
Commission Meeting

of

STATE HOUSE COMMISSION

LOCATION: Committee Room 7
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey

DATE: September 29, 2025
9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION PRESENT:

Assad Akhter, Chair
Senator Michael L. Testa, Jr.
Assemblywoman Eliana Pintor-Marin
Assemblyman John DiMaio
Aaron Binder
Tariq Shabazz



ALSO PRESENT:

Dominic Rota
Commission Secretary

Rafael Soto-Irizaray
Pension Benefit Specialist 2

Cynthia Bussell
Government Rep 3
N.J. Department of Treasury

Tamara Loatman-Clark, Esq.
Deputy Attorney General for the State House Commission

Joseph Salvo, Esq.
Deputy Attorney General for the Judicial Retirement System

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 Vaz Borough Commissioner Seaside Heights Borough	5
Robert Tighue Real Estate Specialist Division of Property Management and Construction New Jersey Department of Treasury	7
Bruce Bergen, Esq. County Counsel Union County	15
Judeth Yeany, Esq. Senior Regulatory Officer Office of Transactions and Public Land Administration New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection	18
William Nierstedt Private Citizen	20
Kathy Cevallos President Friends of Rahway River Parkway	23
David Williams Private Citizen	25
Michael DuHaime President Cranford Hockey Club	27
Robert Moss Private Citizen	28
Kevin Campbell, Esq. Assistant County Counsel Union County	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Jonathan Chipko Consulting Actuary Cheiron	37
Janet Cranna Principal Consulting Actuary Cheiron	37
APPENDIX:	
Testimony submitted by William Nierstedt	1x
Testimony submitted by Kathy Cevallos	5x
Testimony submitted by David Williams	26x
Testimony submitted by Michael DuHaime	56x
Testimony submitted by Kevin Campbell, Esq.	57x
Testimony submitted by Nicole Adler Private Citizen	61x
Testimony submitted by Gregory Akselband Private Citizen	62x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Joao Almeida Private Citizen	63x
Testimony submitted by Jennifer Arianas and Paul Arianas Private Citizens	64x
Testimony submitted by Dan Atieh Private Citizen	65x
Testimony submitted by Jon Ball Treasurer Cranford Hockey	66x
Testimony submitted by Jose Beiro Private Citizen	67x
Testimony submitted by Gloria Binkowski Private Citizen	68x
Testimony submitted by Heidi Bogatz Private Citizen	69x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Paula Borenstein Private Citizen	70x
Testimony submitted by Frank Briamonte Private Citizen	71x
Testimony submitted by David Cacciatore Private Citizen	72x
Testimony submitted by Monica Campion Private Citizen	73x
Testimony submitted by Christine Carman and Jeff Carman Private Citizens	74x
Testimony submitted by Margaret Carroll Private Citizen	75x
Testimony submitted by Michael Carulli Private Citizen	76x
Testimony submitted by Lindsay Clark Private Citizen	77x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Caralyn Cooley Private Citizen	78x
Testimony submitted by Don Cooley Private Citizen	79x
Testimony submitted by Stacy Craig Private Citizen	80x
Testimony submitted by Diana Bryer Private Citizen	81x
Testimony submitted by Mirela Deitz Private Citizen	82x
Testimony submitted by Catherine Dougherty Private Citizen	83x
Testimony submitted by Kevin Dougherty Private Citizen	84x
Testimony submitted by Kevin Dougherty Private Citizen	85x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Robert Duda Private Citizen	86x
Testimony submitted by William Dyer Private Citizen	87x
Testimony submitted by Erin Egan Private Citizen	88x
Testimony submitted by Jack Egan Private Citizen	89x
Testimony submitted by Mary Elmquist Private Citizen	90x
Testimony submitted by Trish Fairweather Cody Private Citizen	91x
Testimony submitted by Mary Feeley Private Citizen	92x
Testimony submitted by Nicole Feeley Private Citizen	93x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Evan Fischbein Private Citizen	94x
Testimony submitted by Stephen Fischbein Private Citizen	95x
Testimony submitted by David Gaetano and Jamie Gaetano Private Citizens	96x
Testimony submitted by Kair Gebauer Private Citizen	97x
Testimony submitted by Cathy Gennaro and Chris Gennaro Private Citizens	98x
Testimony submitted by David Gerlach Private Citizen	99x
Testimony submitted by Marni Ginter Private Citizen	100x
Testimony submitted by Tony Gonzales Private Citizen	101x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Lisa Gootzeit Private Citizen	102x
Testimony submitted by Richard Grawehr Private Citizen	103x
Testimony submitted by Mark Griffith Private Citizen	104x
Testimony submitted by James Haroldson Private Citizen	105x
Testimony submitted by Eric Hausker Private Citizen	106x
Testimony submitted by Michael Christopher Hennie Private Citizen	107x
Testimony submitted by Marilou Ilie Private Citizen	108x
Testimony submitted by Yanna Jiang Private Citizen	109x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Tracy Johnston Private Citizen	110x
Testimony submitted by Kelly Kleiner Private Citizen	111x
Testimony submitted by Jason LaBarge Private Citizen	112x
Testimony submitted by Dever Lagola Private Citizen	113x
Testimony submitted by Michael Lagola Private Citizen	114x
Testimony submitted by John D. Linson NJ Licensed Tree Expert	115x
Testimony submitted by Mario LoPresti Private Citizen	133x
Testimony submitted by Kathryn Malone Private Citizen	134x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Rachael Mandel Private Citizen	135x
Testimony submitted by Daphnie Manzione Private Citizen	136x
Testimony submitted by David McDonald Private Citizen	139x
Testimony submitted by Mariel Mendoza Private Citizen	140x
Testimony submitted by David Munsky Private Citizen	141x
Testimony submitted by Jessica Muroff Private Citizen	142x
Testimony submitted by Christopher Murphy Private Citizen	143x
Testimony submitted by Hadyn Murphy Private Citizen	144x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Kendal Murphy Private Citizen	145x
Testimony submitted by Rebecca Murphy Private Citizen	146x
Testimony submitted by Meg Najarian Private Citizen	147x
Testimony submitted by Alec Nisbet Private Citizen	148x
Testimony submitted by Sasha Nisbet Private Citizen	149x
Testimony submitted by Lucas Paine Private Citizen	150x
Testimony submitted by Anthony Paolillo and Christina Paolillo Private Citizens	151x
Testimony submitted by Christina Paolillo Private Citizen	152x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Chris Payette Private Citizen	153x
Testimony submitted by Danny Perriello Private Citizen	154x
Testimony submitted by Jennifer Soares Private Citizen	155x
Testimony submitted by Valentina Rozanova Private Citizen	156x
Testimony submitted by Kelly Sacchetti Private Citizen	157x
Testimony submitted by Rick Sacchetti Private Citizen	158x
Testimony submitted by Dale Schwebel Private Citizen	159x
Testimony submitted by Matthew Schwebel Private Citizen	160x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Jared Shechtman Private Citizen	161x
Testimony submitted by Jonathan Sinnott Private Citizen	162x
Testimony submitted by Carolee Smith Private Citizen	163x
Testimony submitted by Quinn G. Solomon Private Citizen	164x
Testimony submitted by Jennifer Strahan Private Citizen	165x
Testimony submitted by Heather Tanella Private Citizen	166x
Testimony submitted by Lauren Talbot Private Citizen	167x
Testimony submitted by Shayne Temple Private Citizen	168x

