

**Garden State Preservation Trust**  
**July 29, 2008 Meeting Minutes**

Chairman Wegner called the meeting to order at 11:11 a.m. Ralph Siegel, executive director, read a statement certifying compliance with the Open Public Meeting's Act, and called the roll. Public members present were: Herbert Wegner, chair, Michael Murphy, vice-chair, Jan Rosenfeld and Robert Hughey. Ex-officio members present were Susan Craft (for Agriculture Secretary Charles M. Kuperus), John Flynn (for DEP Commissioner Lisa P. Jackson), James Requa (for Department of Community Affairs Commissioner Joseph V. Doria) and Assistant Treasurer Patrick O'Connor (for State Treasurer R. David Rousseau.) Public member Ken Atkinson was absent.

**OPENING REMARKS**

Chairman Wegner welcomed members and noted it has been six months since the last meeting. He said in his six years on the Trust it has been the longest they have gone without having a meeting.

Chairman Wegner recalled the discussion at the January meeting of the need to seek future funding for land conservation, and he said little progress has been made but that many efforts are being pursued. He noted the board today would be spending funds from the November 2007 voter referendum. He said funds would be exhausted by the end of FY2009.

He said he would be attending a meeting July 30 scheduled in Goshen, Cape May County, regarding Delaware Bayshore preservation efforts. He said a discussion of future funding would be a key item at the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JAN. 29, 2008 BOARD MEETING**

Chairman Wegner asked for corrections or clarifications to draft minutes from the Jan. 29 2008 meeting. Mr. O'Conner noted that ordinarily it was Chairman Wegner in his role as a regular public board member to offer corrections to the minutes.

None were offered.

Moved by Mr. O'Connor  
Seconded by Ms. Rosenfeld  
Approved 8-0.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S FISCAL REPORT Part 1**

Mr. Siegel reviewed the funds available from the November 2007 Referendum Bond Fund, which he said would be organized into separate trust funds for each of the various funded programs in keeping with traditional practice. He directed members to copies of a letter contained in their meeting packets from Treasurer David Rousseau certifying that all of the funds in the various November 2007 Referendum Trust Funds would be available.

Mr. Siegel explained that even if the \$200 million in bonds authorized by the voters in Nov. 2007 are not issued immediately, the certification in hand from the Treasurer means the State's General Revenue will be used to provide cash for the various

Trust Funds, with the cash to be reimbursed to the State General Fund at the time that the bond issue actually occurs.

Mr. Siegel said this is common practice in past voter bond referenda because there has never been a need to immediately issue debt, and thereby incur immediate interest and debt-service costs, until the actual appropriations from these Trust Funds are enacted and signed into law, and the projects were being executed and the cash was required for acquisitions.

Ms. Craft asked whether this meant the programs could proceed to closings with these appropriations. Mr. Siegel said once the appropriations were signed by the Governor approving the funds for the projects, the projects could proceed to closing. He said the programs had no cause and no need to be concerned about whether the actual cash was literally available. He said the Office of Public Finance commonly issued General Obligation bonds, which are not identified for a specific purpose, and places those bond proceeds into a whole variety of trust funds in need of cash.

### **PRESENTATION OF STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2009 GRANTS.**

Ms. Craft, executive director of the SADC, made the presentation to the board accompanied by her fiscal officer, Bryan Lofberg.

Ms. Craft reviewed farmland preservation accomplishments. She said 1,714 farms have been preserved accounting for 167,000 acres. She said this is 20 percent of the working farmland base in New Jersey. It represents the largest percentage of agricultural land base permanently preserved of any state in the nation. She said preservation spending has exceeded \$1.1 billion, with the State providing \$741 million, showing a third of the expenditure is coming from local partners at the county and municipal level.

Ms. Craft reviewed statistics in the special Highlands and Pinelands areas. She said 242 farms in the Highlands region have been preserved covering almost 30,000 acres. She said 25 percent of the funds have been spent in the Highlands area. In the Pinelands, she said 63 farms totaling 9,600 acres have been preserved at a cost of \$25 million. She said this 2 percent of the program's expenditures have occurred in the Pinelands, where preservation has also been achieved at a much larger scale by the landowner sales of Pinelands Development Credits (PDC) to be used in growth areas at no cost to the State. She said about 50,000 acres has been preserved by the sale of PDCs.

