where possible, and we maximize that when we can. And fees are also not an option for us to basically meet our capital equipment needs. Many of our clients on fee-based tests are basically other departments in the State government. And so, it really doesn't save any money to increase fees to those departments; that's just a cost-shifting approach.

We do have some services, such as newborn screening, where we do increase fees to outside agencies, such as hospitals in the case of newborn screening. And again, there's a limited source of funding, and we still -- that equipment still can fail and we have to replace it; and that's part of the cost of operations.

The revolving fund is also not a viable alternative. Last year, we had income of about \$9 million -- 50 percent of that was basically provided -- 50 percent of the public health laboratories operating costs. But we need capital to maintain that particular income; for example, income from the Department of Environmental Protection. So I failed to mention, you probably know this, that we've had no capital requests approved for the last four years, and this puts us at risk of failing to protect the public and provide services to sister agencies such as DEP; and it also fails or can lead to failure to protect our own employees. One of our requests this year is

basically some modest amount of funds related to health and safety of our employees.

I've mentioned DEP a couple of times now. You should know that our laboratory is the primary State lab for DEP, as required by the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act. And so it's important for us to have appropriate equipment so that we can meet the needs of DEP and maintain that primacy.

Looking to the future, I think it's important that we basically have an annual yearly capital plan that replaces our aging and failing equipment before it fails and before it puts the public health at risk, and certainly before we move to the new laboratory, hopefully in three years. Our lab is required by statute to provide services in a timely fashion that protect the public's health, and I really plead with you to approve our requests this year. Again, these are modest requests, they're less than what we requested in our initial submission last August, and we hope that you can approve our needs.

Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Any questions or comments from Commission members? (no response)

MR. DONNELLY: No, thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Gee. Thank you very much.

DR. BRESNITZ: Okay.

MS. MOLNAR: Our next department is Interdepartmental. I'd like to welcome Steve Sutkin, Acting Director, Division of Property Management and Construction.

S T E V E N S U T K I N: Good morning, Madam Chair and Commission members, and thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of Treasury's Fiscal Year 2009 Interdepartmental capital budget requests. The Interdepartmental request is submitted by the Division of Property Management and Construction, DPMC, on behalf of the Department of the Treasury and State agencies in the Capital Complex.

My name is Steven Sutkin. I am the Acting Director of the Division of Property Management and Construction. With me today are Bernard McLaughlin, who is the Deputy Director in the Division; and John Geniesse, Assistant Deputy Director.

Fiscal Year '09 Interdepartmental capital budget requests a total of \$835.7 million to fund projects through Fiscal year 2015. Of that total, 196.1 million is requested in Fiscal Year 2009. Excluding the 98 million constitutional dedication of State sales tax revenues for open space preservation, approximately 98 million is requested to address the most urgent capital needs of the State-owned facilities managed by the Division.

As you are aware, the DPMC is responsible for the operation and maintenance of approximately 40 buildings that range in age from 20 to more than 200 years, with varied uses including office buildings, laboratories, museums, libraries, and warehouses. While the operating systems and maintenance required for each of these buildings may be different, they are similar in that their proper functioning is critical to the building's overall purpose. The efficient operation of these facilities save significant budget dollars, which are particularly important at this time when the State faces many urgent priorities and limited fiscal resources. These priority requests represent conditions that must be addressed in order

to keep the facilities operating. Several of these requests may sound familiar, as many have been part of previous capital budget submitted by the DPMC that were subsequently deferred due to scarce available dollars.

While we recognize the State's limited capital budget funding, the continued deterioration of the buildings exposes the State to more far-reaching projects, as one system's failure has a domino effect on another, resulting in emergency repairs and employee relocations that radically increase costs, lower productivity, and inhibit the delivery of constituent services. The risk of environmental hazards cannot be overlooked either. Failing building systems significantly increase the chance of mold and other airborne contaminants. Public Employee Occupational Safety and Hazard Act-mandated remediations of these conditions has proven to be very expensive.

The projects identified as our top five priorities address fire and life safety, as well as the replacement of core building systems such as roofs and HVAC equipment.

In 2005, the Department of Community Affairs, Division of Fire Safety conducted an inspection that resulted in DPMC being cited for a violation of the Fire Code due to the lack of a sprinkler system in the basement of the Executive State House. Most of the basement is underground, providing limited egress during an emergency. Serious risks to life safety, as well as substantial property damage to the second oldest working State Capitol building, could be the result should a fire occur. An initial Fiscal Year 2007 capital appropriation, recommended by this Commission, provided funding for the design portion of this project. An estimated 1.55 million is needed to complete the construction.

The second item regards the existing building systems at the Beneficial Insect Laboratory, which is 25 years old. Technology and the variety of experiments done at the *Bug Lab* have changed dramatically over the past several years, rendering our current systems obsolete and incapable of performing properly. This is an insect-rearing and testing laboratory where the accurate maintenance of temperature and humidity is critical to the operation. Many of the insect populations are considered rare, exotic species that could be lost if the equipment is not replaced. In the current Fiscal Year 2008, capital funding was approved for the replacement of one of the original boilers. DPMC's Fiscal Year 2009 request of 2.9 million is based on a consultant study that recommends a complete replacement of the facility's HVAC system.