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDIX (continued)

Testimony submitted by Angelica Valenza and Mike Valenza Private Citizens	169x
Testimony submitted by Adam Van Duzer Private Citizen	170x
Testimony submitted by Jaelyn Van Duzer Private Citizen	171x
Testimony submitted by Marisa Wilhelm Private Citizen	172x
Testimony submitted by Sean Wilhelm Private Citizen	173x
Testimony submitted by Monika Zareba Private Citizen	174x

ASSAD AKHTER (Chair): I will call the meeting to order.

We are in compliance with Open Public Meetings Act; notice of the meeting of the State House Commission was given by the way of notice of September 22, 2025; filed with the Secretary of State; distributed to the State House Press Corps; and posted on the State House Commission's website.

Assad Akhter, present.

Aaron Binder.

MR. BINDER: Here.

MR. AKHTER: Tariq Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Here.

MR. AKHTER: Senator Smith is absent, (indiscernible).

Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Here.

MR. AKHTER: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Here.

MR. AKHTER: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Here.

MR. AKHTER: We have a quorum.

First item on the agenda, I would like to take a nomination for Dominic Rota to serve as the State House Commission Secretary.

Is there a nomination?

MR. BINDER: Motion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Motion.

MR. AKHTER: Second?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. AKHTER: Second, thanks Assemblyman.

Are there any questions?

SENATOR TESTA: I have a question.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

SENATOR TESTA: Is this a part-time role?

MR. AKHTER: This is a-- In terms of the Commission, or in terms of public employment?

SENATOR TESTA: In terms of the Commission.

MR. AKHTER: In terms of the Commission, he is the-- He would now be the ongoing State House Commission Secretary as the previous Secretary was before.

SENATOR TESTA: OK.

MR. AKHTER: Any other questions?

OK, I'll take the roll.

Chairman, yes.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: OK, I will now turn the meeting over to our new Secretary, Mr. Rota.

MR. ROTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; good morning.

The State House Commission received written comments from several members of the public. They have been distributed to the members and will be made part of the public record. We will now move on to old business.

Agenda item Number 2: Approval of the June 23, 2025 State House Commission meeting minutes. The verbatim record of the June 23, 2025 State House Commission meeting will serve as the official minutes.

May I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. ROTA: Second, thank you.

I'll now call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: OK, agenda item Number 3.

This-- Oh, I'm sorry, we have a quorum. And, motion passes.

OK. Agenda item Number 3. This is--

SENATOR TESTA: --abstain on that, I wasn't here last time.

MR. AKHTER: OK.

Can we correct the record, that Senator Testa abstained on the (indiscernible) of the minutes?

MR. ROTA: Thank you, Senator.

OK. Moving on to agenda item Number 3. This is an update only, and will not be voted upon. On July 3, 2024, after a five-year \$2.5 million restoration project, the carousel -- this is the Seaside Heights Borough carousel project -- the carousel opened to the public. While most of the conditions have been met, the application to list the carousel on the National Register could not be completed while the carousel was dismantled and undergoing restoration, and remains opened. Andrea Tingey of the New Jersey Historical Preservation Office has advised that the carousel should be reviewed at the July 17, 2025 review meeting. So, here now is an update following that meeting:

The carousel project was not on the July agenda as previously advised. The Borough has submitted application for State and Federal History Site designation, and is hoping to be on the November agenda. As evidenced by the work previously stated to the Commission, the Borough has succeeded in repairing and relocating the carousel, and reopening the carousel to the public. The Borough has taken significant steps towards

meeting the Commission's conditions, and requests that it be granted an extension to meet said conditions.

OK. We will now move on to agenda--

OK. We'll now move on to agenda item Number 4. The Department of Treasury request.

MR. AKHTER: Sorry.

Did someone from Seaside-- Is someone here to present?

MS. BUSSELL: (indiscernible)

MR. AKHTER: Is someone here from Seaside Heights to present?

C H R I S T O P H E R V A Z: We're here for any questions about--

MR. AKHTER: Any questions, OK.

Are there any questions on the update? I know Senator Smith is the one who asked for this item.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: Oh, are there any-- No questions?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: I'm good.

No, I was just saying Senator Smith was the one who had asked.

MR. AKHTER: Yes, Senator Smith was the one who asked; unfortunately he was not able to attend.

Any questions on the carousel update?

Thank you for attending, appreciate it.

MR. VAZ: Thank you.

MR. ROTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We'll now move on to agenda item Number 4, which is the Department of Treasury request. It is Project Number RPR 21-07, Lodi Armory, Block Number 286, Lot Number 1.01, in the Borough of Lodi in Bergen County. The requesting party is the Department of the Treasury. On April 8, 2024, the State House Commission approved a lease on the grounds of Lodi Armory to the County of Bergen. The lease was approved, subject to approval by the State Leasing Utilization Committee.

The terms: The Department would like to clarify that legislation will be used to approve the lease terms for Central Motor Pool, not the State Leasing Utilization Committee.

May I have a motion for agenda item Number 4?

MR. BINDER: Motion.

MR. ROTA: Thank you.

Second?

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. ROTA: Thank you.

OK. Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: OK.

