
Commission Meeting

of

STATE HOUSE COMMISSION

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

DATE: June 4, 2026
9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Jay Redd, Chair
Senator Bob Smith
Senator Anthony Bucco
Assemblywoman Eliana Pintor Marin
Assemblyman John DiMaio
Kavin Mistry
Tariq Shabazz



ALSO PRESENT:

Christina Fullam
Commission Secretary

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

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

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

Brittany Zulla
JRS Administrator

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>
Jonathan Testa, Esq. Law Office of Dorsey and Semrau Municipal Attorneys for the Township of Mount Olive	10
Judeth Yeany, Esq. Senior Regulatory Officer Office of Transactions and Public Land Administration New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection	25
Ryck Suydam Owner Suydam Farms, LLC	37
Jack Erikson Representative Cheiron	48
mj 1-53	

JAY REDD (Chair): Good morning; good morning, we're going to start.

Excuse me. Good morning, good morning. We're going to call this meeting to order.

MS. FULLAM: We are in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

Notice of this meeting of the State House Commission was given by way of notice on May 28, 2026; filed with the Secretary of State; and posted on the State House Commission's website.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Good morning.

MS. FULLAM: I'm going to do roll call now.

Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Present.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Present.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Here.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Present.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Here.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio, not here.

Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Here.

MS. FULLAM: We have a quorum.

We're moving on to old business. Agenda item Number 1 is the approval of the minutes of the December 15, 2025; January 15, 2026; and May 18, 2026, meetings.

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Any questions or comments from the members?

(no response)

Any abstentions or opposed?

SENATOR BUCCO: I abstain on the May 18.

MS. FULLAM: Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco has abstained on May 18; as to the other minutes, sir?

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Motion carries.

SENATOR BUCCO: I will note-- I will note one thing--

MR. REDD: Can you turn your mic on, Leader?

SENATOR BUCCO: Oops, sorry.

I will note one thing that -- on the set of minutes that we held the meeting virtually -- throughout the minutes was “indiscernible, indiscernible,” it’s like 43 times. Somehow, we’ve got to get a handle on that so that-- I know we were virtual and people were stepping on each other and there were connection problems. But, I think in the future, we really have to have a good set of minutes where everybody’s comments are recorded and clearly delineated.

MR. REDD: Understood, Leader, and then let the record reflect that Leader DiMaio is also present now, good morning, sir.

MS. FULLAM: OK, we’re moving on to agenda item Number 2.

The Department of Treasury requests-- The project name is RPR 25-19, NJ Performing Arts Center, Block 17, part of Lot 1.01, City of Newark, Essex County. On December 9, 2024, the State House Commission approved two easements on the grounds of the New Jersey Performing Arts Center, located at 1 Center Street, in the City of Newark, Essex County. The first easement to the City of Newark Department of Water and Sewer Utilities for the installation and maintenance of high- and low-pressure water mains and sewer and storm mains, consisting of approximately 0.037, plus or minus, acres of land. The second easement to Public Service Electric & Gas, or “PSE&G,” for the installation and maintenance of a 4-inch gas line and electric infrastructure, which will include transformer vaults, pull boxes, handholes and conduits, consisting of approximately 0.276, plus or minus, acres of land. Since then, the requested easement areas have been updated based on field conditions, which will now grant the City of Newark Department of Water and Sewer Utilities approximately 0.283 acres, plus or minus, of land and PSE&G approximately 0.052, plus or minus, acres of land.

The terms and conditions remain the same. Since this action benefits the State, the easements will be granted for \$1. Is there a motion to approve?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

SENATOR SMITH: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any public questions or comments? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

OK, for the vote. Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

Agenda item Number 3-- The project is RPR 06-18, New Jersey Training School for Boys, located at Block 53, part of Lot 11.01, Monroe Township, in Middlesex County. At its meeting on June 23, 2025, the State

House Commission approved leasing to -- leasing a portion of vacant land located on the grounds of the New Jersey Training School for Boys, to American Tower Corporation, Limited Power of Attorney for Verizon Communication Inc., or Verizon. American Tower has since requested to lease an additional 385 square feet adjacent to the existing leased area to accommodate the installation of a generator and equipment cabinets for a co-locator on the tower. The terms previously approved shall remain the same. Initial term is five years, with three successive, five-year renewal options. The annual rent increase will be 3.5%, based upon the previous years' rent. There will be a co-location fee, or additional rent, due of 50% of any fees, rent and/or other income American Tower/Verizon receives from a co-locator. Lessee is responsible for all utilities and real estate taxes, if applicable.

Is there a motion to approve?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any public questions or comments? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

OK. For the roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

Item Number 4 on the agenda. This is from the Department of Environmental Protection. The project is Allamuchy State Park, Block 7, Lot 4, now Block 301, Lot 4, Mount Olive Township, Morris County. On September 19, 1989, the State House Commission approved the sale of land, Block 7, Lot 4, in Mount Olive Township, Morris County, known as “the property,” by the NJDEP to the New Jersey Foreign Trade Zone Venture, and amended at the Commission’s August 3, 1990, meeting. The purpose of the sale was to allow the Trade Zone Venture to incorporate the property into the Township’s International Trade Center for use and development by the BASF Corporation as part of the proposed North American Headquarters complex. The NJDEP is now asking the Commission to amend the sale to allow the lifting of the office/research-and-development restriction from the property as memorialized in the December 26, 1990 deed. At the time of the approval, the proposed sale of the property was supported by then-Commissioner Daggett and former Governor Kean as being in the public interest to avoid at least 1,600 feet, and possibly up to -- sorry, 1,600 -- and possibly up to 3,300 high-paying BASF jobs from leaving New Jersey. After

Governor Florio took office in January 1990, the new administration conducted a review of the proposed sale. Governor Florio and then newly appointed DEP Commissioner Yaskin then conveyed their concerns at the Commission's August 3, 1990, meeting, that the original proposed sale terms had been significantly undervalued -- had significantly undervalued the property and asked the Commission to amend the September 19, 1989, approval to increase the proposed compensation based on additional compensation terms negotiated between the NJDEP and the NJFTZ; the matter was approved.