The next item is in reference to a roofing consultant's report, which was obtained in the Spring of 2006, that confirmed previous reports that several State-owned buildings in the Capitol Complex are years overdue for a roof replacement. Funding of 2.5 million was requested in Fiscal Year 2008 to replace the DEP and Beneficial Insect Lab roofs, now five years past the consultant's recommended replacement date. However, at this point in time, only the design phase of the DEP roof project has been approved for funding from the statewide roof repair appropriation created in Fiscal Year 2008. In Fiscal Year '09, the Distribution Center roof will also need to be addressed. The deferral of these roof maintenance projects will continue to cost the State significant dollars in emergency roof repairs and interior work resulting from water infiltration.

Currently, the State Building Authority is overseeing the completion of a \$14 million project to renovate the State Museum. This

project budget did not address funding to address a major water infiltration problem in the exterior plaza that has existed for several years. In the past, water has seeped into the Museum facility through an overhead walkway and building soffits, causing severe damage and continued safety hazards. A recent consultant study found the exterior plaza in various stages of distress and that water intrusion would accelerate as the membrane continues to deteriorate. The study recommended replacement of the plaza waterproofing system, at an estimated cost of 1.5 million, in order to provide long-term protection for the significant Museum renovations within the basement areas.

The next item regards the rooftop cooling tower that services the DEP building. It is more than 20 years old, and due to age and technology has become inefficient and expensive to maintain. The cooling tower supports 900 heat pumps that cool and heat the building, as well as the DEP data center on the first floor. The data center is critical because it maintains essential environmental management systems, including the air and radiation monitoring system which monitors all nuclear power plants in the state for radiation release. We are requesting 1.2 million to replace the cooling tower.

These projects, and those remaining that I did not detail, speak to the continuing emergent conditions of many of the buildings in the Capitol Complex. In some cases, they represent initiatives put forth by DPMC on behalf of the tenant agencies in these buildings. Funding is necessary to resolve these issues now rather than continue to pay exorbitant maintenance and emergency repair costs that buy only short-term, temporary fixes.

DPMC has also included unranked requests for funding replacement and/or major renovation of the Division of Revenue and certain Central Motor Pool facilities. In both instances, the operations are located in deteriorating and inadequate facilities that pose health, safety, and security risks. The cost of replacement or even required repair of these facilities is of a magnitude beyond normal annual capital appropriations. Long-term facility planning is needed to determine future programmatic and capital needs, and to identify a source of funding.

Finally, the Interdepartmental request contains the statewide accounts that are funded centrally by OEM in order to prioritize requests submitted by all the agencies. These include Capitol Complex security, Americans With Disabilities Act, and Hazardous Waste Removal.

In closing, I would thank the Commission for its consideration of this year's capital budget and past support. Approval of these priority requests will fund critical building infrastructure projects that require immediate attention. I ask that you carefully consider these projects to proactively address long-overdue mechanical and building system issues before we must react to expensive emergency shutdowns and repairs.

Again I thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Commission, for the opportunity to present this year's request. I would also like to thank Jim Vari and Tom LaBue of the Commission staff for their ongoing assistance.

Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

I have two questions. The first is the DCA Fire Code violations -- 1,550,000. The description says this project consists of two parts, part

one being the basement. Is this 1,550,000 strictly for the basement, that part one?

J O H N G E N I E S S E: Madam Chair, through you, the description says that. Yes, it's in a previous request. There was two violations: one was the lack of a basement fire suppression system, and the other was a 30-minute fire barrier. If the description says that that's -- that's probably an old description. This request is for the completion of the construction of the basement fire suppression system. We got an appropriation in Fiscal Year '07 which has funded the design of that system. So this funding is for the completion of the construction. With regards to the 30-minute fire barrier: we have funding in the current fiscal year to conduct a study on alternatives to address that violation.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes, that was my question. Because this Commission did not support part of part two, that was the fire suppression around the Rotunda. We felt there must be other options or exceptions for historic buildings, so this Commission was not in favor of any wall around the Rotunda. So I just wanted to make sure none of this money was for that. So the study that they're doing on part two will, hopefully, come up with some alternative--

MR. GENIESSE: That's correct.

MS. MOLNAR: Good -- to closing in the Rotunda.

The other question I had was priority four -- Plaza waterproofing membrane. I saw from the consultant's report that it was built in 1962. The membrane was replaced in '82, and now it's 20 years -- now 25 years later. It sounds like every 20 years this membrane has to be redone. Is that really in the cards, it sounds like, based on the freezing and

melting? So 20 years from now, the State is going to be back asking for another whatever?

MR. GENIESSE: Yes, I would conclude that's probably correct. Every 20 to 25 years you're going to have to address that kind of condition.

MS. MOLNAR: Is it a design flaw or it's just something that cannot be avoided?

MR. GENIESSE: Yes. I'd have to get back to you on that, Madam Chair. I don't-- We could get a better technical answer for you.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes. Okay, thank you.

MR. GENIESSE: Yes. We had a consultant report, and we can follow up with you on that. Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: It sounds like something-- It's -- the way it was designed in '62, we're pretty much stuck with that. There's not much going-- Unless they knock down the whole building, we are stuck with that concept -- membranes on top of a building.

Okay.

