Commission Meeting

of

NEW JERSEY COMMISSION ON CAPITAL BUDGETING AND PLANNING

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

DATE: December 2, 2011
10:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

B. Carol Molnar, Chair
Anthony F. Annese, Vice Chair
Senator Steven V. Oroho
Assemblyman Joseph R. Malone III
Steven Petrecca
Robert Romano
Beth Schermerhorn
Paul Stridick

ALSO PRESENT:

Thomas J. Solecki
Executive Director

Osomo Thomas
Senate Majority
Mary A. Messenger
Assembly Majority
Commission Aides

Christine Shipley
Senate Republican
Jerry Traino
Assembly Republican
Commission Aides

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

pnf: 1-22

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

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

Okay, we'll take a roll call.

MR. SOLECKI (Executive Director): Mr. Sarlo.

MR. THOMAS: Osomo Thomas, representing Senator Sarlo.

MR. SOLECKI: Senator Oroho.

SENATOR OROHO: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Ms. Pou.

MS. MESSENGER: Mary Messenger, sitting in for Assemblywoman Pou.

MR. SOLECKI: Assemblyman Joseph Malone.

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Deputy State Treasurer Robert Romano.

DEPUTY TREASURER ROMANO: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Department of Community Affairs, Paul Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Steven Petrecca, Assistant State Treasurer.

MR. PETRECCA: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: From the Governor's Office, Beth Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Ms. Joanne Cimiluca, public member. (no response)

Mr. Anthony Annese, public member.

MR. ANNESE: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Ms. B. Carol Molnar, Chair, public member.

MS. MOLNAR: Here.

MR. SOLECKI: Madam Chair, we have eight members present. We have a quorum.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

The next item is the approval of the minutes of November 18, 2011.

Do I hear a motion?

MR. ANNESE: So moved.

MS. MOLNAR: Second?

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: Second.

MS. MOLNAR: Any questions, comments, changes? (no response)

If not, all in favor say aye.

ALL: Aye.

MS. MOLNAR: It's unanimous.

Okay, our next item on the agenda is our debt report presentation, which we are required by statute to present.

I'd like to welcome Jim Petrino, on behalf of Treasury.

JAMES M. PETRINO: Good morning.

MR. STRIDICK: Good morning.

MR. PETRINO: I'm Jim Petrino, Director of the Office of Public Finance, and here, once again, to present to the Commission the annual debt report -- this year for Fiscal Year that ended June 30, 2011.

Seated next to me is Anthony Longo, also of the Office of Public Finance.

And this year's report is similar to last year's. And I just wanted to remind the members: Last year we did a significant rewrite -- reformatting of the debt report, and this report this year is now consistent with that, with a couple of minor changes or improvements that I'll address when I get to those pages.

What I thought I would do, with the Chair's permission, is go over a couple of items and then either open it up to questions or I can go as detailed or as high-level as you wish.

What I had hoped to do was to remind everyone what is covered in this annual debt report. A common question is: how much is-- What is the State's debt? And my answer always is, "Well, it depends on how you define it." So I think it's very important to understand what is covered by this report and what's not covered.

This is addressed in pages 1-3 of the report; but generally, what's covered are the State's General Obligation bonds -- bonded indebtedness approved by the voters, issued by the State, secured by the faith and credit of the State; also obligations subject to appropriation -- these are obligations issued by the various State-created authorities that are supported by State revenues and are paid either via contract or a lease agreement with those entities. So that debt, that is the debt service, which is paid by State revenues is included in here. In addition to those bonded obligations, in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, or the CAFR, that is released annually by the State, there are certain other non-bonded obligations that are reported. And within this report we do a reconciliation. We include those items that are in the CAFR that are not necessarily considered debt or bonded debt. So we'll go over that when I get to that part.

Also, this report contains certain data related to the State's unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities for pensions and other post-employment benefits. The inclusion of this is a result of an amendment to the legislation requiring this report, from a couple of years ago, that those obligations also be included in his report.