Consistent with the approvals, NJFTZ acquired the property from NJDEP in December 1990, and immediately conveyed it to the BASF corporation. However, BASF's plans for its North American headquarters never came to fruition, and BASF was unable to find another use for the property. The Township purchased the property in 2012 using unrestricted funds to keep its options open regarding the future use of the property. After considering other uses of the property over the past 14 years, the Township now plans to use the property as the site of up to a 180-unit 100% affordable rental housing development. To use the property for this development, it is necessary to remove the restriction imposed by the NJDEP in the December 26, 1990, deed to the NJFTZ, and is still applicable to the property, which limits the use of the property for office and/or research-and-development purposes and such other purposes as are ancillary thereto. This restriction was not specifically required by the Commission but was imposed by the NJDEP as part of the sale to ensure that the underlying rationale for the sale was enforced. The development will include units for very low-income; low- and moderate-income families; a 50% veterans housing preference; and 12

supportive housing units for persons with disabilities. The project has been approved by the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program and the Morris/Sussex County Mount Laurel judge. The selected developer, Ingerman Development Company, has a June 30, 2026, deadline to apply for HMFA funding for the affordable housing projected, and needs to represent, as part of the application, that the property has no major development restrictions that would prevent it from being used for the project. As to the terms, NJDEP believes that allowing the property to be used for the proposed affordable housing project instead of the BASF project will *not* confer an additional economic benefit on either the Township or the selected developer that is out of proportion to the compensation terms originally approved by the Commission. Therefore, no additional compensation is proposed.

Is there a motion to approve?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: I'll just say a couple things; I mean this is in my neighborhood -- not my neighborhood, particularly, but next community over.

MR. REDD: Can you turn your mic on, Leader.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: And, we-- I'm sorry.

And, again, we're bringing in more housing that--

SENATOR BUCCO: It's on.

MR. REDD: OK.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: We're bringing in more housing, taking away jobs, and we'll be exacerbating traffic situations that were burdened (indiscernible).

And, it's-- If you-- In any kind of good planning principles, this is counterintuitive to what we really need to do. We should have people living near the workplaces, not the other way around. So, it's, once again, one-size-fits-all affordable housing scheme. It doesn't always work well for people who would live there; they have to travel back to wherever they work. So, I'm going to oppose this.

SENATOR BUCCO: I echo what Leader DiMaio just said, and it concerns me because we're taking what would now otherwise be open space property, right, this property is open space at this time.

And, we're going to be jamming in another affordable housing development, and it's not even housing, it's apartments. It doesn't provide any opportunity for generational wealth with families that will go there. It's kind of isolated out there a little bit. And, it just doesn't make any sense; it doesn't make any sense to me, and I think this is part of the problem with this affordable housing obligation and the way the law was developed. It forces a municipality to-- It pushes municipalities to avoid sound land-use planning in order to meet a number that's, really, not developed through looking at the area, and the infrastructure, and the economy. So, I'm concerned with this, as well. And, I plan on voting, "no."

MS. FULLAM: Are there any other--

SENATOR SMITH: Yes, question; does this proposal have the support of the municipality?

Does anyone know?

SENATOR BUCCO: I think the municipality has probably got their hands tied here, right?

SENATOR SMITH: We're going to find out.

SENATOR BUCCO: I mean, they have to meet an obligation that, if they don't meet, they'll subject themselves to builder's remedies, so--

SENATOR SMITH: Could be true.

SENATOR BUCCO: --they're looking for any piece of property where they could jam these numbers in; that's what I think is happening.

MR. REDD: Please identify yourself.

JONATHAN TESTA, Esq.: Yes.

Good morning, members of the State House Commission, Jonathan Testa at Law Office of Dorsey and Semrau, Municipal Attorneys at the Township of Mount Olive. It does have the support of the Township of Mount Olive. I do echo the concerns that are stated by Senator Bucco and Assemblyman DiMaio. We are forced by a state law to meet a massive, large, affordable housing obligation of 317 affordable units for the fourth round. The Township was ineligible for vacant land adjustment, precisely because this project is considered to be developable under the State law. Unfortunately, the deed restrictions for research and development and office space-- The Township is doing the best it can under the circumstances to meet State obligations at this point in time. We are a Highlands -- partially conforming -- Highlands municipality. We have 80% of the Township is in the Highlands Preservation Area; we have a significant amount of preserved land space. I did want to correct-- This property was not designated as open space, and that's part of the reason why we were unable to secure vacant land adjustment, because it is 57 -- over 57 acres at the ties.

SENATOR BUCCO: But it's currently undeveloped?

MR. TESTA: It is currently undeveloped, that is correct, Senator.

And, I also am very aware of the unique circumstances of Highlands communities. We would have had to, alternatively, (indiscernible) this project; be subject to inclusionary zoning to private developers; be subject to over 880 (indiscernible) units; plus the 317 affordable units to make this project feasible, otherwise, to meet their numbers. So, the alternative would be over 1,000 new dwelling units in the Township. And, again, that just goes to show the impact of Public Law 2024, C2, on municipalities that are doing their best to meet their obligations, but also, the other needs of the State with -- as good stewards for 70% of the State's water supply to other municipalities that are in need of that water.

SENATOR BUCCO: So, I think if I understand you correctly, absent this affordable housing mandate that the Legislature imposed on Mount Olive, you wouldn't be looking to put that development in this spot?

MR. TESTA: We were left with no other choices, Senator.

SENATOR BUCCO: I think you answered my question, thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: So, respectfully -- if I can get a microphone on -- I don't quite agree with the Minority Leader.

It's true that we have a State statute on affordable housing, but that State statute was in response to the cries of injustice from mainly from municipalities that they needed a more orderly process than what was COAH a million years ago, and even land-use changes at the counties. And, it's not that it's a statutory issue, it's a Constitutional obligation. We have had

repeated decisions from the New Jersey Supreme Court saying that all municipalities in the State have a Constitutional obligation to provide for low- and moderate-income housing in their community. And, I was a Mayor once; I understand it's more kids in the school system; every kid's \$20,000 in new prop -- in cost for the school system. But, it's still Constitutional obligation; it's not the Legislature coming down on you. Legislature, if anything, was -- when it did that last statute, tried to make it easier for municipalities to comply. And, it sounds to me like you've gotten the best of all worlds, because you don't have to multiply that number by five. As counsel pointed out, when you do affordable housing, you generally do it by giving a benefit to the developer, whomever, where you give them five times the amount of housing to get a 20% set-aside, you're getting a -- this is 100% inclusive, right?