MR. SUTKIN: I can only offer, by way of addition: over at the Justice complex, which was built in the '70s, just a year or two -- we replaced a replacement of -- we replaced the membrane over the parking garage, and that was about 25 or 30 years old; just by way of analogy. It might be similar circumstances, it might not be, but we'll go back and we'll look into the issue and report back.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions or comments from Commission members?

MR. STRIDICK: Madam Chair, through you, in one of the, I guess, the car pool projects that's listed in the materials that we got prior to this meeting, the New Lisbon facility, I'm just a little confused on the scope of work. It seems like there's about a 200-square-foot addition, and yet the costs are substantial. And I was wondering if there is an expanded scope of work that goes beyond that addition?

MR. GENIESSE: Through you, Madam Chair, that is a request that was submitted to us by -- directly by the central motor pool. We can follow up with them for some elaboration on that.

MR. STRIDICK: That would be great.

Thank you.

MR. GENIESSE: Okay.

MS. MOLNAR: Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: The Bug Lab -- it's maybe not a question that you could answer, but maybe the Department of Ag. The Bug Lab has money, as you said before, Steve, from this year's budget. There was a boiler in here for almost \$3 million for the HVAC system, and there's a roofing project as well, buried in the roofing category. I was wondering -- and we can pose this, Madam Chair, to the Department of Ag, maybe -- but whether there's another way of providing that service other than us doing it for what appears to be a fairly large capital expense. I'm reasonably sure you guys don't know the answer to that. We're going on a path here that assumes we're going to replace that building or heavily repair it, I should say here. I'm just asking the question whether that's cost-effective? That's one question.

The other question is, I'm not sure, Bernie, if you remember -- we might have been in a meeting on the waterproofing project for the cultural campus here, the plaza waterproofing.

BERNARD McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: I vaguely recall in the last Spring, or so, we tried to put some money in place to fix that problem. Can I assume that that didn't work?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Actually, there were two separate problems. There was a smaller leak directly adjacent to the building, which we went out and used that money and did a repair on that. And then there was also money used for this project. It's that big concrete plaza that is between the museum and the library back there. And to answer the questions from before, it's not unusual for concrete to need capital work after 20-something years, and perhaps something in between with some resurfacing. And more money spent on smaller capital repairs might be in order going down the road. But the main leak which affects the bigger part of the building in the open plaza area was not addressed at all, other than to get this done.

MR. BRUNE: Okay. So this is a different problem then, right?

MR. GENIESSE: Gary, I think -- through you, Madam Chair -- I believe you're thinking of the exterior of the museum, the marble and the ceiling.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: I recall, John -- I don't know. Bernie, you and I were in a meeting about the membrane itself, and there was some money we

could place and try to fix it, and we didn't quite know if it was going to work. I'm not sure we have apples and apples here.

MR. GENIESSSE: Because you allowed us to use hazardous material funds--

MR. BRUNE: Right.

MR. GENIESSSE: --for this museum exterior project, so we addressed that.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: That was the membrane on the exterior of the building. This is the concrete plaza.

MR. BRUNE: Okay.

On priority five, the cooling tower, we funded the design of the roof replacement with DEP, I think with the full expectation we're going to try to do the roof next year. Could we assume-- Oh, let me ask it to you this way. The cooling tower, does that work have to occur before we fix the roof or does that occur at the same time?

MR. GENIESSSE: Let me ask-- It should. It can be done at the same time.

MR. BRUNE: Same time. Okay.

Well, one last question. One of the priorities is for restoration of parking lots. I heard along the way somewhere -- and I'm not sure I have this accurate -- that DOT wouldn't be adverse to at least considering doing some of that work. Is that -- are you assuming the use of DOT, or would this be a private contract?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Preferably, we'd like to use DOT for this, yes.

MR. BRUNE: But that's not something you've talked about yet?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: We have not. We have contracted with them to do some smaller jobs in the past, as funding allowed us to.

MR. BRUNE: Okay.

Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Any questions here, to my left?

Assemblyman Gregg.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Just back to the Fire Code violations. Perhaps from my viewpoint, I'm still -- I'm surprised on how we end up having a violation after we build a building or renovate a building. Is there a reason that now there's a determination that the basement has to be under -- have sprinklers, as opposed to when it was open to the public, as a normal facility would have to go through?

MS. MOLNAR: Could you give your name for the stenographer?

JENIFER OSBORN: I'm Jenifer Osborn. I'm the Chief Property Manager for the State House. It's my understanding that the violations are under Subchapter 4 of the Uniform Fire Code, and that this chapter is intended for buildings that were typically grandfathered in the past. And it's to bring a minimum fire and safety protection to these buildings that, again, had been grandfathered in the past. So the violations were under Subchapter 4, which they're giving us the violations for. So in the past -- I'm not sure when the subchapter was written -- but it is the intent that any building that was built before the Uniform Construction Code of 1977 are brought to a minimum level, and that's what DCA is telling us.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: So -- I have to apologize. That doesn't make any sense at all to me. Basically, you're saying that the DCA now has determined that they're going to take away your grandfathering.

MS. OSBORN: That was--

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: But let me also-- This building is -- you're talking about a part of a building. You're not talking about *the* building.

MS. OSBORN: No. They inspected the entire building.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: I understand.