What's not covered, though, is bonds -- well, certainly, none of the local government bonds -- municipalities, local authorities, counties, etc. That's not covered by this. Other State-created authorities issue bonds, incur bonded indebtedness for a client base. For instance, the Healthcare Facilities Financing Authority incurs debt for hospital finances on behalf of the hospitals. Those bonds are secured solely from hospital revenues -- there's no recourse to the State whatsoever on those bonds; those are not included in here. Similarly, the Student Loan Authority -- Higher Education and Student Assistance Authority issues bonds secured by student loan repayments. No recourse to the State; they're not in here.

The EDA, the Educational Facilities Authority, other authorities also issue bonds for a client base secured by revenues from that client base; those are not in here.

Other State authorities such as the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, South Jersey Transportation Authority have their own toll revenue base. Bonds that they issue are secured solely by those revenues without recourse back to the State's General Fund or State revenue, so those are not included here.

And then the bi-state authorities -- the Port Authority of New York/New Jersey, the Delaware River Port Authority, etc. -- are not included here.

We also issue tax and revenue anticipation notes each year to fund the cash flow imbalances that occur in just the operations of the State, meaning we incur expenses early in the Fiscal Year; most of the tax revenue comes in later in the Fiscal Year and we do a short-term financing -- we run a short-term financing program to help the State manage its cash over those time periods. Those obligations are paid before the end of the Fiscal Year; they never carry over from year to year. They're not a debt of the State and those are not reported here. And they wouldn't be because this report is as of June 30, and they're never on the books as of June 30 because we pay them off each year.

There's one other category I'll note, and that's on page 3 -- moral obligations. There-- Certain statutes have established what are known as Moral Obligation bonds. Certain bonds issued by-- The New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency, the New Jersey Higher Education Student Assistance Authority, and the South Jersey Port Corporation issue bonds that are supported by debt service reserve funds -- are created under those statutes. To the extent that the revenues of those agencies fall short to meet a debt service payment, they draw on that debt service reserve fund. The statute then says that the State has a moral obligation, when that happens, to replenish that debt service reserve fund for the authority to maintain their solvency and continue in years subsequent.

For the Moral Obligation bonds of the HMFA and the Higher Ed Student Assistance Authority, they have never-- Their revenues have always met their obligations; they've never drawn on their debt service reserve fund, and hence the moral obligation of the State has never been drawn upon. And there's no expectation that there would be, because the revenues have consistently been sufficient; therefore, those bonds are not included in this report. In contrast, the South Jersey Port Corporation, which operates port facilities, obviously in South Jersey -- their revenues have consistently been insufficient to cover their debt service obligations. They've drawn on their debt service reserve fund each year and the State has replenished it under its moral obligation each year. Because we're actively funding that we have included those bonds in this report.

Okay, so that gives you the what's in and what's not in into this report.

The report is broken into several sections. Section 3 covers the outstanding obligations; Section 4, the annual debt service supported by State revenues. Thereafter, there are obligation profiles by each of the issuers -- what their debt picture looks like. There are comparisons to others states in terms of certain measureable statistics. A glossary of debt terms, which you might find helpful; and then a listing of debt that's been incurred since June 30, 2011, which is the date of this report, through today.

In the past we've focused primarily on the outstanding obligations; if you'd like me to kind of walk you through that, I can do that; or, if you prefer, I can open it up to questions that you may have.

MS. MOLNAR: I think we can open it up to questions.

I have two short ones, hopefully. Page 61 -- it's the bonds outstanding. It looks--

MR. PETRINO: These are the bonds outstanding for the Transportation Trust Fund Authority?

MS. MOLNAR: Oh.

MR. PETRINO: Yes, it's a continuation--

MS. MOLNAR: Oh.

MR. PETRINO: --from page 60. Yes, there's-- We list them--

MS. MOLNAR: Oh, okay.

MR. PETRINO: Yes, that's it.

MS. MOLNAR: Just to note: It looks like two of them -- two bonds in 2010 were-- You refinanced some bonds; it says refunding bonds, right?

MR. PETRINO: Yes, correct.

ANTHONY LONGO: Yes.

MS. MOLNAR: But there's another $1.8 billion in 2010 which was used for transportation, right? Okay.

Okay -- page 71, the second chart. It says "Gross Tax-Supported Debt." New Jersey is 1.17. What is that number? What divided by what? I couldn't figure that out.

MR. PETRINO: Do you want to answer? You're familiar with this.

MR. LONGO: Yes.