Ms. Craft said the agency had 233 projects currently underway accounting for nearly 18,000 acres.

Ms. Craft said FY2009 recommendation covered the entire \$73 million farmland preservation portion of the November 2007 \$200 million bond issue referendum.

Mr. Siegel explained the actual resolution before the board totally \$69.4 million recommended for projects. The remainder of the \$73 million was to be appropriated for staff and administrative costs, which he said was up to the Legislature to approve. He said the GSPT only had statutory authority to consider preservation projects.

Ms. Craft said the voter referendum allowed 5 percent to be set aside for administration, and she wanted to lock it up to ensure the staff salaries were funded should there be a lengthy delay in renewal of farmland preservation funding.

Ms Craft said \$21.2 million was being reappropriated from projects that had been funded under prior appropriations. She said these funds were not needed because the projects had failed or had cost less than budgeted.

She said \$46 million was being recommended to provide \$2 million bloc grants to each of the 15 counties that have completed comprehensive plans for farmland preservation, plus an extra \$15 million available for additional grants to be allocated on a competitive basis. If a county used up its \$2 million grant with successful projects, they can apply for a share of the additional \$15 million. She said the county programs preserve the most farms and provide the best opportunity for the State to leverage the funds it provides with maximum local funding. There is also a grant of \$1 million to Cumberland County to fund projects even though that county has not completed a plan and so was not eligible for the bloc grant. She said she expected the plan from Cumberland to be finalized shortly.

Ms. Craft said the bloc grant system with \$2 million grants provides the maximum incentive for closing projects efficiently in keeping with the Garden State Preservation Trust's long-standing goal of the timely expenditure of State funds.

Ms. Craft then reviewed the State Direct easement acquisition program recommendation of \$10.8 million is designed to comply with the 2004 Highlands Act requirements of consistent geographical distribution of State spending on farmland preservation county by county. She said the SADC had calculated deficits of funding in certain counties under the system established in the Highlands Act, and so would be focusing new funds to bring the spending statistics into balance.

Ms. Rosenfeld asked about the funding levels and deficits in Hunterdon County. Ms. Craft explained the targets of spending for Hunterdon were met and exceeded.

Mr. O'Connor questioned why no State Direct easement acquisition funds were going to Morris County.

Ms. Craft said Morris County was not being neglected. She explained the State Direct program had little activity in Morris County prior to the enactment of the Highlands Act and therefore had no requirements for consistent distribution of State funding there. She said the SADC has provided substantial sums to Morris County for farmland preservation through the county's aggressive easement acquisition program. She said lots of farms have been preserved there. But she explained the Highlands Act only imposed the balanced-spending requirements on direct State spending, not on the grant funding that goes through the counties.

Ms. Craft then reviewed the municipal Planning Incentive Grant program. She said many old PIG project areas were replaced by the comprehensive planning in the new county bloc grant program. She said 37 municipalities still had local project areas with newly approved plans, and each would receive \$750,000 to continue their preservation activities.

Ms. Rosenfeld asked about certain counties active in farmland preservation not having any municipal PIGs project areas slated for FY2009 grants. Ms. Craft explained those PIG project areas used to be listed as municipal but really were run by the counties. She said the new county bloc grant and comprehensive plan has replaced them. She said municipal PIGs could also target certain small but important farms that might not meet county criteria for preservation.

Vice chairman Murphy asked if the PIG grants go directly to the municipalities or do they go through the counties. Ms. Craft said the funds are allocated for use at the municipal level but they are required to secure county approval for the project areas “so everyone is on the same page.” Vice chairman Murphy asked if there were municipalities that might not be aware of the grant program because they rely on the county preservation agencies. Ms. Craft said county agencies are required to notify and consult municipal officials when pursuing preservation projects in their towns.

Mr. Siegel asked Ms. Craft to clarify how Morris County had been using the PIG program and why the grants were no longer needed.

Mr. Lofberg explained under the old PIG program, a municipality or a county could apply to have a project area accepted by the SADC. He said in Morris and Burlington, the county agencies were the lead agency in securing approval for the PIG project areas in certain municipalities. He said the PIGs were always county-run programs and so have now been replaced by the county bloc grant.