MR. TESTA: That's correct, if they have 50%--

SENATOR SMITH: So, that 180 units saved you building 900 units.

MR. TESTA: Yes, and, Senator Smith, I will want to make one comment if you don't mind.

SENATOR SMITH: Sure.

MR. TESTA: We had an alternative mechanism that was extensions of affordability controls for a significant number of affordable units in the Township that have terms that are expiring.

Unfortunately, during the program process, even though I believe the statute and the UHAC provisions are very clear on municipalities' authority to extend affordability controls, including rental affordable units created from a prior round, which was the situation that the Township was

seeking to do. Unfortunately, when the program process began, the program judge took a position that he was not going to make a decision on that. I've litigated those cases many times; I've been successful on those, but unfortunately, because of the program process that was developed through Public Law 2024 C2, we were not able -- in a short timeframe that deadline imposed on us -- to fetter out those issues on the extension of affordability controls. In fact, we have a challenger challenge those extensions, and was seeking a significant -- when I say significant, multiple millions and millions of dollars -- from the Township and their taxpayers as compensation to extend our affordability controls, something that the Township is not able to do. So, we had to do what we could do in the short timeframe we had, to meet the shortfall to meet our obligation, and this was the way to do it. So, I do agree with you; we're trying to do the best of both worlds here, limit the development of total dwelling units, by also achieving Constitutional compliance by allowing for affordable housing opportunities for the protected class of people who need that. But--

SENATOR SMITH: On the flip side of that, suppose we said, "This is an abomination," and denied it. Where would you have to go?

MR. TESTA: I'm sorry, Senator, I'm just -- not to come off as disrespectful -- I'm not really sure what you mean.

SENATOR SMITH: Suppose you didn't have this; let's say we all voted "no, terrible idea;" where would your town be at that time?

MR. TESTA: I think Senator Bucco was correct in his sentiments that I would likely have to -- and we have received a judgement from clients (indiscernible) from the Morris County (indiscernible).

What would happen is, we'd have to re-open up our plan; we'd have to change our zoning significantly; and our fourth-round compliance mechanisms that this is the major component for, and supplemented with incentive zoning as you had referenced before through private developers, at a 5:1 rate; which is incredibly significant. And, it is as -- and, I really do echo Senator Bucco's sentiments -- that it is not a one size fit all, especially for a Highlands municipalities, or Pinelands municipalities, that are -- have to be strict environmental stewards for the rest of the state. And, I hope that that is revisited on; that's my personal opinion, and not the Township's--

SENATOR SMITH: It actually was.

Senator McKeon, in the last session, passed a bill, which tried to provide additional relief to Highlands communities and Pinelands communities. And, I think it was signed by the Governor, or not--

SENATOR BUCCO: I don't think so.

SENATOR SMITH: But, they're-- I think we actually dealt with it.

You might want to take a look at that. But, the bottom line, the municipality supports this; you want to see this go forward.

MR. TESTA: Absolutely, absolutely want to see this go forward.

We'd also like to see the strengthening of the language on extensions and affordability controls, though, as well, because we're trying to balance planning here. We also-- We understand and recognize the need for new housing, but there's still also very good, decent housing that can be available for rental opportunities for low-income households.

SENATOR SMITH: And, by the way, when I was mayor, that's one of the things that I did; I got a 1,000 number for Piscataway Township,

New Jersey, and one of the ways we dealt with it was to take housing that had building issues -- building code issues -- and upgrade, provide the money to put in the toilet or upgrade the electric, or whatever. So, everybody's trying to find creative solutions, but if you have a suggestion in Mount Laurel, and especially the Highlands, you should send a letter Senator McKeon and myself; we did the Highlands Act together. And, we've tried to provide, also, money -- \$150 million in a year -- for open-space acquisitions, and to-- We also tried to put some money in the budget, although not always successfully for the Highlands communities. Because, you have to have a lot of water resources; places where you can't build; and most mayors say things a lot of ratables to be obtained in their particular community, and that'll offset it. Unfortunately, it's Constitution -- fortunately, rather fortunately -- then again they'd rather moderate (indiscernible) income person. But, the bottom line is the municipality supports this.

MR. TESTA: Absolutely.

And, Senator, just to make one point -- I'll be (indiscernible) here, like I've been doing for several years now--

SENATOR SMITH: Sure.

MR. TESTA: --and, I'll be happy to follow up with writing.

I do think that the Legislature should really revisit and strengthen the language and the statute on (indiscernible) affordability controls. It is opportunity that's there; I know the renters, the owners, of affordable units; they want to see their units extended because they want the protections of the affordability controls (indiscernible), not just for them, but for the people who also need a--

SENATOR SMITH: All right, future people that occupy the properties; totally understand; and, by the way, a lot of the people who obtain by purchase or lease Mount Laurel housing, one of the things they always look forward to is the end of the affordability controls, because theoretically, they're going to make a pretty significant delta on whatever they paid for the purchase price.

So, there's all kinds of motivations here, Leader. But, I agree with you that we could always improve what we do. So, send in the cards and letters and we'll take a look at it.

MR. TESTA: Thank you, Senator.

MR. REDD: Leader Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes, I don't think Senator Smith and I are far off.

I agree it's Constitutional requirement; I agree the Legislature had to step in and do something. But, where we missed the boat is we passed legislation claiming to make it an easier process; claiming to give municipalities more authority; claiming that there'd be more planning opportunities involved; and, the legislation missed the mark completely on every one of those areas. I mean, you hear it from the municipal attorneys; I've seen it; I've received the letters, and I-- If the Majority is willing to undertake that discussion, I'm happy to go back and point out to where all the flaws were in this process. But, up until now, this was passed a long time ago at this point, but--

SENATOR SMITH: Last session.

SENATOR BUCCO: --and this process had to be rushed through; municipalities spent millions of dollars that they didn't have to-- shouldn't have had to have spent, and they were left in horrible situations.

So, I understand, but I think this is just one aspect of how that legislation failed. And, unfortunately, that community is going to be saddled with this as a result of that. And, that's why--

SENATOR SMITH: So, we respectfully differ on our opinion on Mount Laurel.