MR. PETRINO: I'm going to let Anthony respond. These tables come-- These are excerpts of a report we get from Moody's, the rating agency. And maybe-- Do you have any insight into their calculations?

MR. LONGO: Yes, I think that ratio is, like it says, "gross to net ratio." So the gross tax-supported debt to the net tax-supported debt. So right there it lists the gross tax-supported debt figure -- that $40.1 million.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. LONGO: And then the net tax-supported debt is right to the left of it, that $34.4 million.

MS. MOLNAR: Oh, okay.

MR. LONGO: So that 1.17 is the ratio between those two.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Excuse me; may I interrupt for a moment?

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: There are reporters in the audience; we don't have a copy. Is it possible to get one? We are in a public meeting; many people do have copies. You're referring to information that we don't have access to.

MS. MOLNAR: Are there any additional copies available?

MR. PETRINO: We have some. How many-- We have some. We did not bring some for-- This will be posted on our website.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Right, I understand that. Right now you're referring to information that we don't have access to. I mean-- Thank you.

MR. PETRINO: I have two more; that's all I have.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: I had another question on page 71. But before I ask that, I have one more question on page 75. I guess this is the Transportation Trust Fund again; it's another $1 billion in bonds that were issued.

MR. PETRINO: Yes, $1.315 billion.

MS. MOLNAR: And that will be used for roads, etc., etc.

MR. PETRINO: That is new money bond issue -- yes -- for the capital program of the Department of Transportation, New Jersey Transit, TTFA.

MS. MOLNAR: Now, it's my understanding, though, that all the dedicated funds that go for the Transportation Trust Fund is used just for debt service.

MR. PETRINO: No, I don't believe that's true. I think there's still a pay-as-you-go component of the appropriation to the Transportation Trust Fund Authority.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay. So back to page 71. The first table, it says New Jersey is third on the list in total net tax-supported debt. Unfortunately, New Jersey was downgraded last year. We're the only one on this chart with a Aa3 rating. Do you have any comments about the downgrade, and what direction the Administration wants to go as far as downgrading? Do they see our rating going up in the future, or what?

MR. PETRINO: Well, that is certainly very difficult to predict. There are a lot of factors that go into the bond rating. The debt profile of the State is just one component, and it's probably a rather small component. They-- Well, without getting into their list of criteria, it's a very lengthy and substantial process and criteria that they go through. It's largely budget-based and tax-based: you know, how is the State managing balancing its expenditures against its revenues; how is it managing its debt, etc.? So being from the Office of Public Finance, on the debt side I know the part that I can manage, but it's very hard for me to comment on the other aspects of the entire operation of State government that impacts the rating. That's all I could really say to that. I can comment on the debt piece of it, but I'm really not a budget expert.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay, thanks.

Any others questions or comments?

Senator.

SENATOR OROHO: Yes. First of all, thank you very much. I really do appreciate the comprehensive report that, I guess, we put in place -- I think it was new last year.

When you're looking at page-- I guess I could look at page 8, and-- Okay, page 8 is a summary of -- it includes non-bonded obligations. When I look at -- excuse me, I'm going back and forth -- page 16, where we actually have the details of those-- When we look at the net pension obligations, which are increasing, I just want to refresh my memory: That is the amount that's actually cash-owed for the actual contributions that were supposed to be paid that have not been paid yet, correct?

MR. PETRINO: That's correct. That's the-- That's right.

SENATOR OROHO: All right. So that-- If you look at the--

MR. PETRINO: It's the accumulated over time.

SENATOR OROHO: Accumulated-- And as far as-- That hasn't been paid into the Trust Fund yet. Then you have the impact-- And we don't yet have the impact of, I guess, the significant changes we had taken this year show up -- because I see the unfunded actual accrued liability -- to see what's it's going to be in the future. I see we have the June 30, 2010 number because that's the last actuarial report we have; understood -- they're doing it now, I imagine.

MR. PETRINO: That's right.

SENATOR OROHO: We see that that unfunded future liability has gone down by about $5 billion.

MR. PETRINO: Correct.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay, so-- And that's going-- I would suspect we would see another decline, one, because of the contribution rates and because of the changes to the pension plan that we made. So maybe sometime in the future -- this is what the actuary says we were supposed to put in the plan previously -- the $10.9 billion -- and the decrease we see here in the unfunded liability is really the decline in our future liability, per se.