MS. OSBORN: And the violations are under Subchapter 4, which is intended to go to buildings that were built prior to the Uniform Construction Code in order to give a minimal fire and safety protection. And this is what the violation is, it's specifically Subchapter 4.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Was the regulation changed?

MS. OSBORN: I'm assuming it's a newer regulation. And we can find out the exact date of that for you. We can get the Subchapter copy for you with the date of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: And whether it's a safety issue or not a safety issue, it's not really, I think, what the Commission-- What you're telling me is, ultimately, government is now changing the rules on government. Duh. (laughter) I mean, that's what this Commission continues to deal with; and quite frankly, I've dealt with for a decade and a half -- that the policemen are now changing the speed limits, is what you're telling me, and that may or may not make sense in certain circumstances. But you're coming and asking for money because one governmental agency

is determined to change the rules -- may be or may not be because of safety issues -- just because they changed the rule. Is that what you're telling me?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Can I just ask a question to clarify with? Is it a regulation or was it a statute that was changed that would then cause the regulation to be changed? And there is a different--

MS. OSBORN: The statute, NJAC5:70-4, is Subchapter 4, and that's what they're--

MR. ROUSSEAU: But what I think we need to find out is, did the Department do this on their own or was there legislation passed to force the Department to do it?

MS. OSBORN: Yes. It appears that it is the statute.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The statute first. Okay.

I need just one other clarification. We're talking about the part of the State -- the old part of the State House that has had no renovation done to it, really, in the last 50 years, or even however long it is, right?

MS. OSBORN: Correct.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We're not talking about any of the pieces in either this building or the legislative portion of the State House, or the legislative staff building. We're talking about the stuff directly below the Treasurer's Office, directly below the Governor's Office -- right? -- that's what we're talking about?

MS. OSBORN: Correct. And it's based on the fact that--

MR. ROUSSEAU: You're talking about stuff right below my office. (laughter)

MS. OSBORN: Correct. Because all of the other buildings, when renovated, did get upgraded and do have a sprinkler system. It's the only building that we still have in the complex without a sprinkler system.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Thank you.

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

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

MR. SUTKIN: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Our next presentation is the State Library. I'd like to welcome Norma Blake, State Librarian.

N O R M A B L A K E: Madam Chairperson and members of the Capital Planning Commission, I have with me today Faith Lundgren, who is head of the Library for the Blind and Handicapped; Michael Scheiring, who is Vice President and Treasurer of Thomas Edison State College; and Margaret Nizolek, who is Deputy Head of the Information Center, next door.

As State Librarian, I'd like to thank you first of all for your past support of the State Library and the Library for the Blind and Handicapped, and particularly for your support for Audiovision's transition to digital equipment in 2008, which will mean a dramatic improvement in access to information for New Jersey residents who are blind or who have a print disability.

I'm going to talk first about the Library for the Blind. We have a lot of on-site services for children and adults at this location. It's an extremely important component of the Library's programs. It is the only public library for the visually impaired and the disabled in the state. And for that reason, it should be the model of inclusiveness and accessibility.

We offer a popular monthly story hour program for 600 students a year, and a Summer Reading Club for the deaf, visually impaired, multiple-handicapped teens, and learning disabled youngsters. Programs for adults include training in the new adaptive computer lab; 388 meetings, in 2006, on topics of interest such as accessible boating and transportation; and the very popular Fall Festival, which draws residents from all across the state. And I do invite you to come to this year's Fall Festival, which is on October 13.

As the State's Public Library for our residents with special needs, the Library has major ADA accessibility issues. A number of renovations are needed at the Library. The facility was constructed in 1982, which predated the Americans with Disabilities Act for 1990. And so we do not meet the new regulations promulgated in 1994. For example, the facility has 19 heavy, manual interior doors which need to be replaced with electronic doors to provide easy access for our customers. The closing mechanisms of these heavy interior doors do not meet ADA guidelines that govern the amount of foot-pounds required to open, or to keep open the doors once they are in motion. The placement of the doors also provides obstacles to wheelchair-bound customers who have to move in the arc of the doors before they can reach the handles. Two of the doors also require raising and ramps, at additional cost.

Our request for LBH includes the safety of the courtyard, which has had no repairs for 25 years. The courtyard is used to advance arts for the disabled in partnership with Grounds for Sculpture and many organizations that serve the visually impaired. Presently, the area is not safe for either use by the public or visually impaired staff due to the severe

deterioration and displacement of the hardscape. There are dangerous tripping hazards for our frail customers who visit the courtyard. The outside area was designed for their use and pleasure, however due to tree roots and water damage, nearly all of the bricks and pavement are displaced by over one inch in the courtyard.

Besides the two sculptures loaned to us on long-term loan by the Seward Johnson Foundation, the area also houses a public art statue with Braille lettering that is almost completely worn off. It is a tactile work intended to be touched and the Braille to be read. The State Library is requesting funds to fix the deteriorated foundation and statue; and also a professional plan for the safe, unobtrusive landscape design. Due to the present placement of the sculptures and the hazardous foundation, navigating the courtyard is a challenge for customers who are wheelchair-bound, blind, or visually impaired.

As part of the LBH request, we are also requesting funds to replace 40 public chairs unsuitable for the elderly. Many of our customers are very elderly, and the chairs are much too low and too soft.