Remember, these rounds are every 10 years. So this is, we're talking about fourth-round compliance?

MR. TESTA: That's correct.

And, in case law it says affordable housing responsibility and obligations, they're perpetual. So--

SENATOR SMITH: Yes, yes, yes.

MR. TESTA: When we start a process, I'm sure you know, Senator, we start with looking back to our first round.

SENATOR SMITH: And, by the way, you should start thinking about fifth round, if you want to get ahead of the game.

And, most municipalities understand that. And, I always hear moaning and groaning, especially about school change, more than any other thing that impacts the community in a great way; we have a Constitutional obligation. And, if we would do it better, that'd be -- a wonderful moment if the Minority and Majority party could agree on how we could help the municipalities.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Well, I'm certainly not an attorney, but I'm on the ground in my community, and I understand how things work.

The Constitution stands true: State Supreme Court; one-size-fits-all for the entire state without taking into effect that when you move out to our area, market rate is less by its very nature, because of the location, you have to travel to go back to work. We had a 20-year supply of apartments in our town, large apartments, \$1,500 a month, two bedrooms; they just built a whole group of new apartments that the market rate is now \$3,200 a month, and it's carrying the--

SENATOR SMITH: I think the national administration may have a piece of that.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: What?

SENATOR SMITH: I think the national administration may have a piece of why prices in America are going up.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Well--

SENATOR SMITH: --on everything. It's a much bigger--

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: COVID started a lot of it, too.

SENATOR SMITH: That's true.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Material supply went through the roof.

But, the reality is, we had a very affordable stock of homes. Whether they be ranch houses in parts of our towns was much less expensive than they are down closer to the city. And, now, they've driven the prices by us; they've built some townhomes -- three-bedroom townhomes -- in my town; some of them are market -- (indiscernible) market rate, some aren't. Five hundred thousand dollars for a three-bedroom townhome, over. And, we had a stock of four-bedroom little colonials that (indiscernible). But, what do you think it did to those prices? They're the outliers in the buys.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So, we're not driving affordability, we're actually driving prices up in some communities, by this.

And then, we're totally throwing out the whole thing -- about pollution and cars on the road -- out the window because most of the workplaces are back to the east. So, it's convoluted at best. I think the Supreme Court doesn't understand enough. I was a mayor myself; you know your community; you know what's there and available. But, this is a thing that's being forced; you're cornered; you have to do it; I get it; makes sense but, I'm not going to be supportive of it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Just one quick question; is the municipality-- Is the project going to be a pilot, or is the municipality going to receive property tax payments for this?

Because some developments, a majority of them, are through pilots, correct?

MR. TESTA: Yes.

So, the goal here, with hopefully the support of the State House Commission, to lift that restriction, will be able to proceed to try to apply to the HMFA's 9% program; the deadline, I believe, is June 30 to make an application. That's why we're here today. But, the hope of getting the 9% low-income housing tax credit program project approved, and it will be subject to a pilot HMFA in support of a pilot, which is, I believe, it's 6.28% would be ultimately revenue that's received by the municipality (indiscernible). The municipality is going to be paying a portion to create these units. Again, it's 100% affordable. So, your rateable, first of all, it's a residential rateable; secondly, it's an apartment complex; and, third, it's

100% affordable. So, you're not going to be getting significant tax revenue from (indiscernible) taxes on this. It's really going to be municipal funded, for lack of a better term, and, through LIHTC program hopefully, if we're approved. If we're not approved for the 9%, that cost for the municipality goes up dramatically when it's one of the noncompetitive programs; I believe it's 4%.

MR. REDD: All right, I think we're done with questions, so Madam Secretary.

MS. FULLAM: OK.

I'm going to read the roll call. Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: You should get a motion and a second, at least.

MS. FULLAM: We did earlier.

MR. SHABAZZ: We did.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Pointing out again that the Township is asking us to do this, yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Township might be asking us to do this, but it's like asking somebody if they don't want to be shot when they have a gun to their head.

I mean, I just can't support this. I think this is just the beginning of the unraveling here on this whole process; so, I vote no.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: No.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The ayes have it; we have five; motion carries.

MR. TESTA: Thank you, State House Commissioners, I appreciate this time today, and open ears.

MS. FULLAM: We're moving onto agenda item Number 5, under new business.

This is a Department of Transportation request. The project is Route 30, Section 6, Parcel VX2R44A2, Block 503, Lot 8, on tax map 16.03, Township of Galloway, Atlantic County. The NJDOT is requesting approval for the sale of NJDOT-owned excess land located in the Township of Galloway, Atlantic County, that was acquired as Route 30, Section 6, Parcel VX2R44A2. Title has been vested in the State of New Jersey for more than 10 years. Applicable NJDOT units have reviewed this parcel and confirmed it is no longer needed to accomplish the mission of the Department. The County of Atlantic and the Township of Galloway have expressed no interest in acquiring the parcel for public use. The property has multiple adjoining owners who have expressed interest in acquiring this parcel. The property consists of approximately 10,890, plus or minus, square feet or 0.25, plus or minus, acres of land located at 405 South Pomona Road and can be identified on tax map number 16.03 as Block 503, Lot 8. The property is a non-buildable, non-conforming lot. The highest and best use of this property is

an assemblage with any adjoining properties. As to the terms, the property will be sold via public auction with the minimum starting bid of \$25,000, which is the appraised fair market value. The conveyance of the property is additionally subject to Federal Highway Authority approvals upon receiving State House Commission approval.

Is there a motion to approve?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Do the members have any comments or questions? (no response)

Are there any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or any opposed? (no response)

As to the roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

Agenda item Number 6. This is a request from the Department of Environmental Protection. The project is Rahway River Parkway -- Parkway Park, excuse me -- Block 1501, part of Lot -- it's in the Township of Springfield in Union County. The NJDEP, on behalf of the County of Union and the Township of Springfield, requests approval to partially remove the Green Acres restrictions on a 0.016-plus-or-minus-acre portion of parkland in order to legalize the past unauthorized diversion of a subsurface sewer easement within the County's Rahway River Parkway Park. In 2009, the Township submitted an application to NJDEP for an emergency sewer relocation permit, mistakenly identifying Block 1501, Lot 1, as Township property. The County, as the owner, along with the Green Acres, was notified about the project in 2010, following the completion of the work. As compensation, the Township proposes to give \$10,000 in cash compensation to the County to be used for future parkland acquisition.