MR. PETRINO: That's right. This would be the amount you would need to fund now for all future liabilities. The other one, the net pension obligation, that's what has not been funded to date.

SENATOR OROHO: So really, in the report itself, you really don't have the impact, you really can't see an escalating impact of the significant -- both on the pension and the healthcare reform that we would obviously see as an impact on our cash flow over the next 30 or 40 years, versus the $10.9 billion. Which is really the cumulative amount that -- if we'd put in everything we had to put in that the actuary said we had to put in, we put in an additional $10.9 billion today -- over the many, many years we haven't contributed.

MR. PETRINO: Yes, Senator, John Megariotis from our Division of Pensions and Benefits has joined me here at the table.

SENATOR OROHO: Thank you.

MR. PETRINO: Just in the event we got into this area which -- again, I'm not necessarily a pension expert. And we have, with John's assistance, included the information from their Division, so--

J O H N   M E G A R I O T I S: Let me just say that the-- Going back to the unfunded liability number on page 15.

SENATOR OROHO: Right.

MR. MEGARIOTIS: The $25.6 billion-- The reduction in liability does reflect the impact of the pension reform. We had the 7/01/10 valuation revised to reflect the reform, and that specifically reflects the impact of the suspension of the COLA. In fact, without that revision, the liability would have actually been up above $37 billion. So the fact is that there was a significant reduction as a result of these reforms and the suspension of the COLA. So that does reflect that.

There are other components of the reform that have not yet been reflected in-- But the liabilities in the plan assumed COLA, going forward, and that's what was--

SENATOR OROHO: And it's even reflected in the June 30, 2010 number.

MR. MEGARIOTIS: It's in the June 30-- The 2010 reports were revised to reflect the change in the COLA.

SENATOR OROHO: So that impact was at least $12 billion.

MR. MEGARIOTIS: Yes.

SENATOR OROHO: It would have been $37 billion, and now it's $25 billion -- that's $12 billion. So it's a third.

MR. MEGARIOTIS: Right.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay.

Any other questions at this end?

Mary Messenger.

MS. MESSENGER: I have a question that relates to pages 19 through 22. This is where you make the five-year out-year projections of debt service. When you make those projections, are the out-years based on what's already outstanding, or is there any assumption of additional debt that might be issued over those five years?

MR. PETRINO: This is based on what's outstanding presently, as of June 30.

MS. MESSENGER: Okay. So there's no assumption for any debt beyond (indiscernible).

MR. PETRINO: Not in these figures, no.

MS. MESSENGER: Okay, thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Any other questions over at this end? (no response)

I had one question. Our enabling statute requires that we also make an assessment of the State's ability to increase its overall debt and a recommendation on the amount of any such increase. Do you have any recommendations?

MR. PETRINO: No. I do not have recommendation on an amount. You know, that is a-- That would require a very thorough assessment of the State's capital needs -- which is, I guess, the task of this Commission -- and then the State's ability to withstand the borrowing to fund that, versus pay-as-you-go and what those proper ratios are.

What I can do is, in the-- On pages 70 and 71 we look to where do we stand relative to other states, what could be absorbed, and what couldn't. And I think that might give you some indication. For instance: Moody's has us at, yes, at No. 3 in total net tax-supported debt at the top of page 71, at $34.4 billion. The next-highest state is New York at $61 billion, so nearly double that amount. So, for instance, if there were a $5 billion capital need and you said you needed to issue $5 billion in bonds, and this went from $34 billion to $39 billion, we would still be third by a long shot. It wouldn't penalize us necessarily. And you can look at some of the other ratios and see what that would mean in terms of relative standing throughout the country. That's one way to look at it, and we used to do a quick calculation in past reports where we showed the impact on these statistics of issuing $1 billion or $1.5 billion. We took that out because we feel it's very easy to just sort of eyeball that.