We are also requesting funds for an adjustable reference table for use at the State Library so that wheelchair customers can pull up to a table and it can be adjusted for height. Right now, our customers have to hold all their books on their lap to do work, or have someone stand next to them and hold the books.

And now to look at the State Street Library next door: We currently have a major problem with a faulty electrical, movable shelving system. While the shelves are virtually indestructible, the electric wiring and rails for this system, which is over 25 years old, must be replaced. The

wiring and rails are directly tied to the operation of the safety sensors, which ensure that the stacks do not close on customers or staff, causing harm. The Library can no longer order replacement parts, and the electrical connections and the rails on which the shelves move. Few of our staff are strong enough to crank open the shelves manually. All of the 275,000 books currently stored on these shelves must be moved temporarily in order to repair the shelves.

I don't know if you know, but in your -- several years ago, the books -- well, more than several years ago -- books were put on these compact shelves on Level 1 while there was going to be a renovation of Levels 2, 3, 4, and 5. And due to budgetary cuts, that never happened. And the collection got trapped on Level 1 in the compact shelving, and this is where it remains.

The shelves are located in an unsecured area of the State Library. It was never meant to be a public area. The installation of a camera at the entrance to the shelving is needed to provide security for both visitors and staff, and the State Police will be able to monitor this area if a camera is installed.

So, in total, we're requesting \$478,000 to dismantle the current shelving, refit, and install a hundred ranges of compact shelving; move, store, and reshelv approximately 275,000 books; and install the one security camera for safety and security of this area.

Also, because of the inadequacy of the facility, a feasibility study for a better State Library building is again requested. It was previously budgeted by this Commission in 2002, but the funding was taken out due to budgetary problems. And the need for the study remains.

We struggle to offer 21st century services in a building built in the early '60s, the same time as the Museum. Our needs are also critical.

The world of technology continues to change rapidly, and our business is based on technology. The current infrastructure of the State Library building does not lend itself to this change. Our building was designed before the introduction of computers. The poor design, thick, reinforced concrete walls and floors defy all attempts to adapt it for the technology demanded by modern use. The public areas and office areas are crowded. They no longer match the needs of customers and staff. The building is poorly designed and is insufficient to house our 2 million materials. The collections and work units are split on multiple floors. Many of the items are packed into the compact shelving system. Besides the need for adequate space for library collections, new computer use and training space is needed; along with new meeting rooms, exhibit areas, public service space, preservation and digitization space; and staff offices equipped with the technology needed to serve State government customers, and other libraries, and residents.

So the first step would be to plan for a functioning library building. We need the feasibility study to define our space needs, adjacencies, and new areas. And this state-of-the-art library will better serve government, libraries, and the residents of New Jersey.

Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

I have one question. The new library: Would it be feasible to build the new building outside of the city limits so it would help parking at all?

MS. OSBORN: A State Library building that was built outside city limits would, in no way, function as a State government library. And our primary clientele are the many, many State workers who use our services. So it wouldn't be very feasible.

MS. MOLNAR: So it's more important to be right in the immediate vicinity.

MS. OSBORN: Yes, we love our location.

MS. MOLNAR: Oh, good.

Any questions or comments?

Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: On the first priority: As I understand it, about 600,000 of the 700,000 is for the Library for the Blind's atrium -- the courtyard.

MS. OSBORN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: Could you just describe to me a little bit better the function of that courtyard. I'm trying to-- It's an outdoor area, correct?

MS. OSBORN: Right.

MR. BRUNE: And I'm trying to understand if -- whether you're now running, inside, functions that would otherwise happen outside. I guess I was struggling with the concept of what impact does having that not available to you have?

MS. OSBORN: It is in the interior of the building. You pass it and go around it when you're going to functions in the building.

MR. BRUNE: Oh, it's in the interior of the building.

MS. OSBORN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: Okay.

MS. OSBORN: And it is-- As I said, there are two Seward Johnson statues that are going in there, as well as a piece of public art that has been there for many years for the enjoyment of the blind and visually impaired. And their experience with statues, and with nature and that is tactile. And we are doing a sensory garden. And it's the only public library in the state that is specifically for the blind, and handicapped, and people with other types of physical impairments. So we feel that that is an important function of the building.

MR. BRUNE: Does the \$600,000 pay for the statues or pay for the renovation of the area?

MS. OSBORN: The refurbishing of the statue, and the hardscape as well.

MR. BRUNE: Okay.

You realize there's a central account for ADA-type needs, right, for the doors part of your request?

MS. OSBORN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: You realize that there's a central account that we have every year for that.

MS. OSBORN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: Okay. So that would be one way to fund that particular request.

MS. OSBORN: If funds are available, that would be fine.

MR. BRUNE: Okay.

And just lastly, you mentioned about information in the event of incidences. I'm on the request for the shelving -- I guess there's a security request you're making here.

MS. OSBORN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: And I guess we were just wondering, do you have past experience with incidents occurring--

MS. OSBORN: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: --or is this a preventative--

MS. OSBORN: No, no, I've been--

MR. BRUNE: Is this a prevalent--

MS. OSBORN: --State Librarian for the last seven years. And we've had, during that time, multiple incidents of young people going downstairs and doing certain things in very private areas of Level 1, where there is no way to observe and monitor. (laughter)

MR. BRUNE: Got you.

Thank you.

