
Commission Meeting

of

STATE HOUSE COMMISSION

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

DATE: 9:00 a.m.
December 9, 2024

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assad Akhter, Chair
Senator Bob Smith
Senator Michael L. Testa, Jr.
Assemblywoman Eliana Pintor-Marin
Assemblywoman Nancy F. Muñoz
Aaron Binder
Tariq Shabazz



ALSO PRESENT:

Eric Brophy
Commission Secretary

Brittany Zulla
Acting Secretary
JRS Administrator

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

Jakai Jackson, 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>
Jeffrey Gerber Chief Operating Officer Maxwell Interstate	13
Howard Long, Esq. City Attorney Gloucester City, N.J.	18
APPENDIX:	
Testimony submitted by Jean Public Private Citizen	1x
mj 1-25	

ASSAD AKHTER (Chair): I'll call this meeting to order, and ask for the public notice to be read.

MR. BROPHY: Thank you.

We're in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of the meeting of the State House Commission was sent by way of notice on November 26, 2024; filed with the Secretary of State; distributed to the State House Press Corps; and, posted on the State House Commission's website.

I'll take the roll.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Here.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Here.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Shabazz is not here yet.
Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Present.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Present.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin is not here yet.
Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Here.

MR. BROPHY: We have a quorum.

We got one public comment dated December 9.

MS. BUSSELL: Sixth.

MR. BROPHY: I'm sorry, sixth.

That's today's date. December 6 at 5:14 from Jean Public that has been included in the Commission members' packets, and they can take that under advisement.

Can we have a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting, September 23, 2024?

MR. AKHTER: So moved.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You would have to abstain; you weren't here.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Was I here?

I've been substituting so much I forgot if I was here or not.

Was I here?

MR. BROPHY: I don't think you were here on that one.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: OK.

I've been a sub enough times that I forget.

MR. BINDER: I'll second.

MR. BROPHY: Thank you, Mr. Binder.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Right, I have to abstain.

MR. BROPHY: OK.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: I'm going to abstain.

I believe I was not here, unless your records show something different. But, I think you get all the minutes.

MR. BROPHY: The last meeting I believe you were--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You were here.

MR. BROPHY: OK.

Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Abstention.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Abstain.

MR. BROPHY: Also abstained.

Let's wait til the rest of the-- We'll table it.

MR. AKHTER: Motion to table that -- approval of the minutes.

MR. BROPHY: Yes.

All in favor.

All right, off to good a start.

(laughter)

Number 2 on the list; this is new business now. Number 2 is RPR 25-19, New Jersey Performing Arts Center, Block 17, part of Lot 1.01 in the City of Newark in Essex County. The State Department of Treasury requests approval to grant two easements on the grounds of the New Jersey Performing Arts Center, located at 1 Center Street, in the City of Newark in Essex County. First easement, consisting of approximately .037 acres of land will be granted 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 sewer mains.

A second easement, consisting of approximately 0.276 acres of land will be granted to PSE&G for the installation and maintenance of a 4-inch gas line and electric infrastructure, which will include transformer vaults, pole boxes, hand holes -- no idea what that is -- and conduits. Since this action directly benefits the State, the easements will be granted for \$1.

Any questions or comments?

Could we have a motion?

SENATOR SMITH: Motion to approve.

SENATOR TESTA: Second.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

Senator Testa.

Mr. Akther.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: All right.

Now moving onto Number 3. Department of Environmental Protection request project is Maple Park and Garden Park, Block 3209, parts of Lots 1 and 3 in the Village of Ridgewood in Bergen County. The DEP, on behalf of the Village of Ridgewood, requests approval to allow the village to