The one thing I caution, though, is when you're looking at relative to other states -- if we added $5 billion, who knows what New York would add. Maybe they would add $10 billion and we would actually look better relative to that. Or Massachusetts could issue $10 billion and surpass us. We've relied on these types of statistics and reports of the rating agencies to let us know where we stand. But some-- To put a number on it you have to assess your capital needs, make estimates on the cost of financing, etc.; and that has not been done by our office or by the State, I don't believe.

MS. MOLNAR: Senator.

SENATOR OROHO: Thank you.

In looking at the schedules: Under the non-bonded obligations, the accumulated sick and vacation pay -- that has gone up from year to year. Now, is this just related to State workers, or is this all-inclusive?

MR. PETRINO: I believe it's just State, but I'm going to look over my shoulder -- there are a couple of representatives from the Office of Management and Budget here. Just State? Yes, just the State.

SENATOR OROHO: If I could-- The reason for the increase, because at the State level, as I recall, we capped everything at the $15,000, correct?

MR. PETRINO: That's my understanding. At retirement, that's the most they could cash out.

SENATOR OROHO: At retirement, but--

MR. PETRINO: I think these are-- This is an accounting assessment of what's owed even to current employees.

Am I going astray? Can I ask--

SENATOR OROHO: Sure.

MR. PETRINO: --to phone a friend here?

This is Kathy Steepy, Assistant Director of Office of Management and Budget for financial reporting.

SENATOR OROHO: Yes, we're talking about billions, this is like Wheel of Fortune or whatever that -- Make a Millionaire (*sic*). Phone a friend. (laughter).

KATHY A. STEEPY: Good morning.

SENATOR OROHO: Good morning.

MS. STEEPY: The accumulated sick and vacation time represents, as of June 30, what would be owed to current employees. So it can be accumulated vacation time that you're about to carry over one year in addition to sick leave payouts up to $15,000. It's based upon past practice as to estimates as to how many people have come forward, payouts in cases like that. So it's based upon past experience.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay. It is based upon the cap at $15,000.

MS. STEEPY: Cap at $15,000 on sick, and it's based upon accumulated vacation that is a full payout. But it represents active employees as if everyone would have left as of--

SENATOR OROHO: June 30.

MS. STEEPY: June 30. So a lot of that-- It's an estimate of what is owed if everyone left, and then what is normally paid out. So it's reduced by what is a past experience of payouts. Vacation can be paid out, at the most, up to two full years. If someone leaves on December 31 and has not taken any vacation time in the last two years they would be entitled to the two-year payout, because you can carry forward--

SENATOR OROHO: You can carry over one year.

MS. STEEPY: One year, plus they would be paid for their current year.

SENATOR OROHO: Okay. Thank you very much; I appreciate it.

MS. STEEPY: No problem.

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

If not, this Commission has to approve and accept the report, since it is a report of the Commission.

So do I hear a motion to approve and accept?

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: So moved.

MS. MOLNAR: Do we hear a second?

MR. PETRECCA: Second.

MS. MOLNAR: I will take an individual roll on this.

MR. SOLECKI: Senator Steven Oroho.

SENATOR OROHO: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Assemblyman Joseph Malone.

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Deputy State Treasurer Robert Romano.

DEPUTY TREASURER ROMANO: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: From the Department of Community Affairs, Paul Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Assistant State Treasurer Steve Petrecca.

MR. PETRECCA: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Governor's Office, Beth Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Public member Mr. Anthony Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Ms. B. Carol Molnar, Chair.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Madam Chair, you have eight votes in the affirmative. The motion carries.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Thank you very much.

MR. PETRINO: Thank you very much.

MS. MOLNAR: The next item on the agenda is the capital recommendations for Fiscal Year 2013. I believe Mr. Annese had a general question about roofing in general.

MR. ANNESE: Yes, Madam Chair, through you to whoever you want to direct this. I know over the course of the requests from the different departments we have various problems presented to us regarding the roofs in various buildings. And I'd just like to know, on a summary basis, how we resolve those problems: was it done individually, or out of our roof account, or-- Just a summary of how we are going to handle the roof leaks. Thank you.

MR. SOLECKI: For Fiscal Year 2013, we had 15 roof requests from five different agencies. The amount requested was over $14 million. A recommendation to the Commission was that we recommend seven roofs at a cost of a little over $9 million. Of those seven roofs, four would be at the Department of Human Services. In all cases, we've seen these roofs, we visited them ourselves, and they are all much needed. However, at the residential centers where we have medically fragile folks, they have a higher prioritization. And, as I said, for Human Services we're going to take care of four of their roofs at over $4 million. They're getting the lion's share of our roof recommendations.