We will now move on to new business, which takes us to agenda item Number 5, another Department of Treasury request. Project Number RPR 26-06, Trenton Office Complex, Block Number 202, part of Lot Number 6, in the City of Trenton, Mercer County. Oh, and I'm sorry, I did not -- I failed to read that the motion for Number 4 passed. Sorry about that.

The requesting party is the Department of the Treasury. The Department requests approval to lease plus or minus 1,526 square feet of retail space located at the Trenton Office Complex to Passage Theatre, to be used as a storage space. Since the construction of the building over 25 years ago, this space has not been occupied due to the unusual configuration, making it difficult to lease for anything other than storage space. The lease will be for a term of one year, with three one-year renewal options. The annual rent for year one will be \$12,000. The tenant will also receive three months free rent through October 1, 2025, to December 31, 2025, to allow for moving. The lessee will be responsible for all utilities supplied to the leased premises.

May I have a motion on agenda item Number 5?

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

SENATOR TESTA: Second.

MR. ROTA: Thank you.

We'll call the roll--

SENATOR TESTA: I have a couple questions.

I understand that the explanation was that this building has been vacant for 25 years. Is that correct?

ROBERT TIGHUE: (indiscernible)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes, can you press.

MR. TIGHUE: Which one?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: The red one.

MR. TIGHUE: The red one, OK.

MR. AKHTER: Just identify yourself.

MR. TIGHUE: I'm Robert Tighue, I work for the Department of Treasury.

So, Trenton Office Complex is down the street, and there is-- When it was built, it was built as an office building on top of the Motor Vehicles; the first floor had retail space on it. There's several retail suites; about half of them have never been leased because of the market. This one in particular is on the end; it's really kind of oddly configured. And, I could never see it being-- There's definitely no interest. The other ones there is, (indiscernible) we weren't able to complete a deal. This one, there's no interest. The Passage Theatre is a community group; they have their theater right down the street. They had approached us; they need storage space; they're already currently leasing at a church that's a few blocks away, and it seemed like a win-win. We would never probably -- the State would probably never receive any rent for this space, ever, so we were able to give them the discounted rent based on the fact that it's never going to be finished. So, we don't have to put any money into doing any tenant improvements. So, they're just taking it raw.

SENATOR TESTA: No, I appreciate the fact that it's finally being leased for something--

MR. TIGHUE: Yes, right.

SENATOR TESTA: -- some money is better than zero, for sure.

I just wonder about, sort of, the root cause. Because, you also indicated that there's some other vacancies at that same building, that concerns me, obviously, our State capital, we should try to make it be the jewel that it should be for the State of New Jersey. And, I'm hoping that maybe the market can change for Newark -- I mean, for Downtown Trenton -- so that we can have all of our spaces leased.

MR. TIGHUE: You and me both. (laughter)

Any other questions? (no response)

OK.

MR. ROTA: Thank you, Senator.

We did have a motion and a second, so I will now-- Any other questions from the members? (no response)

OK, I will take a roll call.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: The motion passes.

We will now move on to agenda item Number 6, and this is a request from the Department of Transportation. Project is Route 78, Section 5F, Parcels X177B, X178B, X354B, Block Number 3061, Lot Number 65, Tax Map Number 120 in the City of Newark in Essex County. The Department of Transportation, NJDOT, is requesting approval for the sale of NJDOT-owned excess land, located in the City of Newark, Essex County, that was required as Route 78, Section 5F, Parcels X177B, X178B, and X354B. NJDOT has determined that these parcels have no current or future use by the Department for the improvement, reconstruction, or maintenance of any State highway. Title has been vested in the State of New Jersey for more than 10 years. The County of Essex and the City of Newark have expressed no interest in acquiring the parcels for public use. The property contains plus or minus .079 an acre, and plus or minus 3,430 square feet of buildable, formally residential property, and now it is triangular, vacant land.

The original request to purchase this land was submitted by an adjacent owner, requesting a direct sale; however, because the requestor is no longer an adjacent owner, the property will be sold via public auction. The property will be sold at auction with a minimum starting bid of \$200,000, which is the appraised value.

May I have a motion for agenda item Number 6?

MR. BINDER: Motion.

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. ROTA: Thank you.

Any of the members have any questions? (no response)

Any questions from the public? (no response)

OK, I'm going to take a roll call.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: The motion passes.

We will now move on to agenda item Number 7, also a request from the NJDOT. This is a project at Routes 1 and 9, Section 2, Parcel Number VE29B2, Block Number 5038.01, Lot Number 102, in the City of Newark, Essex County. The NJDOT requests approval for the sale of NJDOT-owned excess land, acquired as Route 1 and 9, Section 2, Parcel E29B, a slope easement, in the City of Newark, Essex County, now known as Parcel Number VE29B2, to the only adjoining property owner, Carlos

Firmino, for private use to enhance his current business operation. NJDOT has indicated that the land is no longer required for the use by the Department in the improvement, reconstruction, or maintenance of any State highway and title has been vested in the State for more than 10 years. Parcel number VE29B2, which is a portion of the slope easement, contains plus or minus .73 of an acre, and plus or minus 3,198 square feet. The property will be sold to Mr. Firmino, who is the sole owner of the adjacent property, for \$160,000 which is the appraised value based upon a recent appraisal report.

May I have a motion for agenda item Number 7?

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

SENATOR TESTA: Second.

MR. ROTA: Any questions from any of the members? (no response)

Any questions from any members of the public? (no response)

OK, I will call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Motion passes.