convey approximately 0.001 acres of land, which is 64 square feet, in fee to Ridgewood Water to legalize the installation of a wellhead necessary for the continued functioning of the village's water system. The village also seeks approval to grant a 0.031-acre -- which is 1,366 square feet -- subsurface easement to Ridgewood Water to connect the well to an existing underground water main. The wellhead replaces the original Linwood Well, constructed on Block 3209, Lot 3, in 1931, prior to Green Acres restrictions. By the early 2000s, productivity of the well declined, and efforts to repair the well failed and Linwood Well was taken out of service in 2005. Over time, demand for water from the Ridgewood residents -- and, the residents of surrounding areas that Ridgewood Water services -- increased. The Linwood Well remained inactive for over 10 years following an administrative order on consent issued in 2014, by the U.S. EPA. A subsequent AOC administrative order of consent placed upon the village required any replacement well to be located within 100 feet of the existing Linwood Well. In 2019, a new well was installed on Block 3209 Lot 1, without Green Acres authorization. New subsurface piping through Lot 1 and Lot 3 is now needed to connect the new well to the water main.

The proposed diversion and disposal of park land will allow Ridgewood water to continue to supply an adequate volume of drinking water to its service area, which includes Glen Rock, Midland Park, Wyckoff, and Ridgewood. The proposed diversion and disposal will not affect any recreational facilities contained within the two adjacent park land lots. It will not involve any tree removal. Ridgewood Water will continue to be the owner and operator of the well. Pursuant to NJAC 7:36-26.10G, the proposed major disposal area, which is 0.001 acre, must be replaced with at

least four times its acreage in land, or 10 times the market value of land, if monetary compensation is provided with a \$10,000 minimum monetary compensation. The appraised value of this disposal area is \$320. Since the 10-to-1 ratio would yield \$3,200 of monetary compensation, the \$10,000 minimum applies. Pursuant to NJAC 7:36-26.5A1, the minimum compensation for the minor diversion of a subsurface easement is less than 0.10 acres in size is \$2,500 or the adjusted tax assessed value, which is higher -- whichever is higher, sorry.

The value of the subsurface was assessed at \$6,800. As compensation for the proposed major disposal and minor diversion, the village has proposed to remit monetary compensation of \$16,800 to the Garden State Preservation Trust Fund.

Can we have a motion?

MR. BINDER: So moved.

SENATOR SMITH: Second.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder, on that one.

Senator Smith.

Any questions, comments?

There are none.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: All in favor.

Number 4. Project is Stafford Forge in Upper Barnegat Bay; WMA Block 315, part of Lots 14 and 32 -- 38.01 in Lacey Township; Block 961 Lot 5 in Lacey Township; and, Block 296 Lot 51 in Stafford Township; all in Ocean County.

The DEP requests approval to convey 219.36 acres of undeveloped land currently part of the Stafford Forge and Upper Barnegat Wildlife Management Area, located in Lacey and Stafford Townships in Ocean County, to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The area is to be conveyed are coastal wetlands, some of which are located next to lands currently owned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and administered as part of the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge. In exchange, DEP will receive 57.37 acres of uplands in Galloway Township -- which is in Atlantic County -- to be used as the location of the New Jersey Fish and Wildlife Marine Resources Administration's new offices.

The Marine Resources Administration's offices are currently located on the property under an agreement between U.S. Fish and Wildlife and New Jersey DEP, but are in desperate need of replacement. For the State to build a new MRA facility on the property, ownership of the land is required. The proposed conveyance will have several advantages for DEP. Most importantly it will allow the MRA to remain at its current location with

a boat ramp on the Nacote Creek, and boat access to the Mullica River, Great Bay, and Atlantic Ocean. These are important water bodies for the MRA and it is extremely important for New Jersey Fish and Wildlife to have access to these waterways via boat to conduct its research and activities. The proposed conveyance will transfer to U.S. Fish and Wildlife coastal wetlands that cannot be developed. These lands will be added to and will continue to be preserved for recreation and conservation purposes as part of the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge.