Is there a motion to approve?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

OK. Roll call. Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

Agenda item Number 7, this is the same park. Project is Rahway River Parkway Park, Block 908, part of Lot 16, Block 406, part of Lot 20, Township of Springfield, Union County. And, Block 3617, part of Lot 1, Block 4508, part of Lot 4, Township of Union, Union County. The DEP on behalf of the County of Union requests approval to remove the Green Acres restrictions from a 0.288-plus-or-minus-acre portion of parkland to convey 0.021, plus or minus, acres in fee, and a total of 0.267, plus or minus, acres in easements, to the New Jersey Department of Transportation in connection with the Morris Avenue, New Jersey Route 82 Bridge replacement over Rahway River and relocation of an associated water line. The proposed diversions and disposal meet the necessary criteria of size, being granted to a public entity for a project serving a public purpose, and no adverse impact on the parkland or loss of recreation and conservation facilities. As

compensation, the DOT proposes to pay \$9,500 in cash compensation to the County to be used for future park improvement; and, \$518,640 -- \$518,640 -- to DEP's Shade Tree and Community Forest Preservation License Plate Fund as mitigation for tree removal on parkland. Under the Green Acres rules, the County would be required to, 1., plant replacement trees, or, 2., make a cash contribution to the Shade Tree and Community Forestry Plate Fund in lieu of the tree planting.

Is there a motion to approve?

SENATOR SMITH: I'm not sure I understand the compensation.

Could you explain that in a little more detail?

MS. FULLAM: Is there someone from DEP or DOT who can come forward?

JUDETH YEANY, Esq.: I'm not seeing the light, so I don't know if this is working.

Judeth Yeany from DEP's Office of Transactions of Public Land Administration. Do you want us to explain the discrepancy between the two numbers, or just what they represent?

SENATOR SMITH: Well, I was trying to figure out why for it-
- This is a request from DEP?

MS. YEANY: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

And, at the end of the day, DEP gets \$518,540 (*sic*)?

MS. YEANY: DEP's forestry program does because the applicant has opted to use that avenue of tree compensation rather than planting the trees themselves.

So, it's not entirely clear from that last sentence, but, that last sentence where it says "under the Green Acres rules, the County would be required to plant replacement trees or make a cash contribution," they'd pick that second option.

SENATOR SMITH: So, the 518, that's an actual number here?

MS. YEANY: Yes, for the trees, under what's called a basal area replacement formula; that's in our rules.

SENATOR SMITH: And, are you-- Is there also this \$9,500?

MS. YEANY: That's the real estate value of the fee transfer and the easements that are needed for the road project.

So, those are relatively small areas, so--

SENATOR SMITH: With a very good purchase price for our DEP, for what is tree replacement program, or future park improvements?

MS. YEANY: Right, so, the--

SENATOR SMITH: Listen, I'd like you to negotiate my next house sale.

(laughter)

Pretty good deal for the State, it sounds like.

MS. YEANY: Yes.

I mean the money, when we do get cash payments, it goes into the community forestry program, and it generally goes to tree planting in urban areas.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you.

MS. YEANY: You're welcome.

Yes.

SENATOR BUCCO: So, the money that they're paying is \$518,640?

MS. YEANY: Yes.

SENATOR BUCCO: It's going to go into this fund, but it doesn't necessarily mean that the trees are going to be planted back in this municipality?

MS. YEANY: It's hard to guarantee that, particularly because we don't run that program; so, we try not to make that promise, but we can certainly -- we're certainly receptive to specific proposals.

Our Commissioner's Office has inquired about that in another location.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

I mean, to taking them out of that area, it seems to me like we ought to be putting the trees back into that area.

MS. YEANY: Well, as you can imagine, writing that check is the last resort.

I know, generally, if you can find locations for the trees, they will get planted locally. But, sometimes it's a matter of just not having the room or the appropriate location for all the trees that would be required to be planted.

SENATOR BUCCO: OK, thank you.

MS. YEANY: You're welcome.

MR. REDD: Any additional questions? (no response)

MS. FULLAM: OK, any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

I think we do need to do the motion, still. Is there a motion to approve?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Second?

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

For the roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: OK, motion carries.

As to agenda item Number 8, the project is Gaylord Park, Block 903, Lot 1; Block 902, Lot 1; Block 2210, Lot 5; Block 2211, Lot 1. And, Windsor Park, Block 4701, Lot 1; Block 2701, Lot 1; Milton Votee Park, Block 4704, Lot 1. This is in the Township of Teaneck, Bergen County. The DEP, on behalf of the Township of Teaneck, requests approval to allow the

Township to convey a total of 0.332, plus or minus, acres of parkland -- 0.230 in fee and 0.102 in easements -- to the Department of Transportation in connection with the Route 4 Bridge over Palisade Avenue, and CSX Bridge Improvements from Garrison Avenue to Queen Anne Road Project. The Route 4 corridor in the vicinity of Palisade Avenue, the CSX Railroad Corridor, and Windsor Road suffers from geometric deficiencies; traffic congestion; safety issues; and a structurally deficient bridge. The project will replace the structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridge and improve the roadway operational problems over approximately 0.62 miles of Route 4. The project will result in minor unavoidable impacts to the following Green Acres encumbered properties along the Route 4 Corridor: Gaylord Park; Windsor Park; and Milton Votee Park. To compensate for the disposal of 0.230 acres of parkland in fee, and a diversion of 0.102 acres of parkland in easements, including the associated tree removal, the Township proposes to accept from DOT, and impose Green Acres restrictions on a -- 0.625, sorry -- 1.625-acre wooded parcel of replacement land. The Department has determined that the proposed replacement land qualifies as comparable wooded replacement land and that the Township's proposal satisfies the tree replacement requirement.

Is there a motion to approve?

MR. SHABAZZ: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

MR. MISTRY: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

The roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Motion carries.