We will now move on to agenda Number 8, which is a request from the Department of Environmental Protection. Project is Warinanco Park, Block Number 7106, Lot Number 1, in the Borough of Roselle, Union County. The NJDEP, on behalf of the County of Union, requests approval to change the Green Acres encumbrance classification from “funded” to “unfunded” for plus or minus 1.1-acre portion of the county’s Warinanco Park, Block Number 7106, Lot Number 1, the diversion area. The proposed diversion will allow the county to construct a new fully enclosed indoor ice skating rink, which would allow for ice skating throughout the entire year, next to an existing, partially enclosed ice rink. The existing ice rink has been in its current location since 1961, with a partial roof added in 1969. In 2016 and 2017, the rink underwent a significant, multi-million-dollar modernization and renovation, doubling the complex overall space, and renamed the Warinanco Sports Center. During warmer months when skating is not possible, turf is installed over the rink to provide additional recreational opportunities for the public. The current Sports Center occupies approximately 54,000 square feet, which equates to 1.25 acres. Warinanco Park has been encumbered with Green Acres restrictions since the early 1960s when the county first received Green Acres funding. Subsequent Green Acres funding projects, Project Number 2000-94-ADA, and Project Number 2000-07-054, established the Green Acres encumbrance status of Warinanco Park as “funded parkland.” Because Warinanco Park is classified as “funded parkland” under NJAC 7:36-25.7a,

which is based on the statutory definition of recreation and conservation purposes being limited to public outdoor recreation, construction of indoor recreational facilities is considered a diversion of parkland. Under NJAC 7:36-26.2b5, a local unit may propose a minor diversion for the construction of a building for public indoor recreation on funded parkland, provided the following criteria are met:

Number 1. The proposed diversion will involve less than 50,000 square feet of disturbance, or occupy no more than 5% of the total area of the parkland parcel not already occupied by structures from January 3, 2006. Criteria Number 2. The proposed diversion will not have a significant adverse impact on the use by the applicant or the public of the parkland parcel, or surrounding parkland, and will not result in any permanent loss of recreation and conservation facilities. Criteria Number 3. The proposed diversion will not have a significant adverse impact on the natural resource values of the parkland parcel and any of the surrounding parkland. Given the substantial cost associated with tree planting, or a monetary contribution, the county has elected to propose comparable wooded replacement land. As compensation, the county proposes to place Green Acres-funded parkland restrictions on a plus or minus 6.15-acre wooded parcel of replacement land, which is part of Block 202, Lot Number 26, in the Township of Cranford, to meet the minimum 1-to-1 replacement land requirement for the diverted area. Based on size, a portion of the 1.1 replacement value requirement for the diverted area -- based on value -- and the tree compensation requirements, based on the comparable attributes of the proposed replacement land and the trees to be removed. The

replacement land is owned by Union County, and is located directly adjacent to the county's Nomahegan Park.

Having said all of that, may I have a motion for agenda item Number 8?

SENATOR TESTA: So moved.

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. ROTA: Any members have any questions? (no response)

MR. AKHTER: So, given the large number of interest in this item, I will ask first, before we hear from the public, I'll ask for DEP and Union County; there's a representative to take any questions from the members.

Is there a Union County representative?

Thank you.

I'll give the county three minutes, if they want to just say a few words about the project and its purpose.

B R U C E B E R G E N, Esq.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman--

MR. AKHTER: I'm sorry, could you just identify yourself for the record, please?

MR. BERGEN: Yes, my name is Bruce Bergen, I'm the Union County Counsel.

I have here also with me today our Parks Director, Vicky Durbin-Drake; our engineer Ricardo Matias; and also, a member of my staff, Kevin Campbell who is our point person, if you will, on this project. Just, very briefly: I know there are many members of the public who have written to the Commission, and some are here today to speak, and their main concern is trees. And, I want to assure the Commission that the

county is as concerned about the trees being cut down for this project as the public is. And, if you take a look at the remediation we're proposing, in addition to a replacement piece of land, which fulfills the land requirement, although the value has to be brought up by cash, it also has sufficient trees to replace the trees that are being cut down. But, that's not all that we're doing. The plan itself, about 50% of the trees that are being cut down for the ice skating rink will be replaced as part of the plan itself. Additionally, through trees that the county is receiving from a DOP project on unrelated land will be adding approximately an additional 150 trees to Warinanco Park. I think within the next couple months, and, if not, then in the spring when the planting time comes. I don't think any member of the public has disputed the need for this ice skating rink; they're concerned about the effect on the park, and I would suggest that the county's plan fully deals with those issues. We are cognizant of the issue of trees, and we're addressing it far beyond what we're required to by law. So, we would ask that the Commission please join with the DEP in approving this project.

Thank you.

MR. AKHTER: Are there any-- Oh, sorry, does DEP want to add anything to the record?

And, I just wanted to make clear that all of the comments that were submitted online have been received and will be submitted into the record and will be shared with the public.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: I just have a quick question.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: This is the area where I think it was in the summer, for other sports to exist in that area, it's kind of like the outdoor area, half outdoor-- It has the roof covering, correct?

And, then they do put the turf down, because I know a lot of soccer entities end up using that, correct, in the summer for camps and stuff like that? So, it would be that area, correct?

MR. BERGEN: It-- The existing ice skating rink--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Mm-hmm.

MR. BERGEN: -- is considered outdoors.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Right.

MR. BERGEN: It has a roof--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: It has a roof.

MR. BERGEN: -- and, it has a fence around it, but it is open to the air.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: It's open, yes, yes.

MR. BERGEN: So, that it is not usable during the summer months.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: It's actually very hot in there during the summer.

MR. BERGEN: But, we do not let it sit unused during the summer.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. BERGEN: As you said, we put turf down right where the ice is, and it's usable all summer.

This project, which, quite frankly, we looked at numerous other locations for within the county, but, any other location would involve greater construction, affecting greater land. This will allow this new project to be next to the existing rink so that it can use all of the amenities there without having to construct new ones. And, it will allow for ice skating all year round, which is obviously--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: OK.

Yes, because, I know on the inside, there is air conditioning already, it is -- through the summer months, so it is usable, if you need to go to the restroom, it's all in the air conditioning. It would just be making that whole area bigger, correct?

MR. BERGEN: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Thank you.

MR. BERGEN: Thank you.

J U D E T H Y E A N Y, Esq.: I'm Judeth Yeany from DEP's Office of Transactions and Public Land Administration.

I was just going to make a point that I think County Counsel just made, which was, in our review and analysis of this application, we pushed the county very hard on alternative sites because we share the concern about the trees, so I think the county officials here can attest to the fact that we pushed them very hard to try to find another location. But, we were ultimately persuaded that the economies of scale that are represented by locating the indoor rink next to the outdoor rink; sharing the parking; sharing the utilities really justified the application that the county presented to us. So, then our focus really did shift to making sure that the compensation for the trees was appropriate. And, as County Counsel has

stated, they're offering 6 acres of wooded replacement land. We understand that the individual trees to be removed here are large, but what they're replacing it with is much more of a functional, wooded parcel that we hope by protecting that parcel forever, will, in the end, provide comparable benefits for the public.

