
Commission Meeting

of

STATE HOUSE COMMISSION

LOCATION: Committee Room 1
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: December 7, 2017
9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

Amy E. Melick, Chair
Senator Robert M. Gordon
Senator Gerald Cardinale
Assemblyman Jon M. Bramnick
Assemblyman Paul D. Moriarty
David Ridolfino
Beth Schermerhorn



ALSO PRESENT:

Robert J. Shaughnessy Jr.
Commission Secretary

Gary A. Kotler
Commission Counsel

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Christopher Chianese Director Division of Property Management and Construction Department of the Treasury State of New Jersey	3
Maureen Hassett Senior Vice President Governance, Communications and Strategic Initiatives New Jersey Economic Development Authority (EDA)	6
Diana Rogers Director Housing and Economic Development City of Trenton	9
Assemblyman Reed Gusciora District 15	15
Ingrid W. Reed Founding Chair Capital City Redevelopment Corporation State of New Jersey	19
Assemblyman Wayne P. DeAngelo District 14, and President Mercer County Building Trade Unions, and President and Assistant Business Manager International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 269	21
Fred B. Dumont Business Manager International Union of Heat and Frost Insulators Local 89	23
Robert S. Powell Jr., Ph.D. Managing Director Nassau Capital Advisors, LLC	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Paul Perez President Board of Trustees Partnerships for Trenton	29
Dennis Jones Private Citizen	32
Jim Gordon Private Citizen	35
Bernard McMullen President-Elect Trenton Council of Civic Associations	36
Lee Ingram Vice President Amalgamated Transit Union 540 New Jersey Transit	37
Bill Kearny Private Citizen	39
Eva Loayza Private Citizen	41
Scott Miller Private Citizen	41
Lori Johansson Private Citizen	42
Iana Dikidjieva Co-Chair Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton (Stakeholders ACT)	43
Tyrone Gaskins Secretary Board of Trustees Partnerships for Trenton	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Anne LaBate Representing Stakeholders Allied for the Core of Trenton (Stakeholders ACT)	48
Assemblywoman Elizabeth Maher Muoio District 15	50
Irvin R. Berkel, P.A. Director Berkel Training Institute	52
Christopher S. Porrino Attorney General Department of Law and Public Safety State of New Jersey	60
Barry Wright Mayor Winslow Township	71
Jennifer Keyes-Maloney Councilmember Township of Ewing	80
APPENDIX:	
E-mail, addressed to State House Commission from Jean Public	1x
pnf: 1-95	

MR. SHAUGHNESSY (Commission Secretary): Good morning.

I'd like to welcome everyone to the December 7, 2017, State House Commission meeting.

We are in compliance with the Open Public Meeting Act. Notice of this meeting was given by way of notice, filed with the Secretary of State, delivered to the State House press corps, and posted at the Offices of the State House Commission, as well as on the State House Commission website.

I will call the roll as the initial matter.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

AMY E. MELICK (Chair): Present.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Bramnick.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: Here.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Chair, we have a quorum.

Before launching into the matters at hand today, I'd like to note that yesterday the State House Commission again received written comments from Jean Public. They have been distributed to the members, and will be made part of the State House Commission records.

And one other point of clarification.

Consistently, on page 3 of 3, under the Terms sheet, in the lease matters, it references a date of November 14, 2017, for certain resolutions. That is a date to be determined.

Under Old Business: The first matter is approval of the November 13, 2017 State House Commission meeting minutes.

May I have a motion?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Any opposition?

SENATOR CARDINALE: Abstain.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: Abstain.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Abstention, abstention.

Okay; thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: What was the vote on? I'm sorry; I wasn't--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: It's approval of the minutes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Oh, abstain.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Okay, so that's No. 1.

We're moving on to No. 2 and No. 3 on the agenda. We'll call them separately, though.

No. 2 is Project RPR 18-05A, Block 3503, Lots 7.01, 7.02, 7.03, part of Lot 7, Trenton, Mercer County.

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

The lease is anticipated to be 30 years.

Is anyone here who wants to-- Do any members, first of all, have any questions about this? (no response)

Hearing none, may I have anyone who wants to be heard on this matter to come up and provide comment?

I see there are a number of people, so-- Come on up, please.

Would you be kind enough to identify yourself for the record?

CHRISTOPHER CHIANESE: Yes; hello.

I'm Chris Chianese, the Director of Property Management and Construction in the Department of Treasury.

I'd like to thank you today for your time to speak with you about these important projects.

I'm here to clarify some information that was presented at the last State House Commission meeting.

The concept that this process for the State office buildings was closed is incorrect. We had had over 10 public meetings, dating back as far as June of 2014.

As a matter of fact, we've adopted some of the suggestions that were discussed at these meetings. One was that there would be no cafeteria in the new Taxation Building. Currently in the Taxation Building, there is a cafeteria. The idea is that with no cafeteria in the Taxation Building, it will create foot traffic in Trenton.

Also, initially, the Taxation Building was to be located on Market Street and John Fitch Way. To give you an idea where that is, it is across the street from the Hughes Justice Complex. But, out of these public meetings and discussions that we had had, there was a change of location. It is now currently proposed on Warren Street and John Fitch Way. To give an idea of where that is, it is in front of the Labor Building. And the reason for this is, it is now -- the Taxation Building is located in front of the Labor Building on Warren and John Fitch way; it is now less than a five-minute walk to the State Street corridor so that the businesses in that area can be patronized; retail and restaurants as well.

The plan is that we're going to bring State employees, located outside of Trenton, into the new buildings. The end result will be more people walking around the streets of Trenton, and it gives us the ability to close leases and save money on our leases.

Our approach is cost-effective and reasonable. We're going to build on our land; there are no acquisition costs.

The City of Trenton is in support of the proposed projects and their location. At the last State House Commission meeting, Diana Rogers, the Director of Housing and Economic Development for the City of Trenton said, "And while there are some who would believe that this is not consistent with our master plan, we want to have folks look at the entirety

of development in the downtown, and not at just one specific project. We do believe that this project will begin to spur economic development in the downtown.”

Ms. Rogers continued, and said, “For this particular project -- the State office building projects -- we do believe that it also allows for a significant investment into the downtown.” Ms. Rogers also added, “If you have the opportunity to take a look at our *Trenton 250*, you will also look to see that we are looking at building density in the downtown. And so we would not want to take the train station area and just put office buildings that are State-owned at the train station...and take prime real estate that is around the train station.”

So clearly, the City of Trenton sees this project as compatible with the *Trenton 250* plan.

But when you do projects of this size, in any area, there’s always going to be opposition. We do believe that the opposition is small in number; and these projects are worthwhile in concept, as well as in their location.

But why shouldn’t we start over? Time and money is the answer. Time: It’s going to take three or four years to get back to where we are today if we change the locations of these buildings. And a project like this is always going to take four years, or more, to do anyway in the end; so this always had potential to cross Administrations.

Money: There has been almost \$4.5 million already invested in this project and expended.

The design of this project: We haven't reached final design yet. So the next Administration will have input into what these buildings are going to look like.

But a different direction in where these buildings are going will just duplicate spending down the road.

These buildings are not just an ending of development, but a beginning in Trenton -- the beginning of development, and it will also bring many jobs into the City.

When I was reading through the transcript, someone had said at the last meeting, "If somebody doesn't want to develop here, they should go build somewhere else." I completely disagree with that concept. If somebody doesn't want to build here, we should engage them and give them reasons why they should build here, and two of the reasons will be these buildings located where they are.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

Any additional comment?

MAUREEN HASSETT: Yes; good morning.

I'm Maureen Hassett; I'm a Senior Vice President of Governance, Communications, and Strategic Initiatives at the New Jersey Economic Development Authority.

And thank you for an opportunity to be heard today.

In addition to Chris' comments, I, too, would like to address some, perhaps, misunderstandings or misconceptions about the role of the Economic Development Authority in this project.

You may hear some testimony today -- and heard it in the prior meeting -- that suggests that the EDA may be operating outside of its enabling act and its authorizations in advancing a project with the State that is not of a mixed-use purpose and not within a half a mile of a transit stop.

I think the misunderstanding there -- in the previous meetings, and in the many public meetings that we've had, as Chris refers to -- is the knowledge that some wonderful activity has been occurring at the EDA through the use of the Economic Opportunity Act Incentive Programs. And those programs, of course, as authorized by the Legislature, are for private investment. And we have seen a number of mixed-use projects that have taken the opportunities of incentives to build mixed-use. This, of course, is not an incentive project; this is a project that represents the partnership that we've long had with the Department of Treasury to build buildings on behalf of the State of New Jersey, and for financial and efficiency measures to actually enter into lease backs for State office use.

And I would point you to the Capital One office building, just about a five-minute walk away, which we did with Treasury; I would look to Cherry Hill's DOT Southern Regional Headquarters, that we also advanced with the State partnership; and also the Asbury Park office building and parking garage; not to mention Greystone Psychiatric Hospital and Liberty Science Center.

So the EDA, through its real estate capacity, as I say, has partnered many times in the past.

The notion of having to locate a building constructed by the EDA within a half-a-mile of transit, again, I think is a misunderstanding of

the incentive programs that we administer, where the Urban Transit Hub Program and the Economic Opportunity Act Incentives actually give bonuses for private investment that has been constructed within a half-a-mile of the Transit Center.

So I also wanted to address the process. We also have the pleasure of serving as staff to the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation. And it is our expectation that we will continue to advance these projects through the requirements of the Capital City Redevelopment Corp. We've had many meetings, over the past three years, where we've updated the members of that Board on this project. And as we move towards conclusion we will, of course, undergo the requirement for an impact statement through the Capital City Redevelopment Corp.

The Master Plan, as Chris said -- we, too, believe and support the concept of *Trenton 250's* Master Plan and, of course, mixed-use development in our downtown. I would point out that as you said in your remarks -- and I think Diana Rogers will join us later -- the concept of mixed-use within a single building is what is being supported by many members of the public. We see that this development opportunity downtown is for mixed-use and density, and not necessarily mixed-use in a single building.

And to that, the concept of the State supporting a mixed-use opportunity through a private ownership model -- I believe the members should recognize that, should the State want to support such a thing in order for a private developer to be interested in owning and developing that property, the developer will look for a rate of return that's a market rate of return. For that to happen, the State would need to support -- either

through a lease structure, a subsidy in the lease structure, or some other straightforward mechanism -- the financing of that project, at a cost that's substantial. So while it's a laudable concept, it is not without cost implications to the State of New Jersey.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thanks very much.

Any other members of the public wish to be heard?

Please step up.

If you wouldn't mind -- I know it's crowded -- if you wouldn't mind introducing yourself and identifying your affiliation.

Thank you very much.

DIANA ROGERS: Good morning.

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

And I want to thank you for this opportunity to come before you this morning and to speak.

I want to first start off by saying that this project -- much has been said about it, much is being said about it, and it will continue to be talked about.

And it's significant because the State is making a significant investment in its capital city; as it should. And I just wanted to say there's been a lot of talk about there not being much conversation with the City of Trenton. And I just want to say that we began some conversations with EDA back in 2014, shortly after the Mayor took office. And EDA came to us to explain to us that there was a need to do some assessment, some analysis, of the Health and Ag Building, as well as the Taxation Building, to

determine the financial feasibility of continuing to either do maintenance on the existing structures -- to rehab the existing structures and do maintenance, or to look at possibly building new structures.

And so those conversations, again, began shortly after the Mayor took office in 2014.

In 2015, we received what were the results of those studies; and what came out of that, of course, was to consider doing construction of two new buildings and the demolition of the existing buildings.

And so my predecessor, along with staff from Planning, had conversations with EDA to talk about potential locations; because we were in the midst of finalizing our *Trenton 250* Master Plan; as well as understanding what the parameters were that were given to EDA, from the Department of Treasury, regarding building these new locations. And so we had conversations about that.

In 2016, there were additional conversations after the announcement that these buildings would be demolished and the new buildings would be constructed. And from there, there have been conversations with stakeholder groups, many of whom will be talking today. And as a result of some of those conversations -- as Mr. Chianese and Maureen have already indicated -- changes to some of the initial thought processes around those buildings were considered.

Again, removing cafeterias to ensure that State office workers would patronize the businesses in the downtown; ensuring that we would not impede the grid that is talked about in the published downtown master plan that was published back in 2009, and that is currently a part of the *Trenton 250* Master Plan. So it was important that that grid would not be

impeded, and that future development on the remainder of those lots would be available for private sector development.

And so those conversations were important. And as Mr. Chianese has indicated, the design of the buildings is not yet complete. And part of that discussion is to continue to talk about what design would be important for the downtown; how it could also help with spurring development in the downtown.