In anticipation of the proposed exchange, U.S. Fish and Wildlife obtained an appraisal for the DEP's review that valued the lands to be conveyed by the DEP to U.S. Fish and Wildlife at \$264,280 while the land and buildings to be received by DEP were valued at \$264,281.25. The properties were appraised as unrestricted conservation land, and/or conserved land for recreational use. Depending on whether the lands were coastal, wetlands, or uplands, both parties to the proposed exchange have agreed to deed restrict all the lands to be exchanged for recreation and conservation purposes. Although the DEP will transfer more acreage to U.S. Fish and Wildlife than it will receive in exchange, New Jersey DEP believes the proposal exchange is an equitable one for the State based on equal real estate value of both sides of the transaction and the benefits to be gained through the ownership of the Nacote Creek area.

Can we have a motion?

SENATOR SMITH: Well, before a motion, I think a comment is appropriate.

MR. BROPHY: Sure.

SENATOR SMITH: We have a public comment here saying, "This is a terrible deal for the State."

Au contraire, I disagree.

First of all, we're not talking about property coming out of the public trust. It's going from one governmental agency in charge of preserving land for open space and seeing to it that there's public recreation. The property's being deed restricted in both instances. And, if anything, it probably saves the State of New Jersey some money, because the land that we're getting is land we're not going to have to buy in order to keep that (indiscernible) or whatever, to approve that center.

So, it looks to me like this is actually one of those few instances where government actually cooperates -- different levels of government -- cooperate for exactly the right purpose. So, I respectfully disagree with the public comment.

I'm happy -- if there are no other comments -- to offer a motion to approve.

SENATOR TESTA: Senator, I have a comment.

This is one of those times, Senator, when you and I agree.

(laughter)

SENATOR SMITH: Something wrong here.

SENATOR TESTA: That might come as a shock to some of the folks in this room. But, you and I wholeheartedly agree. I just want to make sure that the land that is deed restricted to be used for recreation purposes for the citizens of the State of New Jersey is actually going to be available to the citizens of the State of New Jersey. Because, one of the complaints I can tell you that I get from constituents in my legislative district, and slightly

outside, not concerning this particular piece of land, but the Wharton State Forest, where it's supposed to be open for a lot of beneficial use for recreation; things of that nature. And, there's been a lot of restrictions as of late. And, I'm hoping that, when we say this is deed restricted for recreational purposes, that in fact the public has access to it and it's not in name only. That it's for recreational use.

But, I agree with you Senator, I think this is a win-win.

SENATOR SMITH: It looks like it's smart.

SENAOTR TESTA: Yes.

It looks like it's a win-win, and I'll second your motion.

SENAOR SMITH: And, I can't give you the assurances that you may want, but with regard to the deed restriction, I think only the government can do that.

SENATOR TESTA: I just wanted to state that for the record, Senator.

That's all.

And, I'll second your motion.

MR. BROPHY: Great.

So, Senator Smith on the motion, Senator Testa on the second.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: So, as an additional comment.

The initial comment, I totally agree with you that we should make sure everybody gets the benefit of their bargain. But, for example, some recreational uses have adverse impacts that the DEP is trying to regulate. One of the issues -- and, I think it goes directly to Wharton State Park (*sic*) -- is offroad vehicles. And, the concern is the offroad vehicles are being used to either create new trails in the forest that adversely impact the ecology of the forest. But, it always depends on what is the particular use. And, but I totally agree with you. You and I are from the Gifford Pinchot school. Gifford Pinchot was the Governor of Pennsylvania, (indiscernible) became the Secretary of the Interior under President Theodore Roosevelt. And, his belief was, unlike John Muir, Sierra Club, that the parks should be open to the public. That's the way in which you get a constituency who is in favor of open space and outdoor recreation as opposed to John Muir and (indiscernible) all the time who really wanted the parks preserved and keep the public out because we inflict too much damage on it.

I agree with the Gifford Pinchot side of it. But, there are some limitations. I mentioned the offroad vehicles as one that has created a lot of problems in our parks.

But, very enthusiastic, yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: Long way to get the yes.

(laughter)

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: All in favor.

Number 5. Project approval of-- I'm sorry. This is the Department of Transportation request.