Chairman Wegner said he was familiar with the PIG program, having attempted to organize a PIG planning area in his town. He said he thought all PIG municipalities had to have created a special land-preservation property tax assessment to qualify. Ms. Craft said this was partially correct because a dedicated fund could also be used in place of a specific tax-rate dedication. She said the municipal funds would still be needed to share in the costs of the projects even if the county was doing all of the planning and preservation work.

Mr. Hughey asked about the lack of grants for Atlantic County. Ms. Craft said they have not had much activity in Atlantic County, neither municipal PIG project areas nor a county plan or request for a bloc grant.

Mr. O’Connor questioned counties received bloc grants and then municipalities also receiving PIG grants that they turn over to the county. Ms. Craft explained the municipalities do not receive cash grants nor do they turn anything over to anyone. She said the municipality is able to apply its \$750,000 grant to its share of the cost of targeted farms being preserved in cooperation with the county. She said the \$2 million county bloc grants and the \$750,000 municipal PIG grants could only total 60 percent of the total project cost regardless of the combination. She said 40 percent of the project costs had to be funded at the local or county level with their own funds.

Ms. Craft reviewed the non-profit grant recommendations of \$6.5 million. She said the SADC received a “tremendous” number of applications, and they asked the nonprofit land trusts to limit their requests to their top three best farm projects. She said grants of \$500,000 to \$825,000 were being recommended to the various land trusts according to the rankings of the farms they had targeted.

Mr. O’Connor asked about projects using the name of a developer, Toll Brothers. Ms. Craft said the project was named for the land owner. She said in this case the nonprofit land trust has identified the developer’s tract of land as an important property to be preserved.

Ms. Siegel said over the years many conservation transactions are done with developers or the real estate industry as land owners, rather than with traditional farmers. He said developers will acquire land that is more suitable for conservation or agriculture, and so will frequently apply for land preservation funding.

Mr. Requa asked if it is easy to re-allocate funds from an inactive county to a more active area. Ms. Craft said funds will not be permitted to languish and that grants in future years will be adjusted to create incentives and focus State dollars where valuable farms are being preserved most efficiently.

Chairman Wegner praised Ms. Craft for her even-handed administration of the program, recognizing the difficulty of pleasing competing interests or the variety of local governments involved.

**RESOLUTION # 08-006 APPROVING TO APPROVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2009 FOR ATLANTIC, BURLINGTON, CAMDEN, CAPE MAY, HUNTERDON, MERCER, MIDDLESEX, MONMOUTH, MORRIS, OCEAN, PASSAIC, SALEM, SOMERSET, SUSSEX AND WARREN COUNTIES FROM THE GARDEN STATE FARMLAND PRESERVATION TRUST FUND.**

Mr. Siegel explained the need for separate resolutions to accommodate Mr. Atkinson on his likely need to recuse himself from Gloucester County recommendations.

Chairman Wegner asked for motions to approve the Resolution.

Moved by Mr. O'Connor  
 Seconded by Ms. Rosenfeld  
 Approved 7-0.

Ms. Craft recused herself from the vote because of her role as director of the SADC.

**RESOLUTION # 08-007 APPROVING TO APPROVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2009 FOR GLOUCESTER COUNTY FROM THE GARDEN STATE FARMLAND PRESERVATION TRUST FUND.**

Chairman Wegner asked for motions to approve the Resolution.

Moved by Mr. O'Connor  
 Seconded by Mr. Hughey  
 Approved 6-0.

Ms. Craft recused herself from the vote because of her role as director of the SADC. Chairman Wegner recused himself because of personal involvement in Gloucester County projects.

**RESOLUTION # 08-008 APPROVING TO APPROVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2009 FOR ATLANTIC, BURLINGTON, CAMDEN, CAPE MAY, HUNTERDON, MERCER, MIDDLESEX, MONMOUTH, MORRIS, OCEAN, PASSAIC, SALEM, SOMERSET, SUSSEX AND WARREN COUNTIES FROM THE 2007 REFERENDUM FARMLAND PRESERVATION BOND FUND PL 2007 C.119.**

Chairman Wegner asked for motions to approve the Resolution.