The next department that would be getting some roof funding is the Department of Corrections. They asked for two roofs to get funded; we're recommending that two roofs do get funded. Same situation: massive leaks in these buildings -- not only on inmates, but also the general public and the staff that works there.

So at the end of the day, as I say, we're asking for about $9 million for almost half of the roofs that were requested. And these are definitely the top priority roofs. Of that $9 million, we have about $6 million in reserve from the sale of assets. So that would basically suggest that we're asking the Legislature and the Executive Branch to fund an additional $3 million in capital appropriations to take care of $9 million worth of roofs.

MR. ANNESE: Thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay. Now for 2013, on page 19, there's a great summary: The departments requested over $2 billion; today we're approving approximately $43 million discretionary and $1.3 billion in dedicated funds, for a total of $1.385 billion.

Now, it's up to you how you would like to do this. Go department by department, or accept the whole report as is, or if you have questions about specific departments.

MR. STRIDICK: Madam Chair, I'd just like to follow up on Mr. Annese's question, if I may.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. STRIDICK: With regards to roofs, and since we're only funding 10 or 9 roofs, or whatever -- $9 million worth-- As emergencies come up-- And again, I'm talking from a selfish point of view, you know, with our roof being right above our computer room. And if there is an emergency there, what kind of emergency funding is there for, kind of, instantaneous repairs that may be needed if equipment -- not just people -- but equipment and important data is put into jeopardy?

MR. SOLECKI: Most likely for emergencies we do have a little bit of contingency funding. We would probably try to identify some off-budget resources that we could make available for such an emergency so we're not flying by the skin of our teeth. We probably would be able-- We have sufficient resources for such emergencies. Not a whole lot, but--

MR. STRIDICK: Okay. I'm carrying the water -- no pun intended -- on this issue just because I know that that will be a major question of not just my department, but probably a dozen others.

MR. SOLECKI: Any time there's been an emergency we've been able to find the funding to deal with that emergency.

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: Did you ask for a motion to accept the report?

MS. MOLNAR: I wasn't-- Yes, I wasn't sure how you wanted to do it. Do you want to go--

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: I'll make a motion to accept the report in total.

MS. MOLNAR: The entire report.

Any questions before we vote on it? These specific departments -- you have questions about? I think it's pretty self-explanatory. There's not a lot of money this year, and hopefully next year will be better.

All right -- do I hear a second to that motion?

MR. ANNESE: Second.

MS. MOLNAR: Okay, we'll take an individual roll call.

MR. SOLECKI: Senator Oroho.

SENATOR OROHO: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Assemblyman Malone.

ASSEMBLYMAN MALONE: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Deputy State Treasurer Romano.

DEPUTY TREASURER ROMANO: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Community Affairs, Paul Stridick.

MR. STRIDICK: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Assistant State Treasurer Petrecca.

MR. PETRECCA: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Governor's Office, Beth Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Mr. Anthony Annese.

MR. ANNESE: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Ms. Carol Molnar.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes.

MR. SOLECKI: Madam Chair, we have eight votes in the affirmative.

MS. MOLNAR: Thank you.

Okay -- other business. This Commission has to review any bonds that are going to be placed on the referendum for next November. So if there are any, we would probably have to meet in the spring or the summer -- just to give you a head's up.

Anybody else have any other business?

Yes.

SENATOR OROHO: Just for the record, I just want to thank the departments, because at the last meeting I had sent some questions in, and I was very-- I want to thank the departments. They gave very detailed explanations; I appreciate that. Also, I know through the minutes -- I know Paul mentioned the Human Services comment on their submission, which I thought was terrific. So -- all right, thank you.

MS. MOLNAR: Yes, and I'd like to thank the Department of Transportation. I was able to read my report last night on Track 5. There were a few lights that had been repaired. (laughter) I believe they're doing the whole platform, but I was able to read the report. There were lights.

If there's no other business, I wish you all a Merry Christmas, happy New Year, happy holiday, and see you next year.

Meeting adjourned.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)