As I indicated during my initial statements at the previous meeting, we see this opportunity as a way to spur development in the downtown. Again, we do not see that this development by itself will be the end of development in Trenton's downtown, but the beginning of development in Trenton's downtown. We look at our waterfront, we look at what folks are calling *the core* of the downtown, and we look at our Transit Center as the three areas of development in our downtown.

So this being an opportunity for developers to see that there is investment by the State -- significant investment by the State; and that there is an encouragement of development, moving forward, in New Jersey's Capital City.

So we reiterate -- this Administration is in support of this project. We would love to see this project move forward, and we are always available for questions as it relates to the work that we're doing in terms of economic development and redevelopment in the downtown.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thanks, Ms. Rogers.

Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I have a question.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Oh, I'm sorry; Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Ms. Rogers.

May I ask a couple of questions, please?

Thank you.

I was not here, unfortunately, at the last meeting; but I did read the transcript, and I read your remarks where you said that the City of Trenton supports this initiative.

MS. ROGERS: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: There are, apparently, people on the other side who feel that it's not the proper location. No one disagrees that -- apparently no one disagrees that we need this office space; everyone agrees with that. One of the people on the other side said to me, as I was coming in, that what I said to them -- that, "Well, the City supports it" -- they said, "Well, the City has been forced to support it. They've been cowed into this."

How do you react to that?

MS. ROGERS: I would disagree. The City has not been forced into supporting this. As I stated, we have been working for some time on the *Trenton 250* Master Plan, and we've been working in partnership with other stakeholders to identify developers coming to the City to support development in the City. So we see this, again, as an opportunity to leverage development in the downtown. So the idea that the City has been forced into this, I would strongly disagree.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You know, I sat on a planning board for four years, so I know that no matter what you do, there's going to

be opposition. How would you characterize why people are so strongly -- some people are so strongly against this? Do you have an idea of what that motivation is?

MS. ROGERS: I think-- I mean, I can't speak to other folks. But I think some of what we've heard is that some of the stakeholders feel that maybe they should have been brought into the process a little earlier; and rightly so. When we did our *Trenton 250* Master Plan, one of the things that we talked about was a master plan that was developed on input from stakeholders, from residents. But I would also say that when we got to the point where stakeholders were involved, the recommendations and some of the concerns that were brought forth by stakeholders are very evident in what is currently being proposed. Again, removal of the cafeterias is very important, because what we find is that by having cafeterias in the buildings, State workers stay in the buildings and don't necessarily patronize the downtown.

We also-- Again, the siting of the location, and given, again, the parameters that were presented by the Department of Treasury to EDA, made it necessary for EDA to take a look at putting buildings on property that they already own. And so where the initial location of buildings were-- The concerns of those who are opposed move the discussion to looking at a new location, and ensuring that the grid's in place so that there would be future development by the private sector on the remainder of those parcels that are available.

The idea that we would develop around the train station, or that EDA should consider putting the buildings around the train station, is a thought that is strongly held by the folks who are opposing this project.

And again, we do believe that the train station area is a prime area for private-sector development, as well as mixed-use.

One of the other issues concerning those who are opposed to this project is that these would be, in their words, *single-purpose buildings*, and not address the mixed-use that we talk about in our master plan. And one of the things that we have been saying is that while a building may be a single-purpose building, it does not mean that the area in which it is being built -- which we estimate would be another 20 acres that will be remaining, once Health and Ag comes down and once we address the structure parking facility -- that the remaining of those buildings would (*sic*) be a mixed-use area. And so you would have commercial, residential, retail, and entertainment in that area.

And so when we look at -- and we often say we don't necessarily look at the best practices of other cities. So we looked at best practices of cities like Allentown, Pittsburgh, and Wilmington, where there was state investment. There were single-purpose buildings that went up; but around those single-purpose buildings were other types of mixed-use development that happened around those buildings that went up. And so you begin to leverage the investment that was made by the state.

And so to answer your question in short, I think there's a concern about not having mixed-use; and again, I think that is inaccurate. There's concern about not looking at some of the other available properties in the downtown. Again, I think part of that is that the parameters by which EDA had to identify location were set by Treasury to look at State-owned property to construct these buildings.

And the third part is, I think that we're not looking at redevelopment in the downtown in its totality. We're just looking at the construction of these office buildings. And we are looking at it in terms of housing and economic development as an opportunity to leverage.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Thank you very much--

MS. ROGERS: You're welcome.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: --for adding more context and detail.

MS. ROGERS: I'm sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No, I appreciate it; because, you know, I'm trying to get to whether there's a sincere philosophical disagreement over where a building should be placed -- should it be here, or 300 yards away? You seem to be suggesting that you believe closer to those transit stations -- that it's a better opportunity for private development and mixed-use. And the other side may feel that that's wrong.

So it's a disagreement; I just wanted to see if there was more to it than that. But I appreciate your context and detail.

Thank you.

MS. ROGERS: You're welcome.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman; and thank you, Ms. Rogers, again.

Does anyone else want to be heard on matters Nos. 2 and 3?

ASSEMBLYMAN REED GUSCIORA: Yes; I'd like to be heard.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman; thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN GUSCIORA: Reed Gusciora; I'm an Assemblyman from the 15th District, which includes the City of Trenton.

I'm a resident of the City of Trenton; a taxpayer here. And before that, when my father worked at the Department of Health, I used to come to -- I've been to the City of Trenton ever since I was a little kid and enjoyed the downtown area. And I am hoping for the downtown to come back again.

I'm disappointed that the Commission is hosting this meeting again. Three weeks ago, this Commission voted 7-0 to put this on hold until the incoming Administration had a chance to look at this Commission. I don't know what happened in the last three weeks; I guess, miraculously, minds have been changed.

But I think that you should have held to the vote, that I took part in, to hold this project over until the incoming year. I'd be fascinated to find out how -- why things have changed.

Also, I didn't even get a courtesy of a notice; I should have been in the minutes; I should have been given -- received some notice. But yet, this Commission felt they could ignore somebody who was sitting on this Commission three weeks ago.

This is the reason why I'm opposed to this project. And I also might add that City Council had a hearing; one of the things that Senator Smith was concerned about was the lack of public transparency or public hearings. And he was encouraged that City Council would hold a hearing; I would say, overwhelmingly they would support putting the project on hold as well. And very little was testified to in support of furthering this project.

This is the Transit area (indicated on map). There's plenty of space. And as we all know, in the City, it's been stagnant in the last eight years. This Administration has had no commitment to this Capital City, which is a shame. And we've seen the areas around the Transit Center have been stagnant; there has been no redevelopment, so I don't know why we expect anything to change.

Also, this green area is the downtown area of Trenton, and it's in the Trenton master plan for future building. So what does this Administration do, and this EDA? In their wisdom, they put the two new buildings outside both the master plan area, and also outside of the Transit Area.

If you go to the City of New Brunswick, you step off the train. Within feet, you see Robert Wood Johnson Hospital, you see Johnson & Johnson pharmaceutical, you see Rutgers University, you see County courthouses, and a lot of downtown business. That's the way to plan a city. There's no plan, no thought at all into this city. I doubt if EDA even had an urban planner to come in to look at this project; just for the sake of putting buildings on State-owned land, and then tearing down State buildings and leaving them vacant. That is no plan.

And I would think that all of us in this room have pride in this state, pride in his State Capital. I'm sure we've all visited state capitals around the country, and this is probably the least attended from the state. We're treated like a stepchild, and this is the reason why I'm here opposed to this project.

And all you have to do is simply move them in a development area. That will spark development. And if you're going to send \$200

million on a building, what's another \$1 million for a piece of property that you can put the building in there? That will add so many more jobs, so much more redevelopment, and it will show that the State really has a commitment to make this city work.

It's really a shame that you decided to have a meeting three weeks later just so you can ram this through, instead of holding it over to the other -- to the incoming Administration.

And back to Diana's point -- about whether the City was forced. The Governor also had a plan to build a bridge from the State House grounds to the D&R Canal. Do you really think that that is something that the city would be in a partnership -- for the Bridge to Nowhere? That is not a way to plan a Capital City; that's not a way to invest in proper urban planning and smart growth.

And if you want to talk about jobs -- the short hit -- there will be so many more jobs if we can get this city moving; if we can get this area (indicates) -- the Transit area, the downtown area, the master plan -- moving. This was such a wonderful opportunity to take advantage of; and yet, this Administration just wants a quick hit -- put the buildings anywhere, and be done with it.

I really urge you to go along with putting it on hold until the next Administration comes; or asking the Administration to do the right thing, and move these buildings into the downtown business area.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: (off mike) Good job.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

Anyone else want to be heard?

I N G R I D W. R E E D: I would like to be heard.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Please step up; thank you.

How about the lady who was here first?

Thank you.

Please identify yourself; thanks.

MS. REED: My name is Ingrid-- Am I on? Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Red is good.

MS. REED: Red is good? Thank you.

My name is Ingrid Reed, and I'm the founding Chair of the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation.

When Senator Kean created this organization to be the overview and the support for the redevelopment of our Capital City through Treasury, I chaired that Commission until 2010. It's been an important component.

I wanted to remind you that CCRC, as it's known, was created by the State Legislature to ensure that any building that the State undertook in the Capital District, by any entity -- private, public, nonprofit -- conformed with the District Plan, that was done in a very engaging way, with many stakeholders, by a nationally known firm. And that plan today, the CCRC plan, is pointed to as an urban design and revitalization plan. It is a model for other cities. And the planners are still recognized as pioneers in redeveloping urban places that have *good bones*. I think you've all heard that.

This plan -- this entity -- the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation -- was viewed as essential to make sure that State-sponsored

projects took into consideration the impact the projects would have on the City of Trenton, and its redevelopment to be consistent. You all know that the State can override local zoning; but this was designed to keep everyone who had a stake in the Capital District reading from the same page. And the idea was to have a map that would identify placement of buildings, and then require an impact statement so that everyone would know how what was proposed conformed to that plan.

So I'm here today to ask you to consider postponing your decision about investing in what's been presented to you, until you've seen the completed plan and the impact statement come before you of what it would mean to have that building. And the impact statement really addresses the kinds of things that we all ask ourselves. Is it a walkable city? Is there something that's interesting on the sidewalk that makes us want to walk from place to place? If you're thinking of mixed-use -- in the sense of buildings that might be for housing, livable housing, private-sector offices -- how is the street-level activity designed?

We do not yet have an impact statement from the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation now, which is now chaired by former Senator Peter Inverso, who is very engaged in this and has been working with EDA, where CCRC is now housed.

So I think there are a lot of questions which you've been hearing here. It's not all settled. You have not had a map presented by EDA of exactly what is going to be presented. And you do not have an impact statement about circulation. And when you're doing redevelopment, you look at what's proposed first, in the context in which it's proposed, so you can see what kind of impact it would have. I think

this is a very good model; the CCRC plan is a good one. EDA is working with people; but at this point, there's really nothing that can be put forward before you that says, "This is what we would like to do, both in terms of siting and in design." And until you have that, it seems to me it's premature to make an arrangement to finance something.

This is very important. It has nothing to do with Administrations. CCRC existed under a Republican Administration, and then under Democratic Administrations. And we had a hard time helping people understand the importance of this kind of plan, done by professional planners, with an open process that would help people understand what they were getting, both in terms of their own experience and the investment that was being made.

So I see CCRC as the overriding issue: How does this plan work, and what are the design elements that come forward in the impact statement? And we don't have that yet; and it's really important, especially if you want to attract more development. What can people be assured of, if they're looking to put their money in Trenton? And that has not been presented.

So there has been a lot of discussion; I think this is too soon to actually live up to the law, which is Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, that guides the city redevelopment.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Ms. Reed.

Sir.

A S S E M B L Y M A N W A Y N E P. D e A N G E L O: Good morning, fellow members, and members of the Commission.

My name is Wayne DeAngelo; I represent the 14th Legislative District.

I'm here today as President of the Mercer County Building Trade Unions and a representative -- President and Assistant Business Manager of the Electricians Local 269 here in Trenton, New Jersey.

I don't want to further delay your decision and your vote, going forward. But just to recap, briefly, what we heard this morning.

You heard the representatives from the State saying that they've invested numerous public hearings into the discussion on this initiative. You heard representatives from the City of Trenton saying that they're supportive of that initiative.

I'm here to say that in the construction industry, we build our careers on part-time jobs. When unemployment rates around the state are dwindling down and becoming lower, the men and women of the building trade unions here in New Jersey -- here in Central New Jersey, Mercer County, and especially Trenton -- are experiencing unemployment rates in the double-digits. It's just the nature of the beast. We live job-to-job. And this job is important to us, to the men and women and their families, here in Mercer County.

I'm not going to ask everyone who's here behind me to come up and speak; another representative, Fred Dumont, is here and is going to speak. But if I can just ask those men and women who are behind me -- men and women of the building trades -- to raise your hand, showing that you support this initiative, please.