Moved by Mr. O'Connor  
Seconded by Ms. Rosenfeld  
Approved 7-0.

Ms. Craft recused herself from the vote because of her role as director of the SADC.

**RESOLUTION # 08-009 APPROVING TO APPROVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM GRANT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY2009 FOR GLOUCESTER COUNTY FROM THE 2007 REFERENDUM FARMLAND PRESERVATION BOND FUND PL 2007 C.119.**

Chairman Wegner asked for motions to approve the Resolution.

Moved by Mr. Hughey  
Seconded by Mr. O'Connor  
Approved 6-0.

Ms. Craft recused herself from the vote because of her role as director of the SADC.  
Chairman Wegner recused himself because of personal involvement in Gloucester County projects.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Siegel reviewed the content of the members' books featuring a photo of a rare plant species that since the January meeting had been discovered in the Whittington State Forest.

Mr. Siegel said GSPT FY2008 appropriations bills for the Green Acres program and the New Jersey Historic Trust had passed the Legislature in June and were on the Governor's desk awaiting signature.

Mr. Siegel said Chairman Wegner asked him to provide an update on legislative initiatives to renew land conservation funding or the GSPT. He reviewed half a dozen bills seeking voter referenda ranging from a \$75 million bond act for recreational development to a concurrent resolution to constitutionally dedicate \$150 million for 30 years for conservation.

Mr. Siegel said a set of two bills that drew the most attention was a \$150 million water tax proposal, one bill to create the tax and a second bill to dedicate the funds to conservation. He said none got out of committee.

Mr. Siegel said the Governor's office has not endorsed any of these measures and had suggested funding conservation as part of the administration proposal to massively restructure all State debt. He said that proposal was having difficulties in the Legislature.

Mr. Siegel asked Mr. Flynn, director of the Green Acres program, to brief his fellow board members on the status of Green Acres applications. He said GSPT funds already appropriated for FY2008 were keeping his agency busy and he expected to return to the GSPT in the fall with recommendations for FY2009 projects for the Green Acres and also for the revived Blue Acres flood-property acquisition program.

Mr. Siegel noted the GSPT office budget audits were included in the members' books and he invited questions or comments about it to himself or to Ms. Rosenfeld, the chair of the Finance and Audit Subcommittee.

Mr. Siegel said the draft Stewardship Report of the GSPT's 2006 Stewardship Conference has been ready for nearly two years but has not been printed and issued for want of recommendations by the board. He said draft recommendations were circulated. He said he wanted to issue the report, even if recommendations were excluded.

Mr. Siegel said the contract for a conservation financial advisor has not been renewed because the request for proposal, which he said he had drafted in May, has not been finalized by the Treasury department and approved to be issued. He said the financial advisor, Mr. Pat O'Connell, who was at the meeting, has been assisting and facilitating innovative conservation financing, most specifically Installment Purchase Agreement contracts. Mr. Siegel explained the GSPT has made it a policy priority to encourage innovative financing to better leverage the use of GSPT funds.

Mr. Siegel said the GSPT office budget proposal for FY2009 would be held at the request of the Governor's Counsel's office until a report on actual spending for FY2008 was available.

Ms. Craft asked about the guidelines for expenditure of GSPT office funds without an approved office budget. Mr. Siegel said the Legislature had already appropriated \$476,000 to the GSPT for office operations for FY2009. He said this appropriation was adequate to ensure that spending on standard operations continued without interruption on such routine, recurring costs as his own salary and the utilities bills for his office. He said the GSPT board approval of a line-item budget to break down the \$476,000 was done to give the board a voice in how the office spends its appropriated funds, mainly for special expenditures. He said it was a bureaucratic issue rather than a substantial one because the Legislature has already appropriated the funds and so authorized their use.

Ms. Rosenfeld commented on the draft Stewardship Report, saying her sense of it was that the board had no consensus on ideas it wanted to recommend. She said too much time has passed since the GSPT conference was held and that in her opinion the report should be issued without the benefit of recommendations, especially since different members were now on the board.

Mr. Siegel asked if there was agreement among the members with Ms. Rosenfeld's position on the matter.