So, we can answer any other specific questions you might have about the project.

MR. AKHTER: Sir, can you reiterate, where's the new parcel of wooded land going?

MS. YEANY: It's adjacent to a different county park--

MR. AKHTER: Different county park.

MS. YEANY: -- but I'll let the county explain that further.

MR. BERGEN: Yes.

It's actually within the Township of Cranford upon Kenilworth Boulevard; it's currently part of a parcel used by our county police, but this section is wooded and unused, and it is adjacent to Nomahagen Park, which is mainly in Cranford, partly in Kenilworth. So, it is adjacent to existent parkland.

MR. AKHTER: And, accessible by the public.

Accessible for the public--

MR. BERGEN: Yes.

There's actually a walking path not too far from it. I will-- To be fully open on this, part of it is wetlands, so it won't be active recreation, but it grows trees--

MR. AKHTER: Sure.

MR. BERGEN: It has the ability for people to walk by, look at it, and so on.

MR. AKHTER: Are there any questions from members of the Commission? (no response)

Thank you so much. We'll take comments from the public.

MR. BERGEN: Thank you very much.

MR. AKHTER: We will allow three minutes for each member of the public; three minutes, given the number of people who've asked.

If you could just please identify yourself when you start.

BILL NIERSTEDT: Good morning, my name is Bill Nierstedt, I'm a licensed professional--

MR. AKHTER: Sir, if you don't mind just taking a seat, please.

MR. NIERSTEDT: Just put this on and I'll sit down.

MR. AKHTER: OK.

MR. NIERSTEDT: I'm a licensed professional planner in the State of New Jersey.

Before I sit down, I'd like to put this shirt on, I trust that all members of the Commission will know who this, who I put on here. OK. I'm the Lorax; someone has to speak for the trees; the county obviously is not. I'm opposed to this diversion for all the reasons that I previously stated at Warinanco Park public hearing, and my letter to Union County that you Commission members have. (indiscernible) from the onset that there's no reason why this hearing should be construed as hockey rink vs. trees as County Counsel has proposed; that's ludicrous. I support saving 80-year-old trees, and I support Union County creating a hockey rink, just not in the same place. Particularly when there are so many other places in

Union County where 80-year-old trees do not have to be destroyed to build a hockey rink.

First, procedural issues. I believe that Union County's been less than forthright in their public notifications, and may have misled the public in terms of notifying us about the true impacts of its proposed actions. The Warinanco Park public hearing public notice on the Union County website advertised, and the hearing was not listed until three hours before the public hearing; inadequate notice. Second, rather than concentrating the proposed hockey rink, the notice should have done a better job educating the public about what Union County residents are losing. Does anyone see anywhere within the published notice the fact that it's part of this *diversion*? Sixty, 80-year-old trees, trees that were installed -- there or installed -- when the Olmsted Brothers landscape architect firm first designed Warinanco Park in the '20s, will be destroyed, killed, chopped down. Some of the trees in the original park plan were described as towering in the Olmsted report. After reading this deficient notice, would the average resident in the surrounding area know that this diversion removes a grove of trees that has served as a cool forest (indiscernible) the children; air conditioning units for the neighborhood; scrubbers that remove pollutants from the air that they breathe; and flood retention for their properties for over 100 years? No. Obviously, Union County considers this a *minor* -- the destruction of these trees -- a minor diversion for their project. Well, I do not, and I trust that you will not either. A notice is supposed to inform the public (indiscernible) proposed actions, not hide actions between words.

Second, human impact: Most of the hockey players who used proposed diversion from Cranford, Westfield, Scotch Plains, Clark,

Summit, the central and western sides of Union County. Why is Union County proposing a hockey rink in the *eastern* side of Union County for them? Why is Union County subjecting Warinanco Park users and residents of Roselle to increased traffic, air, and water pollution generated by users who will travel through the towns to play hockey? Why should Union County residents of color and lower income suffer the loss of additional natural open space when those who are going to play hockey generally live in townships with large yards and more open space and vegetation? From a human equality perspective, it begs to be pointed out that DEP mapping shows the need for environmental justice actions to be considered in Union County across Thompson Avenue from this proposed denuded area.

This area's been recognized by DEP -- DEP, I think, we just heard from them -- to be one in which air, water, land, noise, lighting, and development impacts in general must be considered at an increased level of review.

MR. AKHTER: Sir, your time is expired, but if you could just wrap-- I'll give you a little time to wrap up.

MR. NIERSTEDT: I appreciate that additional time, I will skip to the professional planning portion, which I will keep short.

I question any alternative analysis conducted by Union County. The hockey rink is only 17,000 square feet. Is Union County honestly saying that they could not find a property with a commercial, or even better, an industrial site to support a 25,000-square-foot hockey arena? I visited the Cranford Industrial Park last week and found 11 properties with "for lease" signs on them; one vacant structure; and one industrial structure

that advertised 52,000-71,000 square feet of space for rent. Last two sentences. We also drove Route 22 from Westfield to Hillside and found four commercial properties, structures for lease, vacant or being underutilized. A review of available commercial sites shows that there are adequate available sites in Scotch Plains, Clark, Kenilworth, and Union. There's no reason to destroy these trees to build a hockey rink that can be constructed elsewhere in Union County.

I ask you to deny this request. Thank you very much. And, thank you for the additional moments.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you.

Your testimony. Other members of the public?

KATHY CEVALLOS: Good morning, everyone.

My name is Kathy Cevallos, I am a life-long resident of Union County; I am currently the President of the Friends of Rahway River Parkway; and an advocate for our local parks. I'm here regarding the minor diversion application for the proposed rink at Warinanco Park. Warinanco Park is just another patch of green. It's the opinion of the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office that Warinanco Park is eligible for State and national designation as a historic place. Highlighting its cultural and historic significance, the park is part of a system designed by Olmsted Brothers' landscape architect firm, founded by Frederick Law Olmsted, the visionary behind Central Park, Prospect Park in Brooklyn, the Capitol Grounds, and more across the country. In fact, hiring the Olmsted firm was one of the very first actions taken by the newly formed Union County Park Commission over a century ago. That early decision signaled how seriously the county valued professionally designed public spaces for all its residents.