MS. OSBORN: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Paul.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes, Madam Chair. I just wanted to get a clarification with regards to the movable shelving system.

In your presentation, you made an aside that the upper floors, 2, 3, and 4, were decanted to the first floor, so the movable shelving -- in anticipation of a future project. What's the status of those upper levels -- the stacks, so to speak? Are they empty now?

MS. OSBORN: Oh, no, they're not empty at all. We have about 2 million items, and we continue to collect government documents and other types of law materials -- the largest publicly accessible law collection in the state. And what's happened is, we've had to divide the collections among different floors. The floors were never renovated. It was

just a partial renovation on Level 4 before it stopped. So the staff who have their offices on different levels have to go to different levels to get the materials to answer the questions and to work with the customers. But Level 1 is the bulk of the collection down there, on this very high, compact shelving that is hard to move from side to side.

MR. STRIDICK: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

MS. OSBORN: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Now, before we lose our quorum, we have to do some housekeeping. I apologize to the General. It will take us about two or three minutes to do some of the housekeeping items.

We will go back to item four, election of Chair and Vice Chair.

I will turn it over to our Executive Director to run the election for Chair. I will open it for nominations.

MR. VARI: Is there a nomination for a Chair of the committee?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I'll nominate Carol Molnar to continue as Chair of the committee.

MR. VARI: Is there a second?

MR. ANNESE: Second.

MR. VARI: On the motion to elect Carol Molnar as Chair of the committee, Ms. Pramuk.

MS. PRAMUK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Assemblyman Gregg.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Rousseau.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MR. VARI: Ms. Molnar.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. VARI: Madam Chair, congratulations.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

This is my 20th year. I was appointed by Governor Kean in 1987, reappointed by Governor Florio, and then appointed Chair as -- Governor Christie Todd Whitman.

So, thank you.

Our next item is election of Vice Chair.

I'd like to nominate Anthony Annese.

MR. VARI: Is there a second?

MR. BRUNE: Second.

MR. VARI: On the motion for Vice Chair Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MR. VARI: I didn't-- (laughter)

MR. ANNESE: Did I jump the gun? (laughter)

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. VARI: Ms. Pramuk.

MS. PRAMUK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Assemblyman Gregg.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Rousseau.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MR. VARI: Chairwoman Molnar.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. VARI: The motion carries.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Congratulations, Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Our next item is election of Jim Vari as our
Executive Director.

I'll make that nomination.

MR. BRUNE: Second.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay.

I have to take the vote. That's good. (laughter)

Ms. Pramuk.

MS. PRAMUK: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: Assemblyman Gregg.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: Mr. Rousseau.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: For Community Affairs, Mr. Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: Gary Brune.

MR. BRUNE: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: Jack Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: And Carol Molnar.

Yes.

Thank you.

Congratulations.

MR. VARI: Thank you.

The motion carries.

MS. MOLNAR: Welcome aboard.

MR. VARI: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: We'll do Items 6, 7, 8, and 9 together. It's
the minutes from October 6, 2006, October 27, 2006--

MR. STRIDICK: I'll move.

MS. MOLNAR: --November 17, 2006, and December 8, 2006.

I heard a motion.

MR. VARI: Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? (no response)

Seeing none, is there a motion?

MR. STRIDICK: I'll move.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay. I'll second it.

MR. VARI: On the motion to approve the minutes of October 6, October 27, November 17, and December 8, 2006.

Ms. Pramuk.

MS. PRAMUK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Assemblyman Gregg.

ASSEMBLYMAN GREGG: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Rousseau.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Donnelly.

MR. DONNELLY: Yes.

MR. VARI: Mr. Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MR. VARI: Chairwoman Molnar.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. VARI: The motion carries.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Okay, now we'll go back to our final presentation.

I apologize to our General.

I'd like to welcome Brigadier General Maria Falca-Dodson and her staff.

BRIG. GENERAL MARIA FALCA-DODSON: Good morning.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and all of the Commission members. And congratulations to those of you who were reelected.

I'd like to introduce some of my staff. To my right is the Director of Fiscal, Roger Bushyeager; to my left, Colonel James Grant, our Chief of Staff, Army; and the Director of Installations, Mr. Ed Sain.

I believe you all have copies of our testimony. I will read it. We do have some pictures in there to further illustrate some of our points that we're going to make today.

It is my pleasure to present you with the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs' Fiscal Year 2009 capital improvement plan. This plan is in keeping with our vision of providing state-of-the-art facilities to meet mission requirements and to enhance the readiness of our New Jersey National Guard, as well as maintaining the best possible services so richly deserved by our New Jersey veterans.

I would be remiss in not pointing out the extensive commitment New Jersey guardsmen and their families have made in our nation's fight in the global war on terror. It is imperative that this State and this Department is always vigilant in ensuring that their needs are met.

At this moment in time, we have soldiers and airmen serving both in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are now preparing for possible earlier large deployments back to Iraq and Afghanistan in late 2008 and early 2009. These great American heroes and their families deserve safe facilities with a decent quality of life.

This capital plan is focused on 10 projects, totaling \$8.5 million, that address our most immediate critical concerns.

