

Center on the American Governor
Governor Christine Todd Whitman Archive
**FORUM ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND POLICIES OF THE WHITMAN
ADMINISTRATION**

Wednesday, May 11, 2016
Eagleton Institute of Politics
(transcript proofread by: Nancy Becker)

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: First of all, thank all of you for taking the time to be here. I know some of you had quite long drives to make it up but we really appreciate it. But more importantly than that thank you for having been part of the administration and been working in government; some of you still are. But for those of you that have moved on it was an incredible time. I think we did a lot of good things and hopefully we had some fun when we were doing it. When people introduce me now, a large part of it is about environment and about we did with the environment here in the state of New Jersey. That's why I think everybody can be proud because we did make a difference. We've put things in a good light and some of you have worked your entire lives at that. And I was the beneficiary of your wisdom. So that was always a good thing. I'm a strong believer in finding the best people and then just listening to them and doing what they tell me to do. That's a good way to go. But I truly appreciate it. And this is an opportunity to go back over things. I don't intercede a whole lot in these discussions. It's more about how you saw things developing and happening and evolving over that time that we were all together in Trenton. And so it's all your remembrances as we got a list of what we're going to address in which order and how you saw it, how the legislature saw it, how people outside saw it, how different departments saw what was happening and the kind of feedback. So it's really going to be your show, not mine and, again, thank you all for coming. I'll turn it over to Nancy and she honchos everybody.

Nancy Becker: At her inauguration in 1994 Governor Whitman suggested a dramatic change in environmental laws and regulations. She said, and I quote, "We must cut through the needless over regulation that drives businesses out of New Jersey and discourages new firms from locating here. We can protect the environment without taking years to process a permit," end of quote. As a newly elected governor, she had an ambitious agenda. The governor proposed a sophisticated computer mapping system, I think it was GIS, of state lands to allow for better decisions affecting regional planning. She understood the importance of saving New Jersey's coastline, protecting Barnegat Bay and the Delaware Estuary. And she called for establishing industrial recycling areas and buying open space. Yet, at the beginning of the administration some environmentalists were highly critical of her efforts. Later on, they acknowledged, the governor, a devoted sportswoman and outdoorswoman was at heart an environmentalist. Governor Whitman clearly demonstrated this by her commitment to saving a million acres through the Garden State Preservation Trust. So let's get started at the beginning of the administration and focus on the environmental programs and policies that were hallmarks of the Whitman years. Let's talk

about what worked, what didn't. Bob Shinn, now you can turn your quacker [mobile phone ring tone] on.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: You served as DEP commissioner for Governor Whitman's entire term as governor. First, tell us briefly how you were selected. You told me an amusing story. Then will you lead off and tell us why the governor decided to separate the Board of Public Utilities from the Department of Environmental Protection, returning it to its previous configuration prior to the Florio administration? And the way that we do this is I ask certain people to start off and then this is a conversation and everybody should feel free to chime in, one at a time. Bob?

Bob Shinn: I had a great candidate for commissioner for the governor and it was Dorothy Bowers from Merck, a Ph.D., very smart woman. And I met with John Sheridan and Hazel Gluck, telling them how great I thought Dorothy Bowers would be as commissioner. And I forget whether it was Hazel or John said, "Well, that's a good candidate but the governor would like you to do it." I said, wow. And that's how I got hired unceremoniously.

<group laughter>

Bob Shinn: I had a great candidate for her but she took a chance and we made some things work. What's the second half?

Nancy Becker: The second thing is I want you to talk about why the administration went back to separating the Board of Public Utilities from DEP.

Bob Shinn: Why did I do that?

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Why did anybody do it? Can anybody remember?

Bob Shinn: Oh, I remember it well. It was a campaign issue, number one. There were certainly some parallels between DEP and BPU. There's no question about that. But I think as DEP had its hands full with what it had to do without accompanying BPU in the process. And there were some savings incurred in the separation. And so we did it. And it really hadn't been completely implemented so it wasn't hard to undo. I mean there was still lots of staff in Newark. So basically it got separated.

Nancy Becker: Anybody want to add to that at all?

Gary Sondermeyer: I would add that it was done, I thought, in a very intelligent and professional manner to have a lot of the core regulation functions go back to Newark. But we actually kept the solid waste rate regulation within DEP and that was, I think, a very

intelligent strategic linkage because historically there was a stronger link between rate utility regulation and the solid waste industry. So I thought it was administered very well. From a human perspective moving all of those folks down to Trenton was very difficult. Most of those folks lived in and around the Newark area and essentially they got to go back home. So I think it was a great strategic move to make good on a campaign promise that was made.

Nancy Becker: Eileen?

Eileen McGinnis: I don't want to weigh in on that because I have no memory of that so I'll say something else. I started thinking about this and Nancy and I have talked a few times the last couple of weeks. I did go back to the inaugural address too. And something John Weingart said about one of the purposes of these forums is how administrations can learn from each other. And I wonder if sort of the slogan that we had that "New Jersey is open for business" created unnecessary adversarial relationships right from the get go? And it took us a long time to get—I think because after that speech a lot of people sort of were out for battle. And while we got a lot of things done, it made it harder. So on the way here I was thinking—I only had an hour drive so I didn't have a solution, but I was thinking what could we have done better that—because you have to think about the context, the historical period when the governor made that speech. You know, we can argue about whether the unemployment rate was a result of the national recession or state tax policy. That's for a different forum. But the fact that nobody can really deny is that a lot of people were out of work. And the governor's number one priority was to get people employed more. And she had heard from the business community that the tax policy and the regulatory arena was not conducive to job growth. So that's sort of what card she got dealt with and was trying to play in that. But I do think that by saying (all of us, myself included) that New Jersey was open for business, people were very suspicious from the start. So what advice would I give to other administrations who were dealt the same deck of cards where unemployment was high? Probably bringing—and I think Judy tried to do this—bringing more environmentalists in at the beginning. At some point in the administration, a lot of us in the front office just didn't want to deal with some of the environmentalists and I think that was a mistake. And I'm not sure—so what I would like to hear today, you know, this really isn't so much to defend our record because there's a lot out there and history will judge the record. But I would like to hear from people what they would have done differently. Or maybe some of what was good and bad, and not just what was good because we'll hear a lot of the good too.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I just want to weigh in. I will weigh in on this a little bit on your original question on the separation. I had been president of the Board of Public Utilities and rate-based analysis is very different from the kind of work that's required of the DEP. Solid waste, clearly, there was that link and they should have stayed there because the impact is so readily obvious to people. But for the rest of it, also business did need a place to go, and not get lost in the morass of a bigger agency, which clearly DEP was. It

was very large. And so it made it easier for them to see where things were. Yes, to Eileen's point maybe declaring New Jersey open for business as a flat out statement was a bit provocative as far as the environmentalists were concerned. But as far as separating DEP and the BPU, that was done because they had very different responsibilities in many ways, except where there was that overlap with the solid waste.

Nancy Becker: First Bob and then Gil.

Bob Bostock: To follow on Eileen's point about the open for business and stuff I think that part of the problem that compounded that thought among people was at the same time cutting the size of DEP. I know the enforcement staff went down and there was a lot of criticism about that. And I'm not trying to segue into the next thing on the list, but where we were able to combat that, I think, very effectively was when Commissioner Shinn led the change from measuring how many enforcement guys and