The next item is agenda item Number 9--

(laughter)

The project is Claremont Field, Block 69, part of Lot 8; Block 81, part of Lot 6.02 and Lot 6.03, Borough of Bernardsville, Somerset County. The DEP, on behalf of the Borough of Bernardsville, requests approval to allow the disposal of 0.263, plus or minus, acres of parkland within Claremont Field in the Borough of Bernardsville, Somerset County, to resolve two private encroachments, one of which preexisted the Green Acres Program encumbrance on the property. In 1975, the Borough received Green Acres Program funding for the acquisition of parkland. As a result of this

funding, the Borough subsequently listed Claremont Field -- which is Block 69, Lots 8, 9, and 29 -- on the Borough's Recreation and Open Space Inventory, or ROSI Inventory, as unfunded parkland. In 2013, as a result of surveying its park and open space holdings, the Borough identified several private encroachments. Specifically, the two private parking lot encroachments are on a 0.263-acre portion of Claremont Field. Disposal Area A consisting of 0.072 acres -- which is Block 69, Lot 5 -- owned by Ramsey Associates. Ramsey Associates had access to, used, and considered the area behind Lot 5 to be part of its property prior to the Green Acres encumbrance in 1975. Disposal Area B consisting of 0.192 acres -- which is Block 69, Lots 6 and 7 -- owned by Rossi Holdings, LLC. The encroachments behind Lots 6 and 7 occurred after the 1975 encumbrance. In 2015, the Borough submitted an ROSI Amendment request to the Department stating that the Borough made a bona fide error when listing Claremont Field on its ROSI in its entirety and seeking to remove these areas from its ROSI. The Department denied the Borough's request regarding the private encroachments given that the uses were unauthorized and constituted diversions of parkland. Since the Borough is combining the compensation requirements from the two disposal areas into one compensation proposal, the Borough proposes dedicating 5.505 acres of land, which is substantially more than the required 3.91 acres under Green Acres rules. This replacement area -- and, there is a typo in the materials -- it's Block 81, Lot 6.03, consisting of 2.639 acres, and a 2.866-acre portion of Block 81, Lot 6.02 is located along Mine Brook Road and State Highway 202 in the Borough of Bernardsville, Somerset County. The proposed replacement parcel is vacant, entirely wooded, and includes a 15-foot access area to Mine Brook Road.

Is there a motion to approve?

SENATOR BUCCO: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Are there any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

OK, the roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Motion carries.

We have agenda item Number 10, the project is Strawbridge Lake Park, Block 3104, part of Lot 1 and part of Lot 2, Township of

Moorestown, Burlington County. The NJDEP, on behalf of the Township of Moorestown, requests approval to allow the disposal of a 0.007-acre portion of Green Acres encumbered parkland within Strawbridge Lake Park in connection with the New Jersey Department of Transportation's resurfacing project on Route 38, from Nixon Drive to the Route 295 Bridge. As part of the project, traffic signals will be upgraded; ADA compliant sidewalks and ramps will be installed for safe access to and from the traffic signals; and guiderails will be upgraded to current safety standards. This project will result in a permanent disposal of parkland and temporary work area within the park. No recreational facilities will be impacted by the proposed disposal. Given the adjacency of the land to the roadway, the area proposed for disposal is not suitable for recreational activities or significant public uses. As to the terms, the estimated value of the 0.007 acre of easement area is \$612. The minimum compensation for the disposal of parkland is \$5,000 for disposals or diversions of less than 0.25 acres. Since the estimated value of the disposal area is less than the minimum compensation required, the Township has agreed to accept \$5,000 cash compensation from NJDOT to be used toward a planned acquisition of approximately 5.5 acres of open space. The proposed disposal does not involve the removal of any trees, therefore no tree compensation is due.

Is there a motion to approve?

MR. MISTRY: Motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: OK, it's moved and seconded.

Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Are there any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

OK, for roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

On to agenda item Number 11. This project is Wilkinson Baseball Field -- which is Block 42, part of Lot 14 -- and Kent Road Playground, Block: 6, part of Lot 15, Township of Oxford, Warren County. The NJDEP, on behalf of the Township of Oxford, Warren County, requests approval to allow the diversion of a 0.136-acre portion of Green Acres encumbered parkland within Wilkinson Baseball Field and Kent Road Playground in connection with the New Jersey DOT Route 31, over Furnace Brook Bridge Replacement Project. DOT has requested permanent easements on both parks to accommodate the bridge replacement, drainage

improvements, and utility line relocations needed as part of the project. As to the terms, the estimated value of the proposed 0.136-acre total diversion area is \$1,765. The minimum compensation for a minor diversion of parkland is \$2,500 for the first 0.10 acre of parkland to which the easements would apply and \$1,000 for each additional tenth of an acre subject to the easement. Since the estimated value of the proposed easements is less than the minimum compensation required, the NJDOT has agreed to pay \$3,500 cash compensation to DEP to be deposited into the State of New Jersey Garden State Preservation Trust Fund.

Is there a motion to approve?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

The roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

The next item is agenda item Number 12. Project is Delaware and Raritan Canal State Park, Six Mile Run Reservoir Site, Block 57, part of Lot 32.02; Block 85, part of Lots 62.02 and 62.03, Township of Franklin, Somerset County. NJDEP requests approval to execute a farm lease agreement on approximately 69.73 acres of land within portions of Block 57.01, Lot 32.02; Block 85, Lot 62.02; and Block 85, Lot 63.02 in the Township of Franklin, Somerset County. These lands are administered by the DEP as part of the Delaware and Raritan Canal State Park and are located within the area known as the Six Mile Run Reservoir Site. The proposed lease was competitively bid at a live auction held on December 10, 2025, in the central region of the State. Notice of the auction was posted on the NJDEP's website and distributed to a mailing list maintained by the NJDEP's Office of Transactions and Public Land Administration. The proposed tenant, Suydam Farms, LLC was the sole bidder at the public auction. As to the terms, the proposed lease term is five years, with the option to renew for three additional five-year terms. The proposed rental rate is \$1,296 per year for the initial five-year lease term, subject to adjustment at the start of each renewal term. The NJDEP established the proposed annual rental rate of \$1,296 per year using soil rental rates set by the Farm Services Agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. As a programmatic matter, based

on prior discussions with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture and New Jersey Farm Bureau, NJDEP agreed to reduce the FSA rental rate for its farm leases by 20 percent to account for the disadvantages of farming on the NJDEP land. These disadvantages include the requirement that the farmed lands be used for public hunting; restrictions on the types of crops that can be grown; and inability to control wildlife damage using management tools such as deer fencing. The rental rate will be reviewed at the beginning of each renewal term to determine the current fair market value of the leased premises based on the Consumer Price Index, FSA soil rental rates or value of similar real estate rentals. However, if the Consumer Price Index and value of similar real estate rentals decrease or remain stable, the rent will not decrease.