Priority 1: The first request of \$1.5 million addresses force protection enhancements for our Lawrenceville campus, housing the Department's headquarters; our Homeland Security Center of Excellence; the Department of the Treasury Motor Pool; the 50th Combat Brigade Armory, and Field Maintenance Shop. These key facilities to our homeland defense and command structure will receive site improvements for perimeter security, controlled entry, standoff distances, and guardhouse. Especially since the arrest of the Fort Dix terrorists, the force protection of our soldiers and airmen is of paramount importance.

Priority 2 requests \$250,000 for the roof replacement of Buildings 1 and 2 at the Paramus Veterans Home campus. These roofs are now at the end of their life expectancy and need to be replaced before major leaks occur causing damage to interior living areas, with mold and mildew growth -- which violates Veterans Administration health-care standards. Failure to replace the roofs will ultimately affect the ability of the facility to provide the necessary resident care and could result in shutting down the home and displacing the residents. This funding represents the 35 percent State share of the project. The photos on the next page do depict the conditions of the deteriorating roof.

Priority 3 is for \$750,000 to repair the sinking drill floors at both the Atlantic City and Cherry Hill armories. An engineering study was performed and identified poor sub-soil conditions caused by water infiltration into the upper levels of the substrate. Corrective action would include a piling and pinning system to raise and secure the floor slabs. These projects are both 50 percent Federal supported.

Priority 4 requests \$1.9 million for roof replacements at the Lawrenceville Maintenance Facility; Cherry Hill, Newark, Westfield, Woodbury, and Lodi armories; as well as the roof at the Brigadier General Doyle Cemetery Chapel. These roofs have greatly exceeded their original 20-year life cycle and are in a serious state of disrepair. The leaking roofs directly contribute to uninhabitable space and structural damage.

We have also identified a multiyear program to repair roofs at 40 facilities. Roof replacements, wherever feasible, will convert existing flat rubber roofs to 50-year sloped metal roofs. The Commission has supported this urgent roof repair initiative in previous budget submittals. Unfortunately, the roofs continue to deteriorate. But Federal funding will pay for 75 percent of the construction of a sloped metal roof that replaces an existing flat roof at our armories.

Priority 5 requests \$175,000 to provide an emergency generator at the Vineland Veterans Home Administration Building. This is the 35 percent State share of the project. The Federal Veterans Administration will provide the other 65 percent. The existing administration building was joined to the new replacement home as part of the construction, but did not include an emergency generator system. The installation of an emergency generator will allow for uninterrupted operations in the event of a power

failure. Additionally, the Vineland Home is unable to fund this requirement under the Line of Credit Program.

Priority 6 is for \$650,000 to fund emergency power generation at four strategic National Guard armories. Our ability for continued command and control, along with an operational base during emergencies, will allow rapid deployment to homeland security/terrorism events and natural disasters. This \$650,000 represents 25 percent of the State share to complete this project.

I have identified, in verbal testimony today, our Department's 10 priorities. But I would like you to also consider the remaining four projects that we have outlined in front of you. But in the interest of time, I'm going to submit them as written testimony only.

As always, we appreciate your continued support in helping us to implement an effective, long-range capital plan that meets the needs of your National Guard, and provides those critical services and programs so richly deserved by New Jersey's veterans and citizens. With over 200 structures at an average age of 58 years old, we remain the fourth largest department in total assets, and the third largest in total buildings. With a veteran population ranked as the ninth largest in the nation, but the oldest, it is imperative to have quality facilities available for their care and well-being.

The New Jersey National Guard continues to play a major role in both the domestic and international theaters, providing security, natural disaster relief support, and humanitarian assistance, while at the same time actively involved in the current war. We continue to be heavily involved in the global war on terrorism and the OPTEMPO of our Federal

mobilizations. The Air National Guard has flown more than 20,000 hours in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and Operation Noble Eagle in the United States.

Since September 11, the New Jersey National Guard has mobilized more than 6,000 soldiers and airmen for operations and continue to prepare for all of our deployments on an ongoing basis. Our facilities are also used for after-school youth activities as part of the National Guard's Drug Demand Reduction Program. Over 6,300 students from 47 schools throughout the state participate in community-sponsored activities at our armories. These programs serve as positive alternatives to gang activity and drug abuse.

I trust you can see, from the photos that we've provided you today, that the capital funding made available to us has been put to good use. With your support, the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs will continue to ensure the security of New Jersey's citizens and provide services to our veterans.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation today.

That concludes our brief. I'd like to answer any questions you may have.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

I just had one question. The emergency generators: Are there emergency generators already at the Westfield Armory?

EDWARD SAIN: At the Westfield Armory, no, ma'am.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Those armories that are identified are battalion headquarters.

MS. MOLNAR: Oh.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: So that for command and control purposes-- I mean, we plan to put generators at all of our armories, but we prioritized them by starting with those battalion -- MSC headquarters and battalion headquarters, where we would -- which would serve as the seat of command and control in the event of a natural disaster or some sort of event.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you. I understand.

Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Brune.

MR. BRUNE: On the generators, you indicated in some of the material you provided recently to us that certain facilities have recently gotten generators: Somerset, Atlantic City, West Orange. And now you're asking for a different batch.

I guess the first question is: How did you fund the ones that you did put in there, because I don't recall the Capital Commission funding them? Is there a different source of funding for some of these?