(audience members raise hands)

So you can see that this is our life blood. Delaying this project further puts the men and women here in Mercer County, here in the City of Trenton longer on unemployment; more difficult, challenging trying to find benefits.

So as we move this initiative forward, we create these jobs, we are reinvigorating the economy, helping to rebuild Trenton.

So thank you very much, and I'll entertain any questions that you have at this time.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN DeANGELO: Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Anyone have any questions of the Assemblyman? Any members? (no response)

Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN DeANGELO: Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you for your time.

F R E D B. D U M O N T: Good morning, everybody.

I'm Fred Dumont, Business Manager for Insulators Local 89; Vice President of the State of New Jersey State Building Trades; and a proud member of the New Jersey Economic Authority.

First of all, I want to say that I am proud of the Division of Property Management and the Economic Development Authority for standing up and doing the right thing. They could have buckled under politics, but they didn't. They could have dropped this project, but they didn't. They knew it was good for the City of Trenton.

This project is endorsed unanimously by the officers and members of the Mercer County Building Trades and the Executive Board of the New Jersey State Building Trades.

This is my seventh hearing on this project; and every project, every time you took back the concerns of anyone in the room -- whether it be a developer, a business owner, or a resident -- and took those concerns to heart and looked at the plan again; seven times. I don't know how many more we have to go through.

The State has invested over \$5 million here. And then to go out and buy another building, in another location, for a couple of million dollars? How much of the State taxpayers' money are we going to waste? We can't afford to do that.

And the thing that infuriates me the most -- and it infuriates me -- is that developers, attorneys, real estate individuals are listened to, but the working families of Trenton and Mercer County are ignored. These are shovel-ready projects that the State has invested in. Put people back to work; that's what we're supposed to do. And it just kills me that we can't get on the same page and work together; and the working families just seem to be left in the gutter.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. Dumont.

Sir, you're next, please.

R O B E R T S. P O W E L L, Jr., Ph.D.: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman (*sic*).

My name is Robert Powell. I am Managing Director of a real estate development and consulting firm, Nassau Capital Advisors, based in Princeton, New Jersey.

And I have just a few brief comments to make today about the matter before you; comments which are informed, just briefly, by my background -- over 30 years in redevelopment work, in New Jersey, in real estate.

I started out as the first Executive Director of the New Jersey Economic Development Authority, and still have a warm and professional relationship with my colleagues at EDA, an agency of which I am very proud that I was originally involved as the first Executive Director.

I was also President and CEO of a substantial development firm, DKM Properties -- that was based here in Mercer County -- which was a leader in the 1980s and the 1990s in the redevelopment of downtown Trenton and downtown New Brunswick using public-private partnerships. We did several buildings with the Kean Administration in downtown Trenton as public-private partnerships, including Capital Center, which is where the Dunham's project used to be, and where we now have, as a result of the State leases that were there, 75,000 feet of new retail space in that project.

My comments about the lease that's before you now are basically as follows.

I am not here to talk about the need for the new State office space, because I assume the State office space is needed. And I don't offer you an opinion about where the new buildings should be located. I think that's somewhat beside the point that I'm going to make to you.

The point I want to make to you is that the way the State is going about creating these new office spaces is going to create very little economic value and redevelopment value for the City of Trenton.

Such value is vitally needed now downtown in Trenton. The project will create no new housing, no new retail -- in fact, some folks or advocates are proud of the fact that there will be less retail in this project -- no new community space. Virtually nothing about this strategy could be characterized as *smart growth*.

The current scheme that you're considering today essentially is going to take a quarter of a billion dollars of investment in Trenton -- probably the largest capital investment in the city's downtown in a generation -- and it will have virtually no impact on the city's economic development fortune. And that, to me, as a matter of public policy, is a tragedy.

What's the alternative? The alternative, in broad strokes, is to restructure this initiative -- which is necessary for State government operations -- as a public-private partnership. That's not a new idea. Public-private partnerships, right now, have been the critical element in the revitalization of some of our other major cities: New Brunswick, Glassboro, and Atlantic City -- which is now receiving over \$200 million of investment, public-private investment, in a public-private partnership to create housing, office space, and new jobs.

Public-private partnerships work basically as follows. The strategy that is before you now would have New Jersey EDA finance and construct, under its direction, just the office space that we're talking about. There would be no other elements to that project -- non-office elements to

the project. I'm not sure what the budget for the space is going to be, but here's what I can tell you in my professional opinion, based upon my experience in doing public-private partnerships with colleges, universities, and State agencies. What I can tell you is, whatever the budget that EDA is putting together for these office buildings is higher than the budget that a number of competent, experienced developers could deliver that same space for as a private investment, such that the State's long-term occupancy costs would be equal to or less than they're going to be under this arrangement that's being put before you today.

The order of magnitude of that savings is around 15 to 20 percent, based on numerous case studies that are available to anybody who is interested in the value of a public-private partnership.

Now, why does that number make any sense and make any difference? Well, if the project could actually be undertaken by a private developer in partnership with the State, and there were a 15 percent capital cost savings, that does not go back into the pocket of the developer. Instead, the public agency -- EDA, the State government -- would contract with the developers such that there are other elements of the project -- non-office elements -- that the developer is obligated to build. And if those other elements require some modest subsidies to make them economically successful, the developer will have to provide those subsidies.

In this case, I would offer to you the possibility and the realistic likelihood that an office development of this sized, undertaken in a public-private partnership, could comfortably sustain the development of 200 to 300 new market-rate apartments in the downtown area where the office space is going to be located; 50,000 to 60,000 feet of new retail space, again

appropriately subsidized by the developer, not by the public; and at the end of the day, you're going to have a mixed-use, walkable downtown project that will actually do something valuable, long-term, for the Capital City.

The parking will be shared; it won't be empty from 5:30 at night until 8:00 the next morning. You'll have, what we called in other towns that are doing these things, more *walking wallets* downtown -- people who will live downtown, shop downtown, in the evenings and weekends.

The apartments will be affordable; and we're not talking about low-income housing here. We're talking about apartments that would meet the needs of people who work in Trenton now, in State government and County government.

The examples of things like this that are going on right now in New Jersey, as I mentioned before, are well-known. Rutgers University and DEVCO in New Brunswick have sponsored \$2 billion of new investment in downtown New Brunswick in the last 15 years. New Brunswick, when our company first became involved with J&J in the 1980s, was in trouble downtown. That downtown now is on fire, in a positive way: retail, housing, market-rate housing, private office space. And why? Because of public-private partnerships with Rutgers University.

The Atlantic Gateway Redevelopment (*sic*), Atlantic City, a public-private partnership with Stockton University and South Jersey Gas Company -- new housing, new classrooms, 60,000 feet of private office space; \$220 million of private investment in Atlantic City. It's under construction; it will be done next year.

Rowan University public-private partnership is rebuilding downtown Glassboro, in partnership with a private developer.

As I said earlier, we need the State office space, and there are plenty of options about where the pieces get put together, in terms of location. My point is a different one. We are about to waste an opportunity, a quarter-of-a-billion dollar opportunity, to do something transformational for our State Capital City. And as a matter of public policy, I would hope that that would be a matter of deep concern to each of you who are considering this decision today.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much, Mr. Powell, for your comments.

Sir, you're next.

PAUL PEREZ: Good morning.

My name is Paul Perez, and I live in Buckingham, here in Trenton, New Jersey; I'm a resident and somewhat of a community activist, somewhat of a community person.

I do represent a large population here in the city. We live here, we play here, we work here, we sacrifice here on a daily basis.

And I can tell you that every single person who I have spoken to in our community really is excited about the opportunity of having \$200 million invested in the city; we're not arguing that, not at all.

What we're arguing is that we have the opportunity to enjoy a city just like anyone else who comes here on a daily basis, who gets in their car and drives home and has a safe city to reside in. We're arguing the point that many of you who serve here in this State House, on a daily basis, can recall the times that you enjoyed a wonderful restaurant downtown in Trenton. We don't have that anymore.

Or you can recall the time when you quickly went out during the lunch hour and went shopping in Trenton and purchased something. We don't have that. And we are also a city that is so financially strapped that we depend on the State to give us transitional aid to keep us going. And that's money that comes from other constituents, because we don't pay it; a lot of us don't pay it. We don't have the ability to make our own money. We don't have the ability to tax people who come here, on a daily basis; and from this beautiful State House enjoy the beautiful views of the Delaware River, because we can't develop it.

Something like \$220 million-- And if we do add what the Assemblyman said earlier, which is the \$18.5 million bridge, that's quite a large amount of money that's going to be invested in this city.

Everyone is hungry for the jobs; we hope that we're included in it. So we're not saying "no" to jobs. Everyone wants to see a beautiful Trenton that can flourish from this great investment by the State; and we thank you for it. But what we ask you to do is to reconsider how this plan came about. We've heard testimony from the State; we've heard testimony from city representatives. But one of the most important catch phrases in all of it is that *the State sets the parameters; the State sets the conditions*. That's interesting. How much input can you have if the State is the one saying to you, "This is how we're going to do it." How transparent is that?

When we sit here at home and we think about the good old days and we think about, "It's 6:00 at night and we want to go to downtown Trenton" -- there's nothing here; it's completely dead. And the few businesses that were here -- and maybe one or two are still here -- can't

even provide us parking, because the State has parking and it's closed at night.

We can't park in your parking lots because we'll be chased off. We just had an event right over here in one of the local spots, and we were told we can't park there anymore. I mean, it's simple quality of life issues that we're facing as a city; and once again, maybe 47 percent to 50 percent, I represent in this city. So that's a large population of people who are really interested in what's going to happen today.

Three weeks ago, everybody celebrated; everybody said how great it was that our representatives took the time to pause -- not to stop, not to terminate the project, but to pause and take time out to think about what we're about to do. It made us feel as though we were heard and that we were included.

Fast-forward to today. People are concerned; people are truly concerned that if this project goes forward the way that it's going right now, we would face another 30 to 40 years before we have an opportunity to do something great in this city. I don't have to tell you the challenges we face in this city; you know it, you're here every day. If we were to take hands, like the gentleman did earlier, and we say, "How many of you guys walk down the street here in Trenton and go to a restaurant?" I don't know that we would have the same amount of hands go up.

And that's what we're talking about. We want you to be a good neighbor to us. We want you to understand that we want to live and enjoy the same things that you do in the towns that you live in. If we have the opportunity to build on other sites that would allow the city to create

ratables, we could invest. If we have the anchor projects placed appropriately, there could be a flourish of development going on around.

We could properly use and share facilities with our partner, the State of New Jersey. But if you build in the way and the form that is being presented today, it's being done in unison for State workers only, we don't get any benefit from it. It sounds good -- \$220 million being invested. It sounds good that there's going to be a lot of work here. But how far does it go, really, and how much does it impact the true residents of this city? Once again, I represent Trenton, New Jersey; born and raised here, seeing this beautiful city 56 years ago. We don't want to see the old Trenton, but we would love to have an opportunity to build a new Trenton.

Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE (off mike): Good job.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. Perez.

Who would like to be heard next with public comment?

Please come up and identify yourself.

DENNIS JONES: Hi; good morning.

My name is Dennis Jones; I'm a resident and business owner here in the city.

And I just wanted to thank the Commission for allowing us -- for the opportunity to speak again.

And I had the pleasure of being here three weeks ago about this same -- very same project. And I have to say, there weren't as many people here the last time. There are a lot of new faces in the audience. And it got me to think about a lot of things; about growing up here in the city living

here, being a business owner here, and the way -- how we go about doing things.

This is a large dollar amount; a quarter of a billion dollars that is the potential investment here in the city. But it also money that the taxpayers of the State of New Jersey have to pay back. And I'm sure that those taxpayers will want to see their money invested wisely with a smart, sensible growth plan and provide the needs of the State -- the State workers who work here -- and to have great buildings to work in.

In this current design, this proposal has not really taken into account the concerns of the residents; and I don't think it took into account the full concerns of a lot of the State workers. If you ever walked from the train station to -- if you were walking down Market Street to the Department of Ag, where the Health buildings are, it's a maze of crossing those streets while walking. And what we're saying is, the development should be transit-centric and oriented, smart growth, mixed-use; whether it's a single-use building -- but that it's densely compacted. And to allow the city the opportunity to, pretty much, reclaim its street grid back that was eliminated during the urban renewal process so long ago.

Again, this is a quarter of a billion dollars. It's a 30- or 40-year thing that -- that's the impact it's going to have, and the same impact, unfortunately, that we have for urban renewal.

This is an opportunity that should be fully evaluated, and not just rushed through after this Commission, you know, said, "Hey, let's take a sensible approach. Let's give this some time, and let's come back." And now we're back, and we're forced to talk about this again.

And it just feels like sometimes we're not being heard. And in fact, what I first heard about this project was, more or less, in the newspapers. And I said, "Oh, wow; that's a great thing. But how are they going to do it?" And then the stakeholders -- our very first meeting was actually in January 2017. So up until that point, we hadn't heard from anyone from EDA.