Approval of outdoor advertising waiver number 77071. It's on Route I-76 milepost 2.41 SRD, Block 212.01, Lot 2 in Gloucester City, in Camden County. The DOT, on behalf of Maxwell Interstate LLC, requests a waiver from Outdoor Advertising Regulations to allow the issuance of a multi-message, static outdoor advertising permit for an off-premise sign. The sign would be installed along Interstate Route 76 in Gloucester City, in Camden County on the eastern side of the roadway at milepost 2.41, and visible to northbound and southbound traffic. This application meets the threshold requirement that a waiver can only be granted for signs on public property. The sign is on property owned by the City of Gloucester City.

The application submitted by Maxwell proposes the erection of a two-sided sign; one side, multi-message visible to southbound traffic. And, the second static visible to northbound traffic, with each side having a face of 20 feet in height by 50 feet in width; 1,000 square feet per side. In total, the sign will have 2,000 square feet of advertising space. The sign visible to southbound traffic will be electronic.

A waiver is required because the location of the sign did not meet DOT regulatory requirements. NJAC 16:41C-8.1D-I, which provides if an interchange lacks a pavement widening, a sign shall not be located in that direction within 1,000 feet of the point of gore. In this instance, the sign is located 732 feet from a point of gore within an interchange in the southbound direction of the roadway. There is no interchange issue on the northbound direction. The Department intends to grant the waiver subject

to the approval of the State House Commission, and has determined that because the sign has demonstrated A., a public benefit; B., a need for the sign; C., public safety; and D., compliance with Federal rules and 1971 Federal State agreements, 23 CFR 750, which is the Highway Beautification Act and 23 USC 131, which is the control of outdoor advertising regulations, a waiver is appropriate.

The sign will be installed functioning and maintained at no cost to the public. In addition, the sign will be subject to the following conditions: Number 1, a post-construction traffic safety analysis shall be completed. Two, conformance with all other pertinent outdoor advertising regulations is required. Three, emergency notices shall conform to established protocols. Four, this waiver is void if it is determined that any sign violated the 1971 Federal agreement.

Can we have a motion?

SENATOR SMITH: No.

I have a bunch of questions.

MR. BROPHY: Sure.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

First of all, does anybody remember us ever giving a State House Commission waiver to provide for a waiver from the outdoor billboard law?

I'm here 20 years; I don't remember one.

Anybody remember one?

J E F F R E Y G E R B E R: Yes.

My name is Jeff Gerber I'm the Chief Operating Officer from Maxwell Interstate. We're the company behind-- The sign is going to be built on Gloucester City property.

SENATOR SMITH: Good.

MR. GERBER: We did a waiver a year and half ago for a property in Camden on 676 on the Jersey Transit property; for a waiver for spacing for rent.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

Your memory is better.

I sit here, and I don't remember.

MR. GERBER: I remember because we worked on the project for a number of years.

But, yes. And, this Commission has done numerous other ones throughout the State of New Jersey. Not ones I've been involved in. This project in particular is going to generate a substantial amount of revenue to-

-

SENATOR SMITH: Second question, second question.

Tell me about the revenue.

MR. GERBER: Sure.

They are going to--

MR. AKHTER: Take a seat, sir.

MR. GERBER: I think it's on.

They are going to get 20% of the gross revenue, not only from this sign, but to other signs that are on private property in Gloucester City. So, when this project is completely built out, it's going to generate \$200,000 - \$300,000 a year to Gloucester City.

There's two officials here from Gloucester City to explain to you, if needed, the importance of that money to their budget.

SENATOR SMITH: Right.

And, I'm not disagreeing with that. The stuff that I read in here; I did not see the monetary arrangement. I saw a comment that revenue for the City is absolutely critical; I got that. Totally understand it. But, I wanted to make sure Gloucester City, the recipient, was getting fair market value. And, there was nothing in here that indicated that. So, what are they getting per sign per month, or is it an estimate?

MR. GERBER: It's just an estimate.