Is there a motion to approve?

SENATOR SMITH: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

MR. MISTRY: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public?

RYCK SUYDAM: Yes ma'am.

MS. FULLAM: OK, please approach.

MR. SUYDAM: I've got no light.

Good morning, I'm Ryck Suydam. This lease is for Suydam Farms, the property that my family has been farming for 300 years. In 1979, the State took this particular piece, and we've been leasing it back ever since. At the latest renewal, it added some restrictions. I ask this Commission to

please agree and pass the lease as it is written, because I don't think this Commission has the authority to change it. There are a couple wrinkles in it, which I am discussing with the DEP, as well as New Jersey Farm Bureau, and the New Jersey Department of Agriculture also have concerns with some of the wording in the lease.

At Senator Smith's invitation, I came to visit you today to get this approval, but I just wanted to share my story -- he encouraged me to share my story -- the problems I have with this. In recent-- In the previous leases since 1979, there was never a restriction on the harvesting of hay. And, I'd just like to point out, at the top of Page 9, when there's a restriction on crops to be grown, that's not correct; it's when crops could be harvested. Small change, really not going to affect you guys at all; it affects me. That harvested crop is hay. We harvest crop; I was baling all week; I should be baling hay right now while the weather is beautiful. But, in the restriction on these acres, I cannot harvest hay until after July 15. I should be harvesting it today. Crops get old. So, this pushing it back til July 15 is incredibly unnecessary, and, again, it's not this body's position to make that change, I just wanted to share my story, that we're hoping to get a administrative waiver on that particular piece on the harvesting after July 15. The purpose is -- of the limiting til after July 15 -- is to encourage ground-nesting birds. They're not there. I have been *personally* harvesting these acres *myself* for over 50 years. I cut it; I rake it; I bale it; I put it away. There's no ground-nesting birds there. And, if there were, the coyotes and the fox would have got them. So, I'm sharing my story. Senator Smith is my Senator; I'm in his district; and he wanted me to share with you this concern.

So, we're going to continue to have conversations with the DEP about it. I'd be happy for you guys to approve this lease as it is. But, I wanted you to know that they're not all perfect. And, this July 15 restriction, to my understanding, is blanket on all new leases on DEP farm property, which is painting with a broad brush. I think it could be to the benefit of agriculture; to the individual farmer; to those towns in which those farms are; to the state's economy to have a strong, healthy agricultural environment, to provide food for people near urban centers. So, how'd I do, Senator Smith?

SENATOR SMITH: You did good.

The -- just for the Committee's benefit -- we're trying to set up a meeting with the Suydam Farm and the new Commissioner, who is from Franklin Township.

MR. SUYDAM: Lives down the street.

SENATOR SMITH: Right, and actually a former Councilman in Franklin Township.

So, to see if there is some way to make the one size fit all go away, maybe of individual determination of the lease itself. So, it's a work in progress. But, the applicant still would like us to come forward with the lease, even though it's imperfect.

MR. SUYDAM: Thanks for listening.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So, this July 15 date added this term?

MR. SUYDAM: This term.

In the previous term, which was a short-term lease, it was waived, administratively, and I should thank you. But, in the renewal, there was no waiver. I think there could be.

SENATOR SMITH: Maybe a good person can do it?

MR. SUYDAM: I don't have an answer for you, Senator.

SENATOR SMITH: Right, so, the irony in all of this is his family owned that land; it was condemned; taken by legal force; and taken back every year just to farm it, as they did for all the time that they've owned the land.

So, it's like, why did we condemn it in the first place?

SENATOR BUCCO: Right, I was just going to say, why don't we give it back?

MR. SUYDAM: I'll buy it.

And, to that point, Senator, this restriction, as read there's a 20% discount in the rate for that restriction, for this and other restrictions. I'd be more than happy to pay the extra 20% to lift the restriction.

SENATOR BUCCO: I would suggest that rather than trying to get a waiver on the restriction, we try to convince them that it'd be in the State's best interest to have the property sold back to the individual that's farming it, and to the family that's owned it for 300-plus years.

It's just, that's just my thought.

MR. SUYDAM: Senator, I'd love to have that discussion; I don't think we can cure it today.

SENATOR BUCCO: No, I don't think we can, but I think it's a discussion we ought to have.

MR. SUYDAM: Well, thank you.

MR. REDD: Thank you for coming out today, sir.

I'll work personally -- I actually have a call with the Commissioner this afternoon -- so, I'll make sure it's flagged and we can get

this in the next couple weeks. And, also, nice to meet you. Being a Rutgers alum, your family's very prominent supporting the University, so, nice to meet somebody from that family, because--

MR. SUYDAM: We're right down the street.

MR. REDD: I know.

So, thank you for coming out today.

MR. SUYDAM: Thank you.

SENATOR BUCCO: Let's try to sell it back to them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Through the application.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any additional public comments? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

OK, as to the roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Motion carries.