So in terms of transparency, yes you can set meetings. It is easy to have a meeting and you put a quick public notice out. But it has forced us, through time and time again over the last several months, just to jump through hoops and hurdles just to be heard. I've gone to a few EDA meetings just to see some of my colleagues just kind of being dismissed or brushed off. I've gone down to Camden to EDA meetings. And the only thing that we're asking for -- we're not saying, "Hey, no, let's not build these buildings." We're saying, "We want you to build the buildings. We want you build them smartly." We want the members of building unions to have the opportunity to build those buildings, because it is a great opportunity. But let's build them smart, so that way it encourages other development, and for the members of the building union to have the opportunity to work on other buildings.

So this needs to be a long-term plan, and not something that's just going to change -- where we're changing our mind again in a three-week period. It's a long impact on our city.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Sir.

I know we have a number of people who want to be heard; so if we could kind of limit our comments to two or minutes or so, and try not to duplicate comments also.

Thank you.

J I M G O R D O N: Uh, oh; two or three minutes? I'm just kidding.
(laughter)

Jim Gordon; I'm a Trenton resident, and I work and play in downtown Trenton.

Thank you very much.

I'd like to address a few things, very quickly.

One is that I'm glad that all the Labor people are here, and I'm glad that this quarter of a billion dollars is going to get invested or wasted -- we don't know yet. And whichever way you decide, I know that Labor is going to be doing all right by this, and that's good *for* me; that's good *by* me.

The EDA helps develop cities and communities throughout New Jersey using modern, thoughtful, professional standards; mixed-use, public transit, public-private partnership. So my question to you and to them is, why not here? Why not in Trenton? Why are these criteria for modern urban development employed everywhere except here, except in Trenton?

That's kind of my question. This is a generational decision. You're going to decide whatever you're going to decide; you're going to go home wherever you live. I'm still going to be living in Trenton; I'm still going to be working and playing in downtown Trenton. This is a generational decision that we're going to be living with for 30 and 40 years,

long after you're gone. The walking, the driving, the traffic -- is going to be set up by what you decide.

If this were in Princeton, or San Antonio, or Pittsburgh there would be lawsuits flying all over the place. You wouldn't be able to move until you got into a courthouse. So why is it that you think you can do this in Trenton and use this 1957 model of urban development?

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mr. Gordon.

Gentlemen, please step up and identify yourselves.

Thank you.

B E R N A R D M c M U L L E N: Good morning.

My name is Bernard McMullen; I am President-elect of the Trenton Council of Civic Associations.

We were delighted by the decision by this group three weeks ago to pause this project -- we do not mean cancel this project. We are very much in favor of a substantial generational investment of a quarter-of-a billion dollars in the City of Trenton.

Our desire for a pause is to be sure that we have examined the options that most likely leverage that \$250 million -- a quarter-of-a-billion dollar investment -- in a way that benefits State workers, that benefits the people who build the buildings; but also benefits the citizens and residents of Trenton.

I've lived here for 30 years; I have seen the devastating effects of the last major urban renewal project where, ironically, the Ag and Health buildings currently sit. We moved what ostensibly was a vibrant residential

and commercial area and made it into a weekend wasteland, essentially creating a blank suburban structure in the middle of a place that should be vibrant.

This is a capital city. In my work, I have the opportunity to visit many capitals, and there are a few that probably parallel Trenton's relationship with the State government; but very few. It's supposed to be a place that people want to come to. But when we build buildings that are outside of the business core, that are not very helpful to the residents, and make it very difficult for people to want to visit because there's just concrete wastelands of empty buildings in the evenings and on the weekends, we're not benefiting our community

I ask for you to continue your decision to pause this project. Not forever. In fact, we will be on your case to say, "When's it going to come into fruition?" once a good decision is made.

But please, we ask you to pause this project.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thanks, Mr. McMullen.

LEE INGRAM: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning.

MR. INGRAM: Lee Ingram, Vice President, Amalgamated Transit Union 540, of New Jersey Transit.

I've heard a lot of things in this redevelopment of Trenton -- about putting the buildings by the Transit hub, and doing all that.

How many representatives from New Jersey Transit are here? None. But we're put with the responsibility of moving all these State workers when they come in on the trains, the River Line, and our buses in

the morning. But we're not at the table, with the City or the State, discussing how we're going to move these people around.

I sat here and I listened, and I listened, and I listened about, "We're going to do this, we're going to do that," but nobody is talking about how they're going to move these people.

The gentleman talked about the State workers who walk from the train station to Labor and Industry under Market Street, where they have to cross over the highway. It's dangerous. We have a system set up where we can move the State workers, but we haven't been included in that; our workers haven't been included in it.

The city talked about how they want to bring business to the downtown area. Why hasn't the city come here and said "Well, we're cleaning up the drug-invested heart of the city, at Broad and East State Street, to show you that we have good intent in bringing it, so that the people who do come into these new buildings can walk downtown." Show me something before you get what you want, and not after, when you can say, "Oh, I forgot."

I was born and raised here in this city. I've been union since I was 20 years old; I'm 56 years old now. I was a member of Building Trades for 15 years. I want my brothers to get this work more than anything else. But I also want them to have somewhere that they can come to after they get off from work, and spend some of the money that they make at their job in this City so that my taxes can go down.

The City gave us a tax assessment that they said the State said we must do. The taxes on my home went up almost 90 percent because

they hired an outside entity from Delaware, that doesn't pay taxes, to come in and tell me how much taxes I have to pay.

So I don't have any faith in any of the things that the City says are going to benefit me, when everything that they do is the complete opposite.

So I'm asking this Commission to also reach out to New Jersey Transit -- the Board of Executives of New Jersey Transit. Reach out to the union representatives of New Jersey Transit so that we can be part of this conversation, a part of this development, to move the State workers, as well as our residents, into a better future.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir; we appreciate your comments.

Sir.

BILL KEARNY: Good morning.

My name is Bill Kearny; (indiscernible) Laclede. I'm a city resident for over 30 years. I have lived and worked here -- lived here for 30, worked here for the last 10.

I'm not against this program at all; I'm not against any union jobs. But in order to ramrod this through to get jobs tomorrow, as opposed to in a few months when this is better thought out -- that's what I'm against.

Another issue is, mixed-use is nothing new. It's not a new trend in building. It's something that's been done for 15 years. It's become the gold standard, and we need that here in the city. If we have these captive audiences -- we're not getting new State workers coming in, we're just

getting new buildings. So there's not new economic development, other than the builders and the people working here temporarily.

But what we are looking for are opportunities for the existing people, and for new businesses to come in. If the State can work with us on mixed-use, the city will also plug in its own mixed-use.

The way I was always taught with any negotiation or deal that's on the table, is that you know you have a good deal when all parties win. If it's lopsided or it's only good for the State, it's not a good deal. The city residents, potential business development people -- people who want to open businesses in the city -- are good for the State workers. They're good for the State and they're good for the city. And that's something where everybody can benefit.

The locations of these buildings need to be in our core downtown area. We have to learn from the mistakes of the 1950s, which we have all repeated and said, "We can't do this again." And here we are with a plan that's looking a lot like the 1950s again. Let's build buildings, let's make them last, let's keep our State people happy, let's keep city people happy, and let's keep the unions employed. You know, everyone can and should win with this deal.

Finally, City support. Of course the City will always support anything that the State does. We are tied -- the city is tied to your apron strings. If the State is spending any money in the City of Trenton, they're going to support you. Any money is better than no money; that looks like political gold to people in politics in this town.

And of course you could fit it -- make it fit any plan that you want. The reality is, we don't just want the money because we don't have

any other source of money. We want money that's going to benefit everyone. Everyone has to win on this; and if we need to take a break for a couple of months to make sure everyone wins, please, let's do it.

I know this is more -- apparently there are bonds looking to be floated at \$600 million, not just the \$250 million. So this is way bigger than most of us in this room even are willing to talk about. So this is a big deal; let's do it carefully.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir.

EVA LOAYZA: Hi.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Ma'am, please.

MS. LOAYZA: My name is Eva Loayza; I am a State worker, and a homeowner in the city.

I am part of the working families in Trenton that a speaker earlier alluded to; and I am asking you, respectfully, to please postpone this and let us see more specific details about this project and exactly how it's going to benefit us city residents, and the city overall, and the downtown businesses.

Thank you.

SCOTT MILLER: Hello, my name is Scott Miller. I live on West Front Street, and I'm a resident and small business owner.

And I represent about a dozen other small businesses, located in the immediate downtown Trenton area, that all oppose this current plan.

We would like to ask you to take your time and consider better options for this that may include location of these proposed buildings in the core of our downtown area.

That's all I have to say.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir; thank you, ma'am.

Any others?

Thank you very much; come on up, please, and identify yourself.

L O R I J O H A N S S O N: Hello; I am Lori Johansson; and I am a local artist, and musician, and resident.

I am here because I really, really care about Trenton. When I heard about this investment, I got really excited; and I am still really excited. However, with that excitement, also, I'm nervous that this is going to be another -- this project is just going to get pushed through quickly, and it really needs to have the thought put into it. And it really -- especially coming here and hearing everyone's concerns about it, I really hope that each of you take that into consideration.

This could be something really great for the city; and the city could really use a great project like this, especially the workers. However, I think this project, as it stands now, completely falls short. And we don't need that in this city.

So I'll keep my comments short, but I'm really hoping that you make a decision that isn't hasty and rushed; but you really take into consideration the long-term effects that your decision is going to make on the city and the people who live in the city.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: We appreciate that; thank you very much.

MS. JOHANSSON: Thank you.

IANA DIKIDJIEVA: Hello, my name is Iana Dikidjieva. I live a block away here in the City of Trenton.

I just want to draw this Commission's attention to the fact that here we are, three weeks after the last vote taken on this topic, at a meeting that was scheduled on three-days' notice.

You already know that you're being asked to make a well-considered, careful, and thoughtful decision, when that's the case.

I would like to address some of the mischaracterizations that the Economic Development Authority and others have made about the process so far.

First of all -- and I would particularly like to draw this Commission's attention to the fact that you do not have enough information to make a well-considered decision. And I ask those of you who are elected representatives to think very carefully how you would like your constituents to vote on a similar matter in your communities, that EDA can put through; where you are the only public approval really needed for a very big project, given that you have a parallel amount of information as you do about this one.

First, in at least the public agenda for this topic, all of the parcels that are supposedly going to be built on are characterized to you as *vacant land*. If we need to take a time-out and take a little field trip so that you can see that this is neither the case in the tax records, nor is it the case, like, physically -- none of these parcels can actually be categorized as *vacant*

land, neither in the tax categorization of what they are, nor in just what you would observe if you were to go there.

One of them actually is the parcel that has the Labor and Industry Building on it -- I find this a little mysterious -- and all of them have improvements in the portions that are being considered for building.

Additionally, the cost of this project: Several people have mentioned the number \$220 million. This does not actually appear in writing anywhere; maybe you have seen it, but this has not actually been shared in writing, publicly, anywhere by the Economic Development Authority. The only, sort of, published figure that we have really seen has been \$650 million, including the State House bonds. So there's some very peculiar math that actually keeps changing; and I actually challenge anyone on this Commission to tell us, what exactly is the cost of this project? And I assure you that this has not been published in any form or fashion by the EDA to at least any members of the public.

Thirdly, I want to stress that these concessions that the EDA claims to have made, over what they present as an extensive public process -- I won't even get into the cafeterias; I mean, it's not like this Commission is actually going to approve the cafeterias if they change their mind. But the siting of the one building -- this was sort of shared with the public; I do agree they called a special meeting to share that. And we have repeatedly requested, in writing, copies of the actual new site plan and the new buildings that they were proposing to put on. They actually have refused multiple times to share that on the grounds that, supposedly, it is not finalized.

And relatedly, as part of the changes that they made to this project at that time, they put in an additional 100,000 square feet, which was a 33 percent increase to the project. And again, this is stuff that we are saying to each other verbally, in meetings, in hallways; there is nothing that the EDA has actually published saying this is the project.

So it actually seems that the content of this project is quite flexible. And I ask all of you again, as members who are representing communities around the state, to make the kind of decision that you would want your constituents to make if you had this level of information about a very important project in your communities.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much. Again, we appreciate your comments.

Sir.

TYRONE GASKINS: Good afternoon.

My name is Tyrone Gaskins; I reside at the Conservatory Mansion here in Trenton. I am a resident and 33-year member of the community here in the City of Trenton.

I am also the Secretary of Partnerships for Trenton, representing a wide swath of community individuals.

The opposition is not small (*sic*), is a comment that was made here tonight; and I beg to differ -- that the representatives of the various stakeholder groups who have come before you today represent a numerous number of different constituencies and sectors that are concerned about this project.