And, all the signs have not been built yet, and it takes time for these signs to ramp up and to generate revenue. At full buildout, it'll be between \$200,000 and \$300,000 per year. We have an agreement with Gloucester City that's in writing; it's guaranteed to them. Again, they get 20% of the gross, not only from this sign, but from three other signs that are being built in Gloucester City. So, it's a very good deal for the City-- No cost to the City whatsoever, plus, the City gets to use the digital signage--

SENATOR SMITH: For emergency messaging.

MR. GERBER: For emergency messaging, for promoting--

SENATOR SMITH: Standard, absolutely.

Absolutely standard.

MR. GERBER: Yes.

All at no cost, of course.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

The only thing that is a little bit of a concern is that it's a-- The amount is variable in the sense that it's 20% of whatever the rental is, and I'm sure you're going to try and get the best rental you can.

MR. GERBER: Yes.

SENATOR SMITH: So, you have a total of how many signs?

MR. GERBER: A total of-- Four total, will be built in the City, when the project is completed.

Two have been built; this one now is subject to State House Commission.

SENATOR SMITH: And, the two that have been built give you a little model for what's going -- What is--

MR. GERBER: It just got built in June.

They're still ramping up.

SENATOR SMITH: They're not rented yet?

MR. GERBER: Well, there is advertising on them, but it's just starting.

But, we would expect-- We would expect this project to generate -- when all four signs are built -- grossing revenue somewhere in the \$1 million - \$1.5 million range.

SENATOR SMITH: Per year?

MR. GERBER: Per year.

Of which, the City would get \$200,000 to \$300,000 per year.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

And, is there any length of time for the agreement?

MR. GERBER: For perpetuity.

SENATOR SMITH: In perpetuity?

MR. GERBER: As long as the signs exist.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

Which is probably a good reason to have the percentage, as opposed to a flat fee, because the theory is that it can grow as the revenues grow.

The only reason I asked -- just for a little rule of thumb for the Commission members -- having a billboard sign is a very lucrative proposition and property owners are normally paid something on the order of \$2,000-- Between \$2,000 and \$3,000 a month for the rental. It sounds like you're getting pretty close to market rate.

MR. GERBER: They're probably getting-- They're also getting revenue from signs that aren't on public property. That's part of the deal that the City's getting here, is two out of those four signs aren't even on public property, they're getting 20% of revenue from those signs as well.

SENATOR SMITH: They're privately owned?

Or they're owned by--

MR. GERBER: They're owned-- They're on private property ownership. They're not on city-owned property.

SENATOR SMITH: Sounds to me like it's a fair deal.

The monetary stuff wasn't in the materials. At least, I didn't see it.

MR. GERBER: If we're involved, the next application will make sure that it's in there, so it's easier for the Commission to review.

SENATOR SMITH: I have no further questions.

MR. BROPHY: We still need a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

MR. BROPHY: Second.

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Akhter.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: All in favor.

MR. GERBER: Thank you very much.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you.

HOWARD LONG, Esq.: On behalf of the City, thank you very much as well.

I appreciate it very much; Howard Long, City Attorney. Much appreciated.

Good to see you, Senator.

SENATOR TESTA: Good to see you.

MR. LONG: How've you been?

SENATOR TESTA: (Indiscernible).

MR. BROPHY: Number 6.

Project is CR 541, Burlington, Mount Holly Road, Parcels V145C, part of Block 123, Lot 5, Burlington Township. And, Parcel B145D, part of Block 807, Lot 1 in Westampton Township, in Burlington County.

The Department of Transportation, Division of Right of Way is requesting approval to dispose of -- via direct sale -- 0.472 acres of DOT-owned excess land, now known as Parcels V145C, which is 0.451 acres in Burlington Township, and, V145D, 0.021 acres in Westampton Township, Burlington County, to adjoining property owner Highview Commercial X5 LLC, to be used for commercial development. The sale is requested to support the proposed CR541 redevelopment center for retail, warehouse, and commercial use by relocating the existing jug handle to a location on the property currently owned by Highview Commercial X5 LLC to allow for improved traffic flow.