Chairman Wegner said his recollection was that many presenters at the 2006 Stewardship conference made a passionate plea for money, and he did not see how the GSPT board would ever reach consensus on which of these appeals might be the most worthwhile. He said Mr. Siegel put a lot of effort in the draft report and that many people

at the conference made excellent presentations, and so the report with their presentations should be issued without additional delay and without waiting for a GSPT board recommendation.

Vice chairman Murphy, who was chairman in 2006 and therefore presided at the Stewardship conference, said he agreed with the sentiments of the chairman and Ms. Rosenfeld to avoid further delay in a struggle to find consensus on recommendations.

Mr. Hughey noted he was not on the board in 2006 but that he believed it was a well-presented and valuable report that should be issued. He said things get outdated quickly in government.

Mr. Hughey asked Mr. Siegel to explain the holdup in the RFP for the conservation financial advisor contract. Mr. Siegel said he has been unable to get an answer on this matter from the contract procurement officials in the Treasury department. He said Treasury administration staff has been under tremendous pressure and he asked Mr. Hughey for patience.

Mr. Hughey said he was concerned that such a small contract would slip between the cracks of the bureaucracy.

Ms. Craft said conservation financial advisor services were essential in a key preservation deal her office has been trying to complete that has already taken far too long.

Ms. Craft also said Stewardship report recommendations would be a problem because any new spending program the GSPT might endorse could divert funds from the main land acquisition programs.

Vice Chairman Murphy proposed a motion to release the report without recommendation. Mr. Siegel and Chairman Wegner said they did not believe a formal motion was necessary as long as all were in agreement. Mr. Siegel suggested a copy of the instant minutes be placed into the report to explain why there were no board recommendations. Ms. Rosenfeld and others said it was best not to do that and to simply issue the report as is without comment.

Chairman Wegner asked Mr. Flynn for his views. Mr. Flynn echoed Ms. Craft's remarks that recommendations for a new program might introduce competition for the funds the land acquisition programs needed.

Mr. Siegel said he was satisfied he had the direction he needed.

Chairman Wegner suggested drafting a formal letter to the Treasury department asking them to make some progress on issuing the request-for-quotes for the conservation financial adviser contract.

Mr. Hughey disagreed with the formality of a letter and directed the question to Mr. O'Connor, as the Treasury department representative, about the hold-up in the contract. Mr. O'Connor said he would inquire into the matter.

#### **RESOLUTION # 08-010 SUSPENDING THE EXPENDITURE MONITORING PROGRAM AND REPEALING RESOLUTION #04-010**

Mr. Siegel reviewed the history and basis of the Expenditure Monitoring Program created in 2004 to monitor the quarterly expenditure of funds by the Green Acres and Farmland Preservation Programs.

He said the GSPT in 2004 and 2005 was in a quandary because most of the previously appropriated funds had not yet been spent, but a delay in issuing bonds would

have meant no new appropriations could be approved in those two years. Before agreeing to underwrite bonds, investment banks and bond counsel were demanding a specific management plan to ensure the bond funds are expended in compliance with SEC regulations and IRS law concerning tax exempt municipal bonds.

Mr. Siegel said the land acquisition programs ramped up in subsequent years with the record year, FY2007, preservation closings were occurring at the pace of \$5 million in deals per week. He said the targets of \$195 million for FY2008 were actually missed at \$178 million, which was 90 percent, but that it was sufficient.

Mr. Siegel explained in detail that 91 percent of the GSPT bond funds had been expended over 36 months, which was above the IRS legal requirement of 85 percent expended. Therefore no reason existed to continue the GSPT's Expenditure Monitoring Program.

Ms. Rosenfeld said the Expenditure Monitoring Program has been successful in getting the money out as quickly as possible and makes a strong case for future funding. She asked if there was a legal reason the program could not be continued.

Mr. Siegel said it was a decision for the board whether or not to continue the program. But he said there was no longer a legal reason to keep the program. He said the Expenditure Monitoring Program included many field presentations in places such as Hunterdon County, where expenditures had lagged. He said in these presentations he always described the EMP spending targets as legally necessary. He said this could no longer be said because the legal necessity had expired.

Mr. Hughey asked if there was a new bond issue whether a new expenditure target program would be required. Mr. Siegel said it believed it would.