I would particularly like to undergird the comments of Ingrid Reed, Mr. Powell, Mr. Gordon, and Minister Ingram -- the fact that they are providing the foundational elements, the historical elements of how development has taken place here, particularly in regards to the State capital in the City of Trenton, and what we should be trying to do differently.

It is presumptuous to presume that the opposition is small. The opposition from the residents and people who live here in the city, residents whose neighborhoods continue--

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Sir.

MS. MELICK: Sorry; we're a little short right now. We're going to have to take a break until we get enough people in the room.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Could you please -- just please--

MR. GASKINS: Oh, we don't have a--

MR. KOTLER (Commission Counsel): Quorum.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Please, please -- sir, your comments are important. We just need to take a break.

MR. GASKINS: That's fine; thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. GASKINS: Thank you very much.

(meeting recesses)

(meeting resumes)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much for your patience there for a moment.

Sir, I'm sorry to have interrupted your testimony.

MR. GASKINS: That's okay.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Why don't you please start where you left off?

Thank you.

MR. GASKINS: I believe that the point I was trying to make was that the opposition to this project is not small, all right? There is a wide array of different constituent groups that are coming today to speak against it. Folks who have good historically referential knowledge, folks who are part of the foundational elements of the way development between the city and the State of New Jersey has been prescribed, and who are speaking out saying that this project operates against that rubric.

I'm particularly concerned about the ability of community individuals and residents to have participated in this. I think it is disingenuous for the State to come forth and say, "We've had a number of public hearings, and we sat down, and we have spoken with the City of Trenton." Cavorting with the City of Trenton and its leadership is not necessarily touching the members of the community.

We are very concerned about the people whose neighborhoods continue to fester in poverty, in spite of the State -- probably an overabundance of State properties that exist here in the City of Trenton and its circumscribed investment strategy. I respect the work that the union members do. I have to, however, question how many of those union members are going to be residents of the City of Trenton. Where are the project labor agreements and smart abatement strategies that are going to ensure that the city gets some return on its investment in regard to this project? We are very, very concerned about that. It's why we stood, before, at the last hearing; it's why we stood at EDA and spoke about, "Where is

the impact statement, what is going to be the impact on the physical and human environment for the people who live here in the city?”

It’s disingenuous to think that State workers are going to go up and down South Broad Street, or North Broad Street, in the condition that it is now. There must be some investment in the social capital of the people who live here in the city; and following the guidance of folks like Ms. Reed, the Powells, and others who have come before you to speak about different ways that that can be done, is one way to ensure that that happens.

We want the project; the money needs to be invested here. We’re asking the State to think diligently, and purposefully, and in intentional ways about how to do that and get the best benefit and return on investment for the people who live here -- not for the developers, not for the short-term money that will be made -- but for the people who live here in the city and need to peruse (*sic*) the streets on a day-to-day basis.

Thank you very much. (applause)

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Much appreciated.

A N N E L a B A T E: Hi, my name Anne LaBate. I’m a resident of Trenton, and I have a business downtown.

And this is actually the third meeting in a row at which I have testified. I wasn’t going to testify this time, but I see changes in faces and people who are here. And this is actually a very crucial -- obviously, a crucial meeting.

The point that I want to make this time is a little bit different. As our Assemblyman Wayne DeAngelo did, I’d like to ask the Labor folks to raise their hands again. You all here, yes? (addresses the audience)

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: (off mike)
They're in the bathroom -- some of them. (laughter)

MS. LaBATE: Okay.

The point I want to make is that those are the sure winners here. No matter what happens -- thank you -- these guys will do the work, and we want that.

The point is, Trentonians want to be winners too. And, in fact, the way this plan is now, we will be sure losers. This is a bad plan, and we knew it right off.

Now, you question that the city is saying it's okay. It's telling that I've been here for the last three meetings -- the Mayor hasn't shown up yet. I think we can read into that that they were not partners. The State showed up and said, "These are the parameters. We're looking at three sites," or, "We're looking at State-owned sites only." It's kind of like when you buy a used car; do you want it, or not? It's not a new car; you're not going to get to pick colors, (indiscernible), stick, features; do you want it, or not? And that's the option that the city was given. And they're political enough to not say it, but that's what's happening here.

We are a part of a big horse-trading deal that seems to be going on; bigger than all of us, and I guess that's why the voters don't really feel the need to be here. I guess maybe it's all been decided. And that's troubling, because this isn't something that will last a fiscal cycle, and if it's a bad decision it's going to run out. This is a decision that's going to affect Trenton for generations. These buildings will last 40 years. The union jobs will last for a year or two. If this is done badly, the repercussions of a mediocre, ill-thought out project will live with us for 20 years.

Yes, we all got tax increases. Trenton doesn't have a tax base to speak of because the State sits on all of it, and we're looking for ratables out of this; absolutely. We need to; we'd be crazy not to. We're dying here. We're a company town; you're the company, and decisions are being made outside this room in the interest of whomever.

So we're pawns, and we see that. But we really need you to rise to the needs of your Capital City. This belongs to the State. We need to thrive; we cannot be pawns. We need to be winners. And with a delay and a well-thought out project, we can be winners, as well as our brothers and sisters of Labor.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Ms. LaBate.

Please.

A S S E M B L Y W O M A N E L I Z A B E T H M A H E R M U O I O:
Assemblywoman Liz Muoio; representing the 15th Legislative District, which includes Trenton.

I first want to preface my remarks by, again, emphasizing that no one here today -- I haven't heard -- I've listened to all the testimony -- no one here is opposed to the idea of new construction in the city, or with the idea that action needs to be taken with regards to the current buildings.

And I think from the testimony today it's clear that the goal is not only to build new buildings and provide those jobs that go with that construction, but also creating a renaissance in the city, a building renaissance that would create even more jobs, and more development, and more growth in the city. That's the goal of people testifying here today, regardless of what side of the issue you're on.

The concern today, though, is with local input, and ensuring that the State's plans take into account the long-range plans and vision of the city embodied in the *Trenton 250* master plan. Just as people in any town in this state would expect the same assurances in the face of a large-scale development in their hometown, the residents of Trenton want to know, understandably, that their vision for the city, their master plan for their city, is being considered and respected.

The testimony today I think makes clear that that was not the case. And it's not this Commission, it's not the EDA; it was in the statement that you heard earlier that the parameters were given by the State to the EDA. So the EDA was handed a plan and was told to make it work.

And as Mr. Powell stated earlier, smart growth principles do not seem to be at play here. This is not a plan that takes smart growth into account. And that's because the parameters set by the State did not make smart growth a priority. From what we heard it was State land to State land; smart growth did not seem to-- I have not heard one person testify at this point that smart growth was a priority in determining where these sites are going to be placed.

And in Trenton's case, in particular, I want to urge the Commission to consider this. We have a unique situation that puts a greater premium on State and local cooperation with regards to building and infrastructure endeavors. Roughly one-third of Trenton's land is owned by the State; one-third. No other city or municipality in this state faces that same situation.

So that makes the State, essentially, Trenton's largest landowner. And so it's virtually impossible to envision an effective or meaningful master plan in Trenton if the State is not a cooperative partner. Smart growth should not be only the city's priority; it should also be the State's priority. The fact-- Ingrid Reed testified, too, regarding the lack of an impact statement. I'm encouraged by the fact that they're going to do an impact statement; but to the extent the impact statement is tied to these locations, we should have an impact statement before you agree that this is the correct plan.

So I urge you to keep in mind the challenges -- the unique challenges we face here in the City of Trenton. We want a renaissance in this city; nobody wants that more than the people in this room, residents and Labor alike. The city deserves a renaissance, and we're hoping that will happen. But please keep in mind the importance of smart growth, the importance of the fact that this is a generational building project for this city, and please keep that in mind when you vote today.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblywoman Muoio.

I appreciate those comments.

Do we have any other members of the public who want to be heard?

There's a gentleman in the back; thank you.

IRVIN R. BERKEL, P.A.: Good morning.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Good morning.

My name is Irv Berkel; Doctor Berkel. I own a vocational school in Trenton for the last 17 years, right on the corner of Calhoun and West State streets; Berkel Training Institute.

In the years that I have been here, I honestly can say that I have not seen a lot of growth in the City of Trenton. When I first proposed to put the school here in Trenton, I looked at other municipalities. But Trenton was the most deserving. The students who I serve here in Trenton are often individuals who -- they have their high school diploma or GED; they are very thankful for the fact that the school is here. But they don't see any advancement in terms-- Some of my students often tell me, "Dr. Berkel, Irv Berkel, as soon as I get my certificate, I want to leave Trenton." Now, that should not ever be. We have invested in the school; we train a lot of individuals -- CNAs, home health aides, EKG, etc. We often give them the beginning. A good portion of my students go on to LPN school, RN school, social work; and I know, because I go to their graduations. But overall, they just don't feel that Trenton is where they should be. It's not offering enough for them.

Now, what I could tell you from other cities -- I'm a so-called *transplanted New Yorker*; I come from Brooklyn, New York. And I have seen Brooklyn -- the redevelopment, and the way that the community has put it together, is really awesome. If you haven't looked into that, you really ought to look into that. I've seen Baltimore, where I have family members. So why is that we cannot do the same here in Trenton? We are not the forgotten.

And one last thing. Usually around 4:00, 4:30, 5:00 p.m., when I go outside my building -- which I'm right across the street from the

new Thomas Edison nursing building -- all I can see is an array of cars, a lot of State workers who are leaving Trenton, going across the bridge. So where is that investment? You know, you really have to ask yourself honestly. And sometimes it's at the point where, at times, I thought of even leaving Trenton myself because I haven't seen the growth that is necessary in order to keep everyone here.

So I am pleading with you; as the other speakers have said, we are not opposed to growth, but it has to be on an equal share. So that is what I would like to share with you today.

Thank you so much.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, sir.

Are there any other members of the public who wish to be heard on this matter? (no response)

Any members of the Commission want to be heard -- questions or comments? (no response)

Hearing none, then I will call for a motion and second.

MS. MELICK: I move that we pass this.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: We have a motion; this is on No. 3.

MR. KOTLER: No. 2.

MS. MELICK: No. 2.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: No. 2; a motion on No. 2.

Is there a second?

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

Okay; any further discussion? (no response)

I'll call the roll, then.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I'd like to just say a couple of words, if I may, before voting.

Three weeks ago I wasn't able to make this meeting. And Assemblyman Gusciora called me and said, "Could I go in your place? I'm very passionate about this, I'm opposed to this." He showed up here; his passion was on display, I read the transcript, and he was able to put this vote off; and we thought that would be the end of it. I would have preferred that, and not be here today.

But I am here today, and I have to make a decision. There are already enough votes to move this. And I am going to disappoint someone today, because colleagues who I respect on both sides of this issue have talked to me about this. And so I am going to disappointment someone today.

Look, I served four years on a planning board, and I can tell you that if a developer came and said, "I want to build a convent on this

lot,” there will be people who will come out and say, “That’s not the right place to put it; you should put it over there.” There will be people who will object to everything.

So for me today, what weighs heavily is that -- we hear from the Director of Housing and Economic Development for the City of Trenton, who says she and the government support this plan, and that they understand--

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: Can I just interrupt you and vote “yes”? Because my daughter-in-law is being -- she’s across-- I’ve been waiting all morning to watch her be sworn in as a judge, so--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Sure.

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: Thank you.

Can I vote “yes”?

Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Sorry; no problem. Sorry.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Are you coming back?

MR. KOTLER: Assemblyman--

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: (off mike) What’s that?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman?

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: Excuse me?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman, are you--

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: (off mike) I just voted.

MR. KOTLER: Assemblyman--

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: (off mike) Jon,
(indiscernible)

MR. KOTLER: Is it just for No. 2 you’re leaving a vote?

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: I left my “yes” votes.

MR. KOTLER: But we need it on the record, sir. So, is it “yes” for the rest of the agenda?

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: That’s correct; yes.

MR. KOTLER: Okay; including the judicial pension?

ASSEMBLYMAN BRAMNICK: That’s correct.

MR. KOTLER: Okay; thank you sir.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And I’m sorry, Minority Leader, that I took up that much time.

But I just wanted to explain that-- Look, I’d rather this were tabled and moved on. It’s going to pass today; there are already enough votes before I even vote. And so because the city supports this, and because we’re going to be putting people to work, I will join the “yes.”

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Assemblyman.

And Assemblyman Bramnick has indicated he is in the affirmative on this matter.

That motion passes.

Okay, I guess on to No. 3.

Does anyone have any other comments with regard to No. 3? This is with regard to RPR 18-05B, Block 10701, Lot 3, City of Trenton, Mercer County. (no response)

Okay, I’ll need a motion on that matter.

MS. MELICK: So moved.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; moved and seconded.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon. (no response)

Senator Gordon, on--

Senator Gordon; I'm sorry.