Our next item is agenda item Number 13. This is Leap Street Park, Block 5925, Lot 1, Township of Egg Harbor, Atlantic County. NJDEP, on behalf of the Township of Egg Harbor, requests approval to change the Green Acres encumbrance classification from “funded” to “unfunded” for a 0.78-acre portion of the Township’s Leap Street Park -- which is in Block 5925, Lot 1 -- known as the “diversion area.” In 2005, the Township acquired Block 5925, Lots 1 through 4, comprising approximately 23 acres using Green Acres funding, and this was Project Number 0100-99-25-02. These lots have since been consolidated as Block 2925, Lot 1, or, “the property.” Currently the property consists predominantly of wooded terrain and includes an outdoor riding area; a small parking lot; several shed and barn structures; and a 900-square-foot recreation building containing restroom facilities, administration/office space and classroom space. The proposed diversion will allow Hearts Therapeutic Riding Center to construct an indoor riding arena on the property to better serve its clients and the Township community on a year-round basis. Hearts is a nonprofit organization that, in 2025, leased from the Township a 5.13-acre portion of the property for operation of a community-based equestrian center, including a trail system for therapeutic horseback riding and equine-assisted activities. As to the terms, as compensation for the proposed diversion, the Township proposes to place Green Acres funded parkland restrictions on a 2.09-acre portion of land located at 6653 West Jersey Avenue -- which is Block 2417, Lot 4. This proposed replacement land is adjacent to the Township’s Green

Acres encumbered Broadway Park -- which is located at Block 2417, Lot 6 -- an 8-acre wooded undeveloped park.

Is there a motion to approve?

MR. SHABAZZ: Motion.

MS. FULLAM: Second?

MR. MISTRY: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Do the members have any questions or comments? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

For the roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

Agenda item Number 14 is Round Valley Recreation Area, Block 14, Lot 7.02, Township of Clinton, Hunterdon County. DEP requests approval to grant a permanent subsurface gas line easement to Elizabethtown Gas Company to serve the NJDEP's State Parks Service Central Region Field Office, located on Block 14, Lot 7.02, -- which is 1451 Route 22 -- in Clinton Township, Hunterdon County. The proposed easement is needed to allow the installation of a new gas line to serve the office. Because the proposed easement will benefit the state, the proposed compensation is \$1.

Is there a motion to approve?

SENATOR BUCCO: So moved.

MS. FULLAM: Is there a second?

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MS. FULLAM: Are there any questions or comments from the members? (no response)

Any questions or comments from the public? (no response)

Any abstentions or opposed? (no response)

The roll call, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

OK. We are now moving on to agenda item Number 15, which is the Division of Pensions and Benefits portion of the agenda. Can we have a motion to sit as the Judicial Retirement System Board of Trustees?

SENATOR BUCCO: So moved.

MR. MISTRY: Second.

MS. FULLAM: OK.

For roll call. Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries.

MS. ZULLA: Good morning.

First on the JRS agenda is the approval of the minutes of the meeting held on December 15, 2025. Can I have a motion?

MR. SHABAZZ: Motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you, motion approved.

Number 2 on the agenda is the confirmation of death claims, retirements, and survivor benefits. Can I have a motion?

MR. SHABAZZ: Motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Up next is Number 3, it's the receipt of the financial statements from July 2025 through September 2025. We don't need a motion, but can I just have -- call roll to receive the financial statements.

Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

And, Number 4 is the receipt of the JRS actuarial valuation report as of July 1, 2025. We don't have a presentation today, from Cheiron; we usually do. They're not here; but, we can schedule one at a later date.

MR. REDD: If the members wanted to have a report in terms of the -- an actuarial report -- we can schedule something over Zoom, via this summer, just to update folks in terms of the pensions and benefits.

So, we'll reach out and find a time--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes, that's a good--

SENATOR BUCCO: I would suggest we do that. I mean, these funds seem to be so underfunded.

And, it takes 20 years at the rate that we're going to have the (indiscernible) reinstated. So, I think we should hear something.

MR. REDD: OK.

MS. ZULLA: We do have someone if you want to -- if you have any questions or current concerns now that can write them down; he can't answer them, if there's anything that pops up right now.

JACK ERIKSON: Hello, my name is Jack Erikson. As you all just said, the actual New Jersey Cheiron team could not make it today, so I'm

here just to write any notes or any feedback you might have on the report or the presentation and then they can respond at a later time.

SENATOR SMITH: So, questions for when you come back-- If I'm looking at the right stuff, there's a calculation of pension expense; looks like on Page 8, and it says from '24-'25, year '25, year '25 that there's been a significant increase in something. Looks like pension expenses and percent of payroll went from 64% to 71%. And, I'm trying to figure out, are you saying we have more assets, or our investments have done better? Why the upspend?

MR. ERIKSON: OK, I can look into that.

SENATOR SMITH: OK, that'd be great.

MR. ERIKSON: Page 8.

SENATOR BUCCO: I just think we need a-- I just think we need to have the folks in the room and have a discussion about where we are; what the future's going to look like; and if there's any proposed change.

MR. ERIKSON: Of course.

MS. ZULLA: And, we can set something up for the summer.

MR. ERIKSON: OK, sounds good.

MR. REDD: Any additional questions or flags?

SENATOR BUCCO: Definitely via Zoom.

(laughter)

MR. REDD: Noted.

MR. ERIKSON: Sounds good.

Apologies they couldn't make it today.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: That's not what you told me, you said you wanted to come in, in July.

(laughter)

SENATOR BUCCO: If you come in, I'll come out.

(laughter)

MS. ZULLA: Even though there's no presentation, there's no changes that could be made, I still have to -- can I just have a motion to accept it as it will be presented?

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you, Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Now, can we ask to have a motion to return to sit as State House Commission?

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: So moved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

MR. MISTRY: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

MS. FULLAM: There are no more items on the agenda, do the members have anything that they would like to address to the Commission?

SENATOR BUCCO: Motion to adjourn.

MR. REDD: Wait, just a moment.

Before I accept the motion to adjourn, I just wanted to say that it took a little while for us to get back on track. But, I wanted to thank the State House Commission staff for pulling this together and bringing everything together. So, thank you, everyone here, for pulling it together, appreciate it.

SENATOR SMITH: And, one more reminder, you want to get to the merry-go-round in Seaside Heights.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes, I've been there; I've been on it; it's nice.

(laughter)

MS. FULLAM: OK.

So, I heard there was a motion to adjourn; is there a second--

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Second.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes I did.

(laughter)

MS. FULLAM: On the roll call.

Chairman Redd.

MR. REDD: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Mistry.

MR. MISTRY: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Senator Bucco.

SENATOR BUCCO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblyman DiMaio.

ASSEMBLYMAN DiMAIO: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. FULLAM: The motion carries; the meeting is adjourned.

I do not have a date yet for the next meeting.

MR. REDD: I think we need to do, at some point during the summer, the briefing on the pensions.

Probably in September.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)