Parcels V145C and V145D were originally acquired as County Route 541 Burlington-Mount Holly Road, and have been declared surplus to the Department's needs. The recommended sale price is \$345,000, which is the difference between the appraised market value as assembled, with parcels V145C and V145D. \$4,385,000, and the market value, before assemblage without parcels V145C and V145D at \$4,040,000.

Can we have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Motion.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman.

Second?

MR. AKHTER: Second.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Akhter.

Any questions, comments? (no response)

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: All in favor.

We're now moving into the Division of Pensions and Benefits requests.

Can we have a motion to sit as the Judicial Retirement System Board of Trustees?

MR. AKHTER: Before we do, we have to return to the motion on approving minutes.

MR. BROPHY: Yes.

MR. AKHTER: Given that-- Given that there's only actually three members here who were at the last meeting, and we can't approve the minutes, but I-- Just to clarify with the AG's Office here in terms of-- And she can speak to the fact that any member here who was not at the last

meeting can still approve -- to vote to approve the minutes given the accuracy of the minutes. And the reason I'm asking for that is because there are substitutes at this meeting, and we may very well have the same problem at the next meeting, if the other members are here.

So, in order to just verify the validity of those minutes -- any members have questions, I'll be happy to take them -- but, I'd like to ask for approval of the minutes.

SENATOR TESTA: I was merely concerned about the Robert's Rules aspect of it, but as long as the Deputy Attorney General there is saying that it's fine for us to vote on it even though we weren't here -- Because, it's quite literally a transcript of what took place and that's fine.

MS. LOATMAN-CLARK: Correct.

SENATOR TESTA: OK.

MS. LOATMAN-CLARK: And, to the extent that the members are comfortable, we encourage you to vote.

MR. AKHTER: So as for--

I'll make a motion to approve the minutes.

MR. BROPHY: Yes.

Mr. Akhter made the last motion; Mr. Binder seconded.

So, if we can repeat that.

SENATOR SMITH: So, just one question.

I ended up recusing on Carlia Brady. Is any of her stuff in that set of minutes?

MR. BROPHY: No.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

MR. BROPHY: This is just State House Commission, anyway.

SENATOR SMITH: OK.

MR. BROPHY: OK.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MR. BROPHY: All in favor.

Now we need a motion to move into JRS.

MR. AKHTER: I'll make a motion to move into the Judicial Retirement System.

MR. BINDER: Second.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Binder.

All in favor.

ALL: Aye.

MS. ZULLA: Number 1 on the agenda is--

MR. AKHTER: You have to take -- (indiscernible).

MS. ZULLA: Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on September 23, 2024.

MR. AKHTER: So, I'll move that.

MR. SHABAZZ: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

With a note that counsel is advised, even though we did not attend, it is permitted to vote for minutes.

MS. ZULLA: OK.

Senator Testa.

SENAOTR TESTA: Yes, with the same proviso provided by Senator Smith.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: And, Number 2 on the Agenda is the confirmation of death claims, retirements, and survivor benefits.

Can I have a motion?

MR. AKHTER: I'll move that.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

SENATOR SMITH: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Our JRS portion is very short today, so, thank you.

I just need a motion now to return to sit as the State House
Commission.

MR. AKHTER: I'll move that.

SENATOR TESTA: Second.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

Mr. Akhter.

MR. AKHTER: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Binder.

MR. BINDER: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Mr. Shabazz.

MR. SHABAZZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Senator Testa.

SENATOR TESTA: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Pintor Marin.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PINTOR MARIN: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Assemblywoman Muñoz.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MUÑOZ: Yes.

MS. ZULLA: Thank you.

MR. BROPHY: Any other questions, comments, issues by the
Commission members? (no response)

If not, we'll take a motion to adjourn.

MR. AKHTER: I'll move that.

MR. BROPHY: Mr. Akhter.

SENATOR TESTA: Second.

MR. BROPHY: Senator Testa.

All in favor.

ALL: Aye.

MR. AKHTER: Thank you, all.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)