SENATOR GORDON: I'm sorry?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: This is actually on No. 3 on the agenda.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Yes; thank you, sir.

Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman Bramnick is in the affirmative as well.

That matter passes. (applause)

We are now moving on to No. 4 on the agenda.

Matters Nos. 4, 5, and 6 are the same- -- or similarly situated matters.

No. 4 is RPR 18-06, Woodbridge Developmental Center, Block 875, part of Lot 1.01, Woodbridge Township, Middlesex County.

The State of New Jersey requests approval to lease 9 +/- acres of surplus property, located on the grounds of the former Woodbridge Developmental Center, to the New Jersey Economic Development Authority as part of a lease/leaseback for financing the construction of a future Juvenile Justice Commission facility in the Northern New Jersey Region.

The lease will be for a term of 30 years.

I'm going to read the other two, Nos. 5 and 6.

RPR 18-07, Ancora Hospital, Block 6801, part of Lot 1, Winslow Township, Camden County.

The State of New Jersey requests approval to lease 6.5 +/- acres of surplus property, located on the grounds of Ancora Hospital, to the New Jersey Economic Development Authority, as part of a lease/leaseback for financing the construction of a future Juvenile Justice Commission facility in the Southern New Jersey Region.

The lease will be for a term of 30 years.

And finally, project No. 6; project RPR 18-08, Stuyvesant Avenue, Block 322, Lot 75 and part of Lots 3 and 74, Ewing Township, Mercer County.

The State of New Jersey requests approval to lease 22 +/- acres of surplus property to the New Jersey Economic Development Authority as part of a lease/leaseback for financing the construction of a future Juvenile Justice Commission facility to be located in the Central New Jersey Region.

The lease will be for a 30-year term.

So those are the three matters up for consideration.

So would anyone like to be heard on this matter?

The Attorney General, please step up.

CHRISTOPHER S. PORRINO: Okay; so thanks for giving me an opportunity to say a few words.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Absolutely, General.

MR. PORRINO: Let me just talk for a minute about the genesis of this project.

One of my first brainstorming sessions after being confirmed as Attorney General -- I was presented with a serious problem that affects how justice is dispensed to juveniles in the State of New Jersey. It's not something that I had any exposure to previously in private practice, but I learned pretty quickly that the national model -- the model that's being implemented around the country -- we were trying to implement. And we had certain policy reforms in play. But the physical plant that we had, the largest detention facility for juveniles in the state, was not in any way, shape, or form consistent with that national model -- which is obviously designed to rehabilitate individuals who are young enough, individuals who can be rehabilitated, individuals who have not yet fully formed their approach to life, kids who had made mistakes, and kids who should have a chance.

And basically what I learned is pretty simple. Big, old, prison facilities in locations that are entirely remote are not what these individuals need. And what they need, and what the national model has moved to -- and you see these large prisons that were built for kids in the 1800s being knocked down around the country -- are smaller group settings, nearer to

their communities and to mass transit, so that people can come -- their families, their relatives, and their friends -- to visit them.

You know, and I heard this; and it was presented to me, and I listened. But like anything else, being there makes it different. And so I took a trip down to Jamesburg; the official name is the *Training School for Boys*. And I will tell you that as we turned into the site it hit me right then. There's a wrought-iron gate, there's a sign in wrought-iron constructed above the gate. It has the numbers 1866; which is, I guess, when they started construction. And the Training School for Boys has its, sort of, logo on top in this wrought iron, and it's *State Home for Boys*.

And I will tell you that it hit me as something that, you know, back when, I guess it was designed to make those who were entering feel better; to make the people who lived nearby feel better. It struck me as misleading, because let me tell you one thing. After going through those gates, and going through the fences, and past the barbed wire, that's not a home. And if that is your home, you are one very, very unhappy juvenile; and your family's heart is being ripped out as a result of the conditions that are there.

So after taking that tour, after getting educated myself, we went to work. You know, the project, I will say, is pretty straightforward. The facility that we're looking to shut down is really two; but the main one is in Jamesburg. Constructed, as I said, in 1866 or 1867; it's 150 years old. Many of the same buildings that were built in 1867 are still there today. And it was designed over 900 acres; 900 acres, 68 buildings. And it was designed to put thousands of kids away where no one would see them; and

they would be out of sight, out of mind, locked up with the key thrown away.

Not much has changed at Jamesburg, except the model for dealing with juvenile justice in the State of New Jersey has changed a lot. And so we're not putting kids away and throwing away the key anymore. And so a facility that was designed to house thousands, now houses -- wait for it -- on average, 144; 144 people, 144 individuals, who are on 900 acres in 68 -- they don't use all 68 buildings -- but with a facility that has 68 buildings on it.

So do the math, right? Nine hundred acres; that's 6.25 acres per kid; 6.25 acres per kid, two kids per building.

Now, I don't know if the information is in front of you, or if you've heard already what the cost is, on an annual basis, to run Jamesburg. Those of you who were involved in the budget process know this. Over \$44 million; \$44 million to run that facility. So for those of you who own a calculator, let's do the division: 144 individuals, divided by \$44 million per year, is \$306,000 per year, per kid; \$306,000 per year, per kid. One year at Jamesburg.

So I sat down last night as I was trying to figure how best to make this point. And I Googled what it cost to go to Harvard; it's about \$60,000 a year, with room and board; four years at Harvard. And after you graduate, a \$50,000 down payment on a new home. That's what one year at Jamesburg costs for each kid who's there.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Why?

MR. PORRINO: Why?

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. PORRINO: Because it is an enormous, outdated facility that needs to be staffed in a way that is inefficient; because there are no -- there are many, many sight-lines that are obstructed. And the buildings are falling down, so they consistently have to be rebuilt. The roofs are breaking and leaking; I mean, it's a-- I encourage you, one day, to make a trip; it's extraordinary.

But if you said to me, you know, as the person who's responsible for the rehabilitation of these individuals-- And this is the other side of my job. We put lots of people in jail, but we're also responsible, on the juvenile justice side, for rehabilitating. If you said to me, "We're spending \$306,000 a year per kid; but you know what? We have an extraordinary operation. We are turning lives around and we're making it work;" I'd say, "It's a lot of money, but at least we're doing the right thing and we're moving in the right direction." The unfortunate truth is, we're spending that money, and we're moving in the wrong direction. It is like, you know, dropping a significant portion of that -- and I'll get into it in a second -- in the toilet every year.

This is not-- The concept of what we're proposing is not controversial. It's consistent with all the best practices and all the models that are out there being utilized around the country. And as I said, it's for all the reasons that you would expect. Kids being in a big prison facility that people can't get to, to visit -- that is dangerous for the JJC staff, and dangerous for the individuals who are there because they can't be properly supervised -- is a bad thing.

The proposal that we have is one that was developed -- it's consistent with these national models; we had the experts in. We worked

hard, as a Department. This is -- for better or for worse, this is not coming from any sort of political incentive or motive. This is a straightforward attempt by my office and the Department of Law and Public Safety to turn a bad, very expensive, and overpriced operation into something that makes sense.

So our position is -- and I think you'll agree -- that it's not only socially responsible, but it's fiscally responsible as well.

The plan is, quite simply, to shut down Jamesburg. And you may have heard about the protests; the families that have lined up outside Jamesburg several times, asking for its closure. We are proposing that it be closed, and in its place -- we stop spending \$44 million a year on operating this outdated facility, and in its place we construct three new state-of-the-art, smaller, group-type facilities in three locations: North, Central, and South.

The first is on a site of the former Woodbridge Developmental Center; 7.5 acres, bordered by a rail network, light industrial, a wooded area, some residences nearby, excellent access to mass transit. And it all happens to be within a quarter-mile of Rahway State Prison and the facility that houses sex offenders for the State.

The second facility is located -- to be located across from Trenton Psychiatric Hospital on Stuyvesant Avenue in West Trenton, between the Library for the Blind and DOT Headquarters. Again, excellent access to mass transit.

The South facility-- And this is all State-owned property, so it's property that is available to us to use; and it was the result of a statewide, exhaustive search by Treasury to find the most suitable sites.

In the South, the site that we've located is on the campus of Ancora Psychiatric Hospital; again, good mass transit service from local cities.

The plan that we're putting forth -- it's not cheap. The price tag is about \$170 million. But I want to stress: With the construction of these three buildings, the operation of them will cost about half of what it costs to run Jamesburg right now. And the reason for the reduction is it takes less staff, and the facilities obviously will be new and not in need of the kind of maintenance that we have here.

And so, the project pays for itself. In addition, it allows us to devote millions of dollars a year to additional programming and rehabilitation for these kids.

Look, I understand that no town, no mayor, nobody who has a facility to rehabilitate troubled kids wants it in their backyard; I understand that. But this is the State House Commission, and the State has to make decisions not just based on what is favored locally. And I think -- I hope I have described the locations in a way that help underscore the fact that they're not dropped inside of country club, residential neighborhoods. They are strategically placed in areas that made sense for what they are.

But at the end of the day, someone has to speak for these kids. They don't get to vote, right? They don't get to vote. They don't have a voice. They're forgotten and they're pushed aside. It's my job to come in and say, "Wait a second. Somebody has got to do something here." And I apologize that it's taken a long time, and I apologize that, you know, we're running into the end of the Administration and that makes it more complicated.

But the rules have been followed; notices have been provided in accordance with the law. If the notice provisions are not of the liking of anyone who is complaining, or is heard to complain today, well then, you know, the Legislature can change those laws. But notice was provided in accordance with the provisions of the law. And at the end of the day, I hope and pray that the members of this Commission, and the rest of our communities, will think more about the individuals who don't have the opportunity to come here and argue for this, and the families that face those horrors every day.

As I said, I think the project -- I *know* the project is socially correct; I know it's fiscally correct; and I would urge the members of the State House Commission to vote in its favor.

I'm happy to take questions, if you--

Yes; Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Thank you very much for being here today.

One of the last things you mentioned was notification. I am against all three of these, for a variety of reasons. The first reason regarding notification -- I don't know if you have this in front of you, but I'll read it to you. This was a letter from Mayor Barry Wright of Winslow -- who is sitting to your right at the moment -- in which he says, "It was not revealed to the Township until November 13, 2017, after this matter went before the New Jersey State House Commission" -- three weeks ago -- "that this is actually a project to construct a juvenile detention facility under the guise of the Economic Development Authority."

They knew nothing about it. Does that sound like good notification to you?

MR. PORRINO: It's notice consistent with the law, and I'm not the least bit surprised that the Mayor is against it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No, I understand that.

MR. PORRINO: I mean, I get it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: But is that--

MR. PORRINO: I get it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: --the kind of notification in a transparent government that we should be giving to municipalities?

MR. PORRINO: It is notice in accordance with the law, Assemblyman. If you want to change the law, that is your prerogative, not mine.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: That's correct, because we're lawmakers. And I think we should, because when someone wants to put a jail in someone's town, and all they have to do is send a two paragraph letter to the Mayor saying it's an Economic Development project, and they don't have to tell what it is, that tells me that people are hiding something because they know there will be opposition. And that's not transparency.

MR. PORRINO: Look, I--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I'm not asking you what the law is; I'm asking you, do you think--

MR. PORRINO: I'm happy to respond to all that; there's only one thing--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I'm asking you, do you think that that is fair?

MR. PORRINO: I understand that local politicians don't want troubled kids in their neighborhoods; I get it. The development of these facilities-- I mean, it's State property, right? Ancora is State-owned property; it's now a mental institution. There is going to be a small number of acres -- 5 or 6 on a 500- or 600-acre campus, not near any residential facilities at all -- that will be designed, state-of-the-art, to rehabilitate these kids.

With respect to its design, and with respect to its construction, Treasury is more than happy to hear from the local community about what it thinks is appropriate or not appropriate. But at the end of the day, nobody -- nobody wants these kids in their backyard; I get it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No, I get that.

MR. PORRINO: I get it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: That isn't what I'm talking about.

MR. PORRINO: That *is* what you're talking about.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No it isn't. What I'm talking about is notification.

MR. PORRINO: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Don't you find it a bit ironic that if I wanted to put a 20-by-25-foot shed in my backyard, that under zoning laws in the State of New Jersey I would have to give more notification to people who live within 100 yards of me than you've given to the Township of Winslow?

MR. PORRINO: State-owned; Ancora Psychiatric Hospital--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Well, I own my land, and I put a shed on it.

MR. PORRINO: --six hundred acres.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I still have to notify.

MR. PORRINO: This is not your house; this is not your house, and with respect, it's not the Mayor's house either.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay. If that's your answer, that's your answer.

MR. PORRINO: That's my answer.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I find it implausible that that's adequate notification--

MR. PORRINO: I get it.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: --to a town.

MR. PORRINO: I understand.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So let's talk about-- Look, I applaud your compassion, and I applaud the mission. But let's talk about cost-benefit analysis.