Ms. Craft said the program had served a valuable policy objective in making sure land preservation agencies used their funds promptly regardless of legal requirements. She said it had a driving effect on the new rules to reform the farmland program.

Chairman Wegner said the policy objectives behind the timely expenditure for GSPT funds for permanent preservation remained valid and so the Expenditure Monitoring Program should be continued as a policy.

Mr. Siegel said a new resolution would be drafted for the next meeting.

#### **RESOLUTION # 08-011 TO ESTABLISH COMMUNITY CONSERVATION AWARDS PROGRAM TO RECOGNIZE MUNICIPALITIES**

Mr. Siegel reviewed the idea of establishing GSPT Community Conservation awards as a means of attracting public recognition of preservation projects.

Ms. Craft asked about criteria. Mr. Siegel said he wanted to avoid detailed criteria or a handbook. He said he would want interested communities to apply for an award and then the board could judge based on the applications as to whether expenditure, preservation acreage, preserved landscapes or other measures where the best basis on which to make an award.

Mr. Siegel said he was seeking board approval but that approval from the Administration and from the various departments had not yet been secured. He said he wanted to make sure his own board was behind him before approaching the other partner agencies.

Chairman Wegner asked for a motion to approve the resolution.

Moved by Mr. O'Connor  
Seconded by Ms. Craft  
Approved 7-0.

Vice-chairman Murphy had left the meeting.

### **SUBSTANTIAL APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.**

Mr. Siegel reviewed the actions taken during the meeting and requested "substantial approval" of the minutes of these actions as he had reviewed them.

Chairman Wegner asked for a motion for substantial approval of the July 29 meeting minutes.

Moved by Mr. O'Connor  
Seconded by Ms. Rosenfeld  
Approved 7-0.

### **TRUST MEMBER COMMENTS**

Chairman Wegner said he had received volumes of inquires and emails about renewal of funding for the Garden State Preservation Trust. He said he had hoped to discuss the matter openly at the board meeting but that Mr. Siegel had explained prior to the meeting that State employees such as himself and the cabinet designees sitting on the board were limited in participating in discussions concerning legislative advocacy.

Chairman Wegner said he would have expected one of the funding initiatives to have gotten somewhere by now and was disappointed that none had. He said it meant there would be no preservation funding for FY2010. He said this bothered him "tremendously." He said many landowners who had been reluctant to preserve their farms in the past were now coming forward.

He asked for other comments. Mr. Hughey said no one could disagree but that everyone had to accept the depth of the State's financial crisis. He said once a proposal has been structured and advances, that will be the time for the GSPT board to make its voice heard.

Chairman Wegner said he recently approached a local legislator to discuss the GSPT funding matter and he said the legislator avoided him because he wanted to avoid the subject.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Wegner asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to address remarks to the Trust members.

Tom Gilbert from the Trust For Public Land, who also represents the Keep-It-Green coalition, addressed the board. He reviewed a joint TPL-Nature Conservancy poll done in June with 600 likely voters. He said the poll tested three proposals:

1. An \$800 million bond issue.
2. A dedication of \$150 million from a new water “user fee.”
3. A dedication of \$175 million from the existing sales tax

Mr. Gilbert said the majority of poll respondents supported all three of the options, showing the depth of public support for land conservation and historic preservation funding in New Jersey. He said broken down, the poll showed 61% for the bond issue, 58% support for the water-fee dedication and 54% support for the sales tax dedication, (which happens to be how the GSPT is currently funded.)

Mr. Gilbert said the “headline” of the poll results was that the New Jersey voters support any number of options, and it was up to the leaders to develop their preference.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Wegner asked for motions to adjourn the meeting.

Moved by Ms. Craft  
Seconded by Mr. O’Connor  
Approved 7-0.

Respectfully submitted

Ralph Siegel  
executive director  
board secretary  
March 11, 2009

Others in attendance representing agencies:

GSPT DAG Cliff Rones  
Sonia Frontera, Governor’s Counsel, Authorities Unit  
Daniel Patrick O’Connell of Evergreen Capital Advisers  
OLS staff member Carrie Anne Calvo-Hahn  
Assorted legislative staff members.