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: I'm going to let Ed answer that question. But let me just tell you that part of that prioritization that we're doing-- Atlantic City and Somerset are both major subordinate commands, which are above the battalion level. And so they were done first. West Orange is a unified command post, so that armory would service not just the National Guard, but all other responders in the case of an emergency, such as the FBI, the State Police. All those folks would gather there.

MR. BRUNE: So there's a pecking order of sorts.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: It is a pecking order, in terms of how it--

MR. BRUNE: Is that laid out in any plan that you've put together, as far as assessing the condition of your armories? Has the Department prepared a plan that says, "Here's our capital, sort of, priority list for the armories," and, in a sense, the relative pecking order of these?

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Well, their needs are different, obviously, because the age of the facilities vary. And the way that we selected them to be MSC commands and battalion commands is more related to their location rather than condition of the armory. So the two don't always go hand-in-hand.

We do have an overall plan for all our armories, in terms of putting it all together. What we presented to you today was prioritization of projects, based on-- We lumped all the roof projects together, and all the generator projects together. They do overlap in some cases.

MR. BRUNE: Yes. And I guess I'm asking -- not to interrupt. But if you could, through the Chair, provide-- If such a report exists, and it helps rationalize how we fund this armory as opposed to that one--

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Armory by armory, you mean.

MR. BRUNE: Yes. Does such a plan exist -- and whether the Commission could see that.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Ed, can you take that.

MR. SAIN: Well, we have plans to address the worst roof conditions at the worst armories. We have a plan to address, as the General

said, generator priorities. We have a plan underway to evaluate mechanical systems. But the worst roof at a location may not be the first place that we want to put a generator for a battalion. Those are integrated, but--

MR. BRUNE: That's exactly why I'm asking for the plan -- because it helps answer that question.

The thing that might come first is not necessarily the thing that's in the worst case -- is in the worst condition. That's what you're saying. And so I guess I'm asking whether the Department has put together a plan that rationalizes the different armories against one another in terms of their importance.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Although, in some cases, it does. Atlantic City, for example -- where the drill floor is sinking -- is a major subordinate command. The 57 Troop Command is housed there and serves as a main site for command and control should there be an event, say, in Atlantic City or in that area.

MR. BRUNE: So I'm not sure, does that plan exist? Is that something that--

MR. SAIN: We have a database that does an evaluation of probably 35 building components, for every facility, that's given a numerical value. So, yes, there is a comprehensive plan that would indicate how many good points each armory has and how many bad points each armory has. That resides in a huge database. The report, integrated, is a couple-hundred pages long, but we can share that with you.

MR. BRUNE: No, I'm not looking for a database report. This past year, we funded the Teaneck Armory roof, in part because it was told to us that that is a critical facility for homeland security purposes. Right?

So I guess what I'm asking is: If somebody took the time to do something like a strategic plan, that looks at the armories and gets to that condition-- "Here's Teaneck. It sits on it's own because it's unique. It's serving a unique--"

What I'm obviously driving at is some rationalization of the armories that exist and the purposes or the functions they serve. So it's an open question whether-- If you've done it, all we're asking for is a copy. If you haven't, just some--

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: We do not have it in the format that you're asking for.

MR. BRUNE: Okay.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: But we could certainly do that. It would take us some time.

MR. BRUNE: It just would help, at least me, understand the relative -- the rationalization for why we're picking this facility as opposed to another one. I don't sit here knowing that, for instance, Teaneck -- until you told me -- was more important than something else.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Right. Well, Teaneck is obviously location; and headquarters, and all those.

MR. BRUNE: So that would be one question.

The original question though, is: It seems like you're replacing some of the generators on your own over the years--

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: --as opposed to--

And so the first question was: Is there another way of doing this besides--

MR. SAIN: The generators that we have done-- The one at -- that we supported for the headquarters at Fort Dix was entirely federally funded. The generator at West Orange had a partial Federal Homeland Security grant that paid for a portion of West Orange. The Department paid for 50 percent, and the Federal government paid 50 percent. The generator at Atlantic City-- And we installed a generator at the (indiscernible) at Lawrenceville as part of the whole construction undertaking for building the Homeland Security Center at the campus. So that was a component of the work. That's how we've done those.

On the other projects that are for generators: two of those are designed -- and Jersey City and Teaneck are the two that are designed. I mean, they're ready to go. And it is part of the money request. Obviously, we have to fix the roof at Teaneck before we start investing in some other activities to go into Teaneck. Two others are under design at -- in the state.

MR. BRUNE: Well then-- Not to interrupt, but maybe we could just leave it this way with you. Through the Chair, if you could just provide us with a sense of -- for the ones you listed today that were previously funded -- what was the funding sources for those? That would be all I ask.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: We can do that.

MR. BRUNE: And just lastly: You indicated that you got a Federal grant for fencing, on your first priority -- over \$300,000 from Homeland Security.

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Yes.

MR. BRUNE: And the first priority talks about perimeter fencing. Can I assume that you need fencing beyond what the Federal government has just provided you?

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: That only pays for a portion of what we need for that campus. That's a huge campus in Lawrenceville. And we have some protection measures in the front, but the fact is that the back is wide open.

MR. BRUNE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments? (no response)

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

BRIGADIER GENERAL FALCA-DODSON: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay.

Our next meeting is October 26.

Is there any other business for the Commission today? (no response)

If not, meeting adjourned.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)