You talked about the cost -- of what it costs to incarcerate. We've known for a long time it's cheaper to educate than incarcerate, so it doesn't surprise me that it's cheaper to go to Harvard than be incarcerated. I forget the number--

MR. PORRINO: For a year; one year.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: --was it \$300,000-something

MR. PORRINO: It is \$306,000 a year.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Right. So now we're going to take -- to take care of 150 juveniles who need to be put in a Level 3 prison,

really, we're going to pay \$175 million of taxpayer money, which is about a \$1.7 million for each of those juveniles; a lot more than the \$300,000--

MR. PORRINO: It's not per-year, sir. That's not per-year.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I know, I know.

MR. PORRINO: Okay; that's for the life of the facility.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: I understand.

MR. PORRINO: And if we do anything -- this one lasted 150 years, so--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And then we're going to do this without adequately notifying the 167,000 residents of Woodbridge, Ewing, and Winslow. They're taxpayers; they're going to foot the bill; 167,000 residents are going to be ignored for 150 juveniles who need to be incarcerated at a Level 3 facility that we're going to pay \$175 million for. I just find this unbelievable.

I applaud your compassion; I think we do have to do what we can to better assimilate people back into society. I understand one of the reasons to do this, and have one in the South, and in the Central, and in the North, is so people can be closer to their families so they can visit them. I just don't think that that is paramount above the 167,000 residents who haven't had their voice heard, have been ignored, and this has been pushed through under the cover of darkness. I find it appalling, and I'm--

Go ahead and say whatever you want.

MR. PORRINO: Look, I do really understand. I'm not ignorant to the realities of local government, and the fact that this is unpopular.

All I will say is that from a fiscal perspective, to be clear, this project pays for itself quickly; and still allows dollars to be devoted back into more dollars for training and rehabilitation.

These are sites that were carefully selected: Ancora State Psychiatric Facility and the Woodbridge facility that is bordered by railways and within a quarter-mile of a State prison and a sex offender facility. And, you know, I just -- I understand no one wants it. These locations were strategically developed to create the least impact on the communities that surrounded them. And we believe that it's the right choice for the right reasons, and we hope the Commission will support it.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Any other questions from the members of the State House Commission? (no response)

Mayor, would you like to be heard?

MAYOR BARRY WRIGHT: Yes, please.

My name is Barry Wright; I'm the Mayor of Winslow Township.

MR. PORRINO: I'm going to excuse myself; thank you, Mayor.

MAYOR WRIGHT: And I also am appalled at the -- it's almost deceit that we were faced with, in notification about this facility.

I respect what the Attorney General said; but I was also a member of law enforcement community for 27 years. I'm a retired officer from Winslow Township. And he was right to say it meets the requirements of the law. But I was taught as a police officer that there's the *spirit* of the law and the *letter* of the law. And this excuse for notification -- to myself, and the governing body, and the people of Winslow Township --

in my opinion, is not at all within the spirit of the law. And maybe that's why people have no trust in government today, in this state and in this country.

He talks about the-- The Attorney General talked about the proximity to mass transportation. I might say that the only mass transportation is the New Jersey Transit bus that goes down Route 30. The facility they're talking about constructing is going to require about a two, two-and-a-half mile walk from Route 30.

The other major highway, Route 73 -- there is no mass transportation down there. New Jersey Transit doesn't travel. So its proximity to mass transit -- it just doesn't-- That's not my idea of mass transit -- when people are going to have to walk from White Horse Pike down a dark road, on Spring Garden Road, to this proposed facility.

The whole idea of Ancora Hospital-- And to let you know, you know, we do support the work that is done at Ancora Hospital. As a matter of fact, I attend every one of their Board of Trustees meetings. But we had our troubles with Ancora Hospital for years. You know, as a police officer in Winslow -- from 2000 until 2008, when there was a judicial order that Ancora had to clean up their act when it came to security of the patients -- you know, we were dealing with patients, sometimes violent patients, going onto peoples' properties and into peoples' homes. It was an absolute nightmare. And I will say, Ancora Hospital -- their staff has really come to the front; they've put up security measures that have worked.

But back in the 1970s -- under Brendan Byrne; and Ann Klein was the director, then, of Human Services -- they decided they were going to put a Bayside Prison Annex on the Ancora grounds. And back then, the

Mayor then, the late Dominic Maiese, vehemently opposed that, as well as the residents. And I will say, up until a few months ago, when the prisoners were finally removed, it was a headache for the residents. As a matter of fact, in June of 2016 -- I don't know if the Attorney General is aware of this -- there was an escape from that prison annex. The escape -- the guy escaped at about midnight. The corrections facility finally discovered the escape about 4:00 a.m. The Winslow Police Department -- which is the host community -- was finally notified at 6:40 a.m. Appalling, in my opinion.

So now, you know, we have the residents finally accustomed to a psychiatric facility; and they support that facility and the wonderful work they do for the mentally disabled. And we're finally saying, "Okay, now the prisoners are out of the Ancora facility." But now we're going to construct a juvenile detention center. What are the residents going to think? "What's he going to do?" They talk about economic development? What kind of residential value, depreciation, do you do? Winslow Town-- You know, when that escapee from the correctional facility -- when the news-- For three or four days, on the byline of every news program, *Winslow Township escaped prisoner*. So now the byline is going to be, once again, you know, *Winslow Township*.

And listen, I was a cop for 27 years. I know we need a facility -- an adequate facility for these juveniles. I'm not -- I agree 100 percent that the conditions -- they are deplorable. I visited there, as a police officer and as a detective. But I'm just saying that there was not due process, thought, given to this. I don't think it's a good location. I think when you start to put a juvenile detention center with a mental health facility -- it just isn't

the right thing to do. And once again, you know, the Attorney General said this has been planned -- they've been working on this for how long? When was Winslow Township going to be brought into the equation? That's what I'm trying so-- It's deplorable that that would happen that way.

And economic development? Listen, I applaud economic development; all the things they're doing in Camden City, Atlantic City, and all. But what do they come for, economic development in Winslow Township -- a juvenile detention center. It just doesn't make sense to me.

So I would ask this Commission -- really look at this carefully. If not voting on approving this today, at least give pause and let us sit down and really discuss this. I think the host community, Winslow Township, has a right to be at the table, and we have not been afforded that right.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Mayor Wright. We appreciate your comments.

MAYOR WRIGHT: Any questions?

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Any questions from any members?

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale, please.

SENATOR CARDINALE: What township would like it?

MAYOR WRIGHT: Well, there are other areas. Look at where Leesburg is; that's (indiscernible).

You know, the Attorney General gave some statements about there being no residential homes in the area. I don't think he ever -- actually ever drove around that area, because I'm telling you, there are

residences there, because I'm the one who gets the complaints from the residents in that area.

So there are other areas. New Lisbon has 20-some-acres available there. I'm not saying-- Listen, we'll take the mental hospital, okay? And we support the mental hospital. But Senator, look at my point of view. At least come talk to us. If you're going to smack us in the head, let's sit down and have a conversation before you hit me.

SENATOR CARDINALE: I am looking at your point of view; I was a Mayor myself.

MAYOR WRIGHT: Yes.

SENATOR CARDINALE: And if somebody wanted to put a facility in the town that I represented, I'm sure there would be a lot of objections. But it has to be somewhere. And it seems to me that if it's on the grounds of an existing facility-- Look, if somebody wanted to put that hospital, today, in your town -- if it wasn't there -- I'm sure you can have -- a lot of your residents would object to its being placed there. But it is there.

And it seems to me that they've gone to great lengths to try to have a place where it's going to have less impact than a lot of other places. If they were to put it in the middle of a residential area-- Now, Ancora may be near some residences, but it is Ancora; so they're putting it in Ancora. It just seems to me that while I sympathize with your personal difficulty in dealing with it, it has to go somewhere; it has to go somewhere. And if you knew about it -- I don't know what the notice requirements are; forgive me for that -- but if you had better notice, it doesn't change the location; it doesn't change what your residents are going to feel about it. And I sympathize; you have to deal with those residents, and I appreciate that.

But I just don't see the-- You know, everyone knows the term *NIMBY*, and it's a very valid term. I mean, I wouldn't want it in my backyard; I really wouldn't. But it has to go somewhere. And it seems to me they've gone to some degree of care -- probably more care than normal -- by putting it into a location such as they have. And I sympathize with you; I want you to know that as well. But I just think it has to go somewhere, and what else can we say about it.

MAYOR WRIGHT: Senator, all I can say in response to that is the 42,000 residents of Winslow Township were never talked to, were never consulted about this. Whether it would go through or not, whether it is going to be rubber-stamped -- which is probably going to happen here today -- the fact of the matter is, 42,000 residents of Winslow Township were not given proper notice, according to the spirit of the law, and I find that to be deplorable. And I don't think that's what we should be doing as a government. I don't think it should be that way.

It does have to go someplace; like I said, there are other places that are not within a residential area, that are State-owned property, where this could have gone in South Jersey. But it was not. And under the guise of availability to mass transportation -- that's just a farce; that's not true.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Mayor, could I ask--

Are you finished? I'm sorry, Senator.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes, I'm done.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Mayor, can I ask you a quick question?

I already mentioned this earlier, when the Attorney General was here.

The last time this body met, it was tabled; I could not be here. Did you know at the time of this last meeting, when this could have been approved -- did you know there was going to be a juvenile detention center slated for that area?

MAYOR WRIGHT: This is the only notice I was given, in a letter sent to me by Mr. Shaughnessy, on October 3.

“Dear Mayor Wright, The State of New Jersey, Department of Treasury, on behalf of the Department Human Services, proposes to lease the above piece of property to the Economic Development Authority.”

And then there’s a very short paragraph, stating New Jersey statute, annotated. “Any comments regarding this action, we would appreciate your response by October 17.” Nothing at all about a juvenile detention center. That--

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So at the time that this body met, a few weeks ago, they could have taken action on this and you would have been completely devoid of any knowledge that this was going to be a juvenile detention center; and the 42,000 residents of Winslow wouldn’t even know about it.

MAYOR WRIGHT: Absolutely. I would have had no knowledge, unless I was alerted on that date by somebody who was here that this was being considered even.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And that’s what the top lawmaker in the State of New Jersey -- who’s not here at the moment -- says is *legal notification*. So apparently, that’s the law, which we need to change. But do you think that’s the spirit of proper notification?

MAYOR WRIGHT: It is definitely-- Like I said, after 27 years as an officer, that's in no way, shape, or form-- And you know, I have a degree in common sense; and it's a master's degree in common sense. (laughter) That in no way is under the spirit of the law. I have seven kids who are 14 to 44. If I was to tell them this story, they would say, "Pop, that ain't right." And that's what I'm saying.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Now, in your town, if I wanted to put a shed in my backyard--

MAYOR WRIGHT: You have to go through Zoning, you have to make sure it's properly zoned. You have to go to the Planning Board.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And who would I have to notify?

SENATOR GORDON: Everyone within 250 feet.

MAYOR WRIGHT: You'd have to notify the surrounding residents.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And would I have to tell them what I'm planning to put up?

MAYOR WRIGHT: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: How does that make any sense here? We're talking about a prison, a Level 3 prison for 50 people, which we're going to pay \$60 million for, that we're going to stick in his town; nobody knows about it. At the time of this actual board meeting the last time, he didn't know about it. Now, is that fair?

Let me ask you another question, Mayor. You have Ancora there. Do you-- If they came to you and said, "We want to sit down and

talk about this, why would it be okay here,” would you entertain sitting down and talking about this?

MAYOR WRIGHT: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: You have 900 acres of land at Ancora.

MAYOR WRIGHT: Absolutely. You know, and that’s why I said, I attend every Board of Trustees meeting at Ancora. Of course, we haven’t had one lately, because they haven’t appointed replacement trustees, for one reason or another. But I actually notified -- I spoke yesterday on the phone with the Deputy CEO of Ancora Hospital, and he also spoke to the CEO. I said, “Do you guys have any idea about a juvenile--” They said, “Absolutely not. All we knew is, they came down and looked at some of the property for an economic development project.”

And I still say a juvenile detention center as an economic development project -- that’s-- Once again, the common sense rule comes in. That doesn’t sound right.

So if the CEO and Deputy CEO of Ancora Hospital don’t have knowledge of it, and Winslow doesn’t have-- Who does have knowledge of it? Definitely not the people who are directly affected; not the 42,000 residents, not the governing body and the Mayor, and not the CEO and the Deputy CEO of Ancora Hospital.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: That just doesn’t seem fair; when you have to notify people that you want to put a shed in your backyard, but you can put a Level 3 jail in someone’s backyard and nobody knows it. And for that reason, I would make a motion to table Nos. 4, 5, and 6.

SENATOR GORDON: Madam Chair.

I'm going to second that motion.