This is also an environmental justice issue. According to New Jersey's E.J. map, the environmental justice mapping, assessment, and protection tool, the neighborhoods surrounding Warinanco Park identify as overburdened communities, characterized by high proportions of minority, low-income, and limited-English households. The proposed wooded parcel that the county offers as replacement land, Block 202, Lot 26 in Cranford, shows little to no existent stressors when searched on the E.J. map. Yet, Cranford has significantly fewer overburdened areas; already enjoys multiple parks: Nomahegan Park, as mentioned before, Hanson Park, Sperry Park, the Unami Park, to name a few. And, large, vast private yards. This replacement does not equitably offset the loss of green space for the Warinanco Park community. The environmental burden of losing 65 *viable* trees, which include 33 mature white oak trees, would fall on the community as a whole, but especially on neighborhoods already short on green space, and already designated as overburdened. I also do not dispute that there is a demand of ice time. County officials have noted the high school, an adult hockey program, and have pressed for more and better practice lots in the current rink. I understand that. According to the Assistant Counsel Kevin Campbell himself, quote, "The most recent trend also has girls now playing this sport. Three towns field such teams: Summit; Westfield; and Cranford. And, more schools are expecting to follow their lead." Unquote. However, it is essential to note that these three towns, Summit, Westfield, and Cranford, are not part of the surrounding Warinanco Park community. The local children and families who rely most on these parks are not the ones being served on this project. That raises a critical concern. Can families from Elizabeth, from Roselle,

from Linden, who depend on Warinanco Park green spaces and alike, continue to rely on the decision-making process for future diversions? I don't think so; I'm not sure about that. And, beyond equity, there's accessibility. Ice hockey is one--

MR. AKHTER: If you could wrap up your comments, please.

MS. CEVALLOS: I'll wrap it up.

Ice hockey is one of the most expensive youth sports in New Jersey, with season costs ranging 24 -- maybe up to \$7,000 per child covering fees, equipment, and charges. A new rink would mainly benefit a small segment of families who cannot afford that, quite frankly. I know, I grew up in Elizabeth, and now I live in Westfield. And, it's close to me for those reasons. This became my backyard when my backyard was more concrete than grass. So, for these reasons, and for on behalf of over 750 people who signed our petition opposing this project, I request that the Commission deny this project at this location.

Thank you.

DAVID WILLIAMS: Whoops-- I just-- You're good-- No-- There you go, sorry.

David Williams, lifelong resident of Westfield, New Jersey. My name is David Williams; I'm a horticulturist; former owner of Williams Nursery in Westfield. I have provided trees to Union County for the past decade, helping to restore and expand our public canopy. I want to speak out about Justin's Grove, the century-old picnic grove at Warinanco Park that is at risk from this proposal. First, I have reviewed Daniel Bernier's environmental assessment report. Mr. Bernier documents that the trees in this grove were mature even in 1924, and that the understory was removed,

leaving them without younger successors. However, the Assistant County Counsel has interpreted this as meaning the trees are at the end of life. That is not what Mr. Bernier wrote. In my professional opinion, these white oaks are not at the end of life, in urban park settings, white oaks can live 200 years or more. These trees are viable and should not be dismissed as nearing the end of their lifespan.

Second, the county's environmental assessment minimizes the role of white oaks. For example, in the overall discussion of Warinanco Park, the report describes white oaks as only a small percentage of the park's canopy. That broad generalization hides the reality that Justin's Grove itself is primarily a white oak stand. An independent 2024 survey ordered by the county specifically for this grove found 33 viable white oaks out of 65 trees, more than half the canopy. While there's some nonviable trees, noted, this is normal at any mature stand; this does not mean the grove is unhealthy. In reality, the survey shows a thriving canopy with white oaks and other species in strong condition. The same study applied three different replacement formulas by basal area. The 65 viable trees are the equivalent of 15,000 replacement trees. That's over \$5 million worth of trees. Two other formulas were also included in the report, but, in an urban environment where canopy equity is critical, Green Acres should respect the basal area method as the true measure of ecological value.

Third, the acreage question. The application speaks of a 1.14-acre diversion, but the stamp site plan from Suburban Consulting Engineers shows a clearance of more than 4 acres, which is nearly triple the figure before you today. This is not a minor impact.

Finally, I ask that the Commission not base the decision on conflicting and incomplete science. If the county disputes my professional assessment, the State should require an independent evaluation by one of New Jersey's State urban foresters. Failing to do so, in my opinion, would be negligence in making such an important decision. I've submitted supporting documents to the commission, including the independent tree survey, and the county's environmental assessment report.

In conclusion, I ask the Commission to deny the request to change the Green Acres encumbrance classification from "funded" to "unfunded." Green Acres was created to preserve open space for the benefit of communities, especially in urban areas where canopy and parkland are limited. Approving this diversion would undermine that mission, and moving those trees into Cranford in a suburban space compared to an urban space is not acceptable.

Thank you for your time.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you.

MICHAEL DuHAIME: Hello, thank you very much for your time and consideration.

My name is Mike DuHaime; I'm also a resident of Union County. I appreciate that, also a long-time customer of William's Nursery, before it was closed to make way for housing development. So, I just wanted to thank everyone for their consideration of this matter.

I'm President of the Cranford Ice Hockey Club; we're a member of about 300 families in Union County; it's an all-volunteer organization. And, I think the purpose of this park is to bring people in for enjoyment, and over 1,000 people come in every Saturday, every Sunday, on

weeknights, streaming in mostly from Union County, but also from around the state and even neighboring states. Many parents drop their children off; they jog around the park for an hour while their kids warm up for their games; they really enjoy this park, many people wouldn't be able to use this park.

I also find the notion that somehow the park is not for residents of the entire county, but only for certain parts of the county, to be incorrect and unfair. As somebody who spends many of my Sundays in the winter volunteering my time coaching kids from Elizabeth, from Roselle, from Hillside, from the eastern part of the county. We as a club take very seriously the equity and opportunity that we bring to the children from the nearby area, and we come in; we volunteer our time; we pay for equipment; we have many kids on scholarship in the program so that they can afford to play hockey, enjoy the park. This park is meant for recreation; this is a fantastic project; this has been in the works for six years. Thousands of people will enjoy this rink. It's wonderful; I think the county's done a great job trying to figure out how best to make sure that this would work and work for all parties involved.