I don't disagree with the Attorney General that we need a new approach to juvenile justice, and new facilities to go with that approach; and that the current facility is not cost-effective. But at the very least, these are important decisions, and I think the next Administration should be the organization that makes those decisions, shapes the policies -- hopefully in concert with the local stakeholders.

So I'm going to second that motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: And at the very least, I would ask this pause to at least go and talk to these communities -- and I'm speaking especially for the Mayor in my District, because I know he was not of any understanding of what was going on. He's telling me Ancora doesn't even know it. And I just don't think that's the right way to do business.

Meet with them; if they have objections, come back. At least you met with them; they know what's going on. Show them some plans, and we'll move forward.

So I've made my motion; here's a second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; motion and second to table Nos. 4, 5, and 6.

Is there anyone else who wants to be heard? (no response)

Any members in the audience, or the public, who wish to be heard on this matter?

JENNIFER KEYES - MALONEY: So, very quickly, I'm Jennifer Keyes from Ewing Township.

And the reason -- I actually would like to echo the Mayor's concern and add a specific detail related to the parcel that's located in Ewing Township. I had a chance to speak with some of the offices with regard to this particular parcel.

What makes the property in Ewing very unique is that, in addition to the fact that, as the Mayor indicated, we did not receive notice with regard to what was going on with the property, more importantly, it's located adjacent to a boarding school for children; a boarding school that looks to, actually, work with inner city youth; in essence, creating an innovative, educational environment for them where they are there 24/7.

And so, very candidly, we would welcome those conversations with JJC to ensure that, in essence, we're coming up with the best possible parcel within the Township. There are lots of options in Ewing Township; we're about 15 square miles. We have 37,000 people within our town. And this parcel is not in the middle of nowhere; it's actually 2.4 miles, if you will, from, actually, Trenton Psych by driving; a little bit closer than that for the way the crow flies. But the reality is, that this is kind of smack-dab in the middle of the edge of the town, and it's going to have a direct impact on the citizens who live around it and, more importantly, the children who actually live 24/7 right down the street from it.

And so, you know, we welcome those conversations; but we need to have them. And so to echo what Assemblyman Moriarty indicated, they need to be had before we move forward.

And so we would just simply urge you to the table, as the Senator and the Assemblyman have indicated, so that we can have those

conversations and really have an intelligent decision made with regard to each of the parcels in each of the towns.

And I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: If I may.

I didn't catch your name at the beginning

MS. KEYES-MALONEY: Sorry; Jennifer Keyes-Maloney from Ewing Township; I'm on Council.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Okay; thank you very much for showing up here today.

So what notification did you get, and when did you find out that they were planning to put a Level 3 juvenile detention center?

MS. KEYES-MALONEY: So, through my Mayor, who I had a conversation with, as well as my Business Administrator, who was here in November-- In essence, they had similar issues with a very -- in fact, no notice given to the Township. And if it hadn't been for, actually, other legislators who were aware of the actual parcel moving forward, we would have had no ability to review it and have known about the actual change. And that's troublesome.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: So you don't know anything, at this point about the design; whether there's going to be razor fence around it--

MS. KEYES-MALONEY: Unclear.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Unclear. So nobody has talked about anything.

See, this is the problem; because when people decide, "Oh, we'll just do the letter of the law, and we'll send this one paragraph," they're

doing this because they're trying not to let people know what's going on. I mean, that's where the spirit of the law comes in. It's designed to not get-- And I understand why; it's designed not to get people upset, because the people are going to -- kneejerk reaction; we don't want this in our backyard; NIMBY. But the alternative -- hiding things -- is much worse; because if someone comes forward and says, "Look, we're going to put this facility; it's only going to be 40 to 50 people. Here are the safeguards. It's going to be -- you know, we guarantee it's going to be back from the road, it's going to be well-maintained, it's going to have great security," maybe there can be a level of comfort. But to just say, "Here's a paragraph; we're following the letter of the law," and you find out -- not through any official channel, but through back channels -- something doesn't smell right; the smell test is wrong.

Senator, you were a Mayor, I was a Mayor. If that happened to me -- I don't know about you, but if it happened to me, I'd be pretty upset. I would think someone is trying to pull one over on me. And that's why I think, as the Councilwoman says, they'd like to have those meetings; they might find a more appropriate place, or maybe it is the appropriate place. But they haven't had a chance to have even a meeting.

Thank you.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you very much, Assemblyman.

So there's a motion on the table, Counsel--

MR. KOTLER: And a second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: --to table.

MR. KOTLER: Let's vote on each one separately.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay.

This is a vote to table on No. 4; and we have a motion and second to table.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman Bramnick has left his votes, but not on this matter; is that correct?

MR. KOTLER: That is correct. For this Commission, we need five affirmative votes to pass any motions; so this motion fails.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: So then we move on to No. 5.

There is a motion to table, concerning No. 5; and a second on that motion.

Any further discussion? (no response)

If not, I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman Bramnick has not left a vote on this matter.

So that matter is not successful; correct?

MR. KOTLER: Correct.

And No. 6 is RPR 18-08.

Motion to table, and second to table.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Bramnick has not voiced on this matter.

MR. KOTLER: That one fails as well.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; so with regard to No. 4, may I have a motion to approve it?

SENATOR CARDINALE: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale; and a second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Okay; any further discussion with this? (no response)

Hearing none, I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman Bramnick -- he has been marked in the affirmative on that matter.

That matter passes.

No. 5 on the agenda, RPR 18-07.

May I have a motion to approve that?

SENATOR CARDINALE: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale, motion.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy Chief Counsel Melick seconded it.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: And Assemblyman Bramnick has been marked in the affirmative.

That matter passes.

And No. 6, RPR 18-08.

May I have a motion to approve?

SENATOR CARDINALE: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator.

Second?

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you.

I'll call the roll now.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty.

ASSEMBLYMAN MORIARTY: No.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Bramnick has been marked in the affirmative.

That's five in the affirmative; that matter passes.

Okay, moving on to No. 7.

This project has been before this Commission several times. It's Project RPR 07-14A through RPR 07-17D, East Jersey State Prison, Block 908, part of Lot 10, Woodbridge Township, Middlesex County.

For the record, I understand Assemblyman Moriarty has-- Assemblyman Moriarty has to be somewhere else at the moment, so he is a "yes" vote on the balance of the agenda.

So let's move forward.

This project was approved by the State House Commission at its meeting of June 16, 2014, as the direct sale of 15.5 +/- acres of land and improvements, located at the East Jersey State Prison, to Woodbridge Township for a restricted use. This sale was authorized by P.L. 2013, chapter 198.

It is now being requested by Woodbridge Township that the State agree to subordinate its deed to the proposed financing for the future affordable housing project; and the reverter clause in the deed be earlier released. Upon completion of construction of the apartments and the outdoor recreational field, and receipt of all final certificates of occupancy with respect thereto, Woodbridge Township shall submit to the State of New Jersey, by December 31, 2019, evidence of compliance with the covenants, conditions, and restrictions set forth in the recorded deed.

Upon its confirmation and approval, the State shall execute and provide to Woodbridge Township, for recording in the land records, a document which will extinguish the State's rights of reverter and fair market value reimbursement. The proposed amended and restated deed, and subordination in final or substantially final form, are included in the members' packages.

Is there any member who wants to be heard, or has questions on this? (no response)

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

Hearing none, then, may I have a motion on this one?

SENATOR CARDINALE: So moved.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Second.

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

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty has been marked in the affirmative; Assemblyman Bramnick has been marked in the affirmative.

That matter passes.

Now we're moving on to New Business; this is No. 8 on the agenda, DOT requests.

The project is Route 35, Section 8A, Parcels VX22B and VX22C, Block 151, adjoining Lot 1, Wall Township, Monmouth County; Block 44, adjoining Lot 14, Spring Lake Heights, Monmouth County.

DOT is requesting approval to sell a vacant piece of excess surplus property, having an area of approximately 0.038 acres, to the only adjacent property owner -- it's M2K2 1900/OMR LLC -- for assemblage to its existing commercial property for additional off-street parking.

The property will be sold as a direct sale for the purchase price of \$24,000, which is the appraised value.

Does any member have any questions or concerns about this matter? (no response)

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

Hearing none, may I have a motion?

SENATOR GORDON: So moved.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you; motion and second, Senators.

I'll call the roll.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty has been marked in the affirmative; Assemblyman Bramnick has been marked in the affirmative.

That matter has passed.

Finally, on the agenda is the Division of Pensions requests on behalf of the Judicial Retirement System.

I need a motion to adjourn as the State House Commission, and to sit as the Judicial Retirement System Board of Trustees.

May I have a motion?

MS. MELICK: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion; second?

SENATOR GORDON: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

All in favor? (affirmative responses)

Anyone opposed? (no response)

Any abstentions? (no response)

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

May I first have approval of the minutes held on November 13?

May I have a motion?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second?

SENATOR GORDON: Second.

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

SENATOR CARDINALE: Abstain.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Abstain; any other abstentions? (no response)

Okay, thank you.

Then we're on to No. 2.

Confirmation of the death claims, retirements, and survivor benefits.

May I have a motion on that?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion; thank you.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Motion and second.

I'll call the roll for that.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty and Assemblyman Bramnick have been marked in the affirmative from previous votes.

That matter passes.

And the final one is just a vote on the receipt of the financial statements for July 2017.

May I have a motion for that?

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Motion.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Second?

SENATOR GORDON: Second.

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

Oh, I'm sorry. I have to take a voice vote; pardon me.

Deputy Chief Counsel Melick.

MS. MELICK: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Deputy State Treasurer Schermerhorn.

MS. SCHERMERHORN: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Acting Director Ridolfino.

MR. RIDOLFINO: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Cardinale.

SENATOR CARDINALE: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Senator Gordon.

SENATOR GORDON: Yes.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Assemblyman Moriarty and Assemblyman Bramnick, both in the affirmative.

That matter passes.

If there is no other business, we need a motion to go back to sit as the State House Commission.

SENATOR GORDON: So moved.

MS. MELICK: Second.

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

Any opposed? (no response)

Any abstentions? (no response)

Okay, we're now sitting as the State House Commission.

And if there is no other business before the State House Commission today that anyone has, then may I have a motion to adjourn?

SENATOR GORDON: So moved.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Senator.

MS. MELICK: Second.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Thank you, Deputy Chief Counsel.

We are adjourned.

Thank you for your time, and the investment of your time.

Thank you.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)

APPENDIX

From: Jean Public <jeanpublic1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 06, 2017 1:55 PM
To: State House Commission; yourviews@app.com; jungaro@gannett.com; info@taxpayer.net; media@cagw.org; info@njtaxes.org; info@afphq.org
Subject: public comment for meeting of State House Commission on December 7, 2017 at 9 am in State House Trenton NJ

as to the numbered items on the agenda:

2. deny additional lands for new expensive health building. there are plenty of open spaces to rent space for any additional health dept employees, and the taxpayers of this state should not be gouged to build a new state building. that is gross in view of the financial deficit already spent by our legislators and the fact that there is plenty of large open spaces for rent reasonably since so many businesses are moving out of nj due to the high taxes here in nj both for businesses and ordinary citizens. Deny.

3. Deny approval. Taxpayers cannot afford to build a new taxation building. rent space. there is plenty available due to the fact that so many businesses and people are leaving nj due to the high taxes that the legislators have caused with overspending. Deny.

4. deny approval. There is no reason for taxpayers to fund a new building for Juvenile Justice when there is so much available open space due to businesses and citizens leaving this state due to high taxes. Use of space on a rental or leased basis, and since there is so much unused space already rented that nobody in govt even uses, it is clear that taxpayers should not be gouged to fund new buildings for state employees. The level of taxation required to build all these new buildings is obscene. rent instead.

5. deny There is no reason for taxpayers to fund a new building for Juvenile Justice when there is so much available open space due to businesses and citizens leaving this state due to high taxes. Use of space on a rental or leased basis, and since there is so much unused space already rented that nobody in govt even uses, it is clear that taxpayers should not be gouged to fund new buildings for state employees. The level of taxation required to build all these new buildings is obscene. rent instead.

6. Deny There is no reason for taxpayers to fund a new building for Juvenile Justice when there is so much available open space due to businesses and citizens leaving this state due to high taxes. Use of space on a rental or leased basis, and since there is so much unused space already rented that nobody in govt even uses, it is clear that taxpayers should not be gouged to fund new buildings for state employees. The level of taxation required to build all these new buildings is obscene. rent instead.

7. No deed on property owned by nj taxpayers should ever be allowed to be subordinate. This state's taxpayers cannot afford to be vulnerable for the financial stupidity of the development process.

8. Judicial pensions are too high. it is best to take steps to bring them down to the level of other govt employees, not so much higher. There is no reason for this financial superiority of judges. it is discriminatory.

these comments are for the public record please receipt. jean public1@gmail.com.