I respect the dissenters, but I urge a "yes" vote for this. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

ROBERT MOSS: Still on, I guess, yeah-- Robert Moss, M-o-s-s, Bloomfield, 17 New Street, Bloomfield.

I agree with the other opponents of the park who have spoken, and I protest the ridiculously short three-minute time limit. I'll just mention a couple things. This is sloppily put together. This has nothing to do with funded parkway -- funded parkland. The regulations may have

some things about a difference between “funded” and “unfunded” parkland; such differences are not consistent with Green Acres law; the bond acts; constitutional amendments; and State legislation. And, the other-- The problems I have with this-- This project will reconfigure the parks; it will put a hole in a contiguous area of parkland; replace that with scattered parcels elsewhere. That’s known as fragmentation. The result is not the same as what it started, whereas compensation is supposed to improve or improve on what was there, not fragment parts. The other thing I heard, I had a communication from one of the Assistant County Counsels, noting in his opinion, that Union County was becoming built out. Now, that’s something we’ve heard in North Bergen; some of you may have heard about that. But, supposing Union County is built out, that’s not a valid reason to build in the park. And, to the extent that the regulations allow for that, they also are inconsistent with the Green Acres laws; bond acts; constitutional amendments; and legislation. If you allow-- If there’s no available parcels for a project, and you say, “That’s OK, then we’ll put it in a park,” that means the end of the parks. Just think about it. Anytime the county or the municipality wants a project, “Well, we’re built out, so we’ll put it in the park.” What’s going to happen?

And, I’ll yield the rest of my time at that.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you, sir.

Are there any other members of the public who’d like to be heard?

KEVIN CAMPBELL, Esq.: My name is Kevin Campbell; I’m Assistant County Counsel for Union County; and I’d like to make a few comments.

First, none of the opponents to the rink have shown that this will have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area, nor have they shown not having significant benefit for the public, which is what is required by the regulation to make this non fund -- to make this happen, this project happen. The-- In addition-- I'm sorry. There's a-- I'd also like to mention, we've already submitted it. The Olmsted map shows that the trees were not part of the original Olmsted plan. Instead, the trees were existing at the time the Olmsted plan was developed 100 years ago. They were already then quite large trees, and the trees that are coming down are 65, approximately 64 will remain. And, those trees will be, again, will result in Justin's Grove -- in some of it -- still existing. We also would like to mention that there's been no undergrowth in any of these trees, even though some may have life left in them, that life is going to end eventually, and there'll be no trees to replace it. So, the benefit here to the public is also significant. There've been-- A lot of towns in our county would like to have additional playing time at the ice in the existing rink, and we don't have it. You don't have that time. Other towns would like to join in. Girls' teams are now forming, and we have three towns in Union County that have girls' teams, and we expect more to come along. This project has the benefit of having rinks right next to each other, tournaments can be conducted. And, there's also the staff will all be there. In light of all this, in light of all the comments that we've heard, we would urge that there is a significant public benefit to this and there will be no significant adverse impact on the park.

Thank you.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, if County Counsel gets two shots at the (indiscernible), can public also?

MR. AKHTER: It's two separate individuals, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. AKHTER: Are there any other members of the public who'd like to speak? (no response)

OK, thank you. If there are no comments or questions from, we can move to a vote.

MR. ROTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'll take a-- Call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz-- Excuse me.

Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Motion passes.

We will now move on to agenda item Number 9 on the agenda, the Nami Tract Project, Block Number 2732, Lot Number 3.01, in the

Township of Hamilton, Mercer County. The NJDEP, on behalf of the County of Mercer requests approval to allow the conveyance of a plus or minus .106-acre access easement across unfunded parkland known as the Nami Tract to Chong Il Kim, and Sung Tae Kim, collectively known as the “Kims,” owners of an adjacent preserved farm on Block Number 2732, Lot Number 6, known as the Kim Farm. The access easement is needed due to the acquisition by the former NJ Turnpike Authority, now known as the NJ Highway Authority, of the former access road to the Kim Farm, in connection with the New Jersey Turnpike Exit 6 to Exit 9 widening project. As part of the Turnpike widening project, the Authority needed to acquire certain parklands from the county, including interest in Block Number 2732, Lot Number 3.01 in Hamilton Township. These parkland interests were acquired pursuant to a prior diversion application that the State House Commission approved on October 27, 2010. At that time, all parties acknowledged the existence of an access road, which provided the county and the Kims with access to and from their respective parcels and Crosswicks-Hamilton Square Road. However, the county, and the Kims, and the Authority had not fully worked out the details of formalizing a new access road, and conveying a new access easement to the Kims. So, the prior Authority did not seek approval for the access easement that is now proposed. To compensate the county for the conveyance of the access easement, the Authority proposed to convey to the county, in fee, .45 acre of lands owned the Authority, parcels Number X324C, and X324B, adjacent to the Nami Tract. The appraised value for the proposed access easement is \$1,590. The total appraised value of the replacement parcels, X324C, and X324B, is \$6,750. The ratio of both the value and size of the

proposed replacement land to the value and size of the access easement exceeded the 4-to-1 requirement. Therefore, proposed compensation is consistent with NJAC 7:36-26B4.

I will ask for a motion for agenda item Number 9.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So moved.

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. ROTA: Any questions from any of the members regarding this agenda item? (no response)

Seeing none, any questions from the public regarding this agenda item? (no response)

Seeing none, I will call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: The motion passes.

We will now move on to agenda item Number 10. The project is Delaware and Raritan Canal State Park, Block Number 5201.01, Lot

Number 5.01, in the Township of Lawrence, Mercer County. The NJDEP requests approval to grant a permanent sewer line easement to the Ewing-Lawrence Sewage Authority to serve the historic Port Mercer Canal House, located on Block Number 5201, Lot Number 5.01, in Lawrence Township, Mercer County. The proposed easement is needed to allow the house to be connected to the public sewer system after the failure of the on-site septic system. Because the proposed easement will benefit the State, the proposed compensation is \$1.

May I have a motion for agenda Item Number 10?

SENATOR TESTA: So moved.

MR. ROTA: Thank you.

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MR. ROTA: Thank you.

Any questions from any of the members regarding agenda item Number 10? (no response)

Seeing none, any questions from the public regarding agenda item Number 10? (no response)

Seeing none, I will take the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: The motion passes.

OK. We are now going to move on to agenda item Number 11, which concerns the Division of Pensions and Benefits. I will ask for a motion to now sit as the Judicial Retirement System Board of Trustees.

May I have a motion?

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MR. ROTA: OK.

I'm going to call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: The motion passes, and Tamara and I are now going to step out.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Now I have the JRS agenda item Number 1, the approval of the minutes of the meeting held on June 23, 2025.

May I have a motion?

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Any abstentions or opposed?

MR. AKHTER: You abstain?

SENATOR TESTA: I have to abstain.

MR. AKHTER: Abstain.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: I will now call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Abstain.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: I will now read the JRS agenda item Number 2, which is confirmation of death claims, retirements, and survivor benefits.

May I have a motion?

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Any abstentions or opposed?

I'll call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: And, Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Agenda item Number 3, the receipt of the financial statements from January 2025 through April 2025.

Also, the agenda item Number 4, we have the presentation of the JRS Experience Study.

JONATHAN CHIPKO: Hello, I'm Jonathan Chipko from Cheiron, this is my colleague Janet Cranna. We're consulting actuaries.

We're here to present the Triennial Experience Study.

Typically, we're here in the spring to talk about the valuation results; this is a little bit different. Janet's going to give us an introduction, and then I'll talk about the results. We plan to be brief, about five minutes.

JANET CRANNA: So, we do an experience study every three years, and what an experience does is that it reviews all the actuarial assumptions that are used in the valuation of the Judicial Retirement System.

And, so, these assumptions will be used to calculate the liabilities, and, in turn, what the contribution requirements are each year. We do these experience studies every three years, and that's in accordance with New Jersey State statute. These assumptions will first be affected -- any recommendations we make -- will first be affected with the July 1, 2025 actuarial valuation, which we're going to start shortly. There's two different types of assumptions that we use in the valuation. We use economic assumptions and demographic assumptions. So, for the economic assumptions we review the salary increase assumptions and review price and wage inflation. We don't review the investment rate of return because that is set by the State Treasurer. On the demographics side, we look at assumptions regarding when people are going to retire from the plan; when they're going to terminate; become disabled; when they're expected to die; and we also look at family composition; who's married and set of people that are married with spouses. These assumptions are intended to be long term in nature, so we don't change the assumptions every year, but we try

to collect data and do one every three years, in accordance with New Jersey State statutes. And, we want each assumption to be reasonable, both individually and in aggregate. And, so, we'll propose assumptions when we don't think that the current assumptions are anticipating what we expect to be future trends. When we recommend assumptions, we want to take into account both historical experience of the plan, but we also want to take into account any future expectations or trends that we see coming.

MR. CHIPKO: So, from here I'll talk about the -- what we're recommending. If you're following along in our presentation, I'm on slide 6.

Here we list the different assumptions that we reviewed, along with a brief description of the current assumption, and, finally, the recommended changes. And, you'll notice what you see here is very few recommended changes. In fact, the only one is to the mortality assumption. So, how long members and retirees will live in the future. And, the reason for this update is really, not because the current assumption is performing poorly, but because there's new research from the Society of Actuaries, a professional organization that provides insight on mortality trends for public sector plans.

So, what we're proposing is to update to the most recent mortality table. The current assumption is called Pub-2010 Table. It's become a little bit outdated now and the new tables were released in the spring of this year, and they're known as the Pub-2016 Tables. So, we're just recommending an update to the most recent tables. On Slide 7, we review the impact on the system. We're showing the results here, the impact as of the July 1, 2024 valuation, but of course it would not be effective until 2025. At the top, we're showing the assets and the liabilities.

The first column is the current assumptions. So, these are the results we presented to you in the spring. We start off with the actuarial liability. The next column shows what the results would be under the recommended assumption, and then, finally, the change or the impact. And, I'll focus on those last two in our comments here.

So, the result of this updated mortality assumption would decrease the actuarial liability by about \$13 million. There's no impact on the assets, so the unfunded liability would decrease about \$13 million. And, so, that improves the funded ratio by about half a percent. So, from 35.4% to 35.9%. So, it's a relatively small decrease in the liabilities. That would also impact the statutory contribution amounts. There would be a small decrease in the State's normal cost. The normal costs represents the cost of benefits that members earn in the upcoming year. And, then, the decrease in the liability would also result in a small decrease in the amortization payment of UAL, that's the payment intended to close the gap between the assets and liabilities. And, so, in total, the statutory contribution would decrease by \$1.3 million, or 1.8%.

And, that is a summary of the results. Are there any questions?

MR. AKHTER: Questions from the members? (no response)

Thank you very much.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRY: All right.

Now--

MR. CHIPKO: I think it needs approval?

MR. AKHTER: No, it does not -- part of the vote.

MS. CRANNA: Oh, it doesn't?

OK.

MR. AKHTER: No, it doesn't.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRY: No vote for this.

Thank you.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you very much.

It says no vote, so I don't know--

MS. BUSSELL: (indiscernible) counsel, does it need?

I just want to make sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would ask--

MR. AKHTER: I think we just acknowledge and receive; I don't recall--

MR. CHIPKO: I'm sorry, it-- Typically, the boards do approve the assumptions for the actuarial valuations; they're usually accepted by the boards.

But, the assumptions are typically the board's assumptions, and, so, they are often -- typically adopted--

MS. CRANNA: They're typically adopted so that we're allowed to use them in the next valuation.

MR. AKHTER: Well -- we'll take the precaution if there's no objection from the council, we'll take the precaution of voting to approve.

So, I move to approve the report.

MR. BINDER: Second.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRY: All right.

I'll take the roll. Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: And, Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Thank you, it's approved.

All right. Now, I'll ask for a motion to return to sit as the State House Commission.

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: All right, I'll call the roll.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRAY: And, Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. SOTO-IRIZARRARY: Yes.

SENATOR TESTA: Now we need a formal motion to adjourn, right?

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

As the State House Commission.

(laughter)

Change the hat.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Switch (indiscernible)

MR. ROTA: OK, thank you.

Any questions or any other issues that the members would like to address to the Commission? (no response)

OK, seeing none, may I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

SENATOR TESTA: So moved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MR. ROTA: Thank you, I'll take the roll call.

Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. ROTA: Chairman Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. ROTA: The motion passes.

Meeting is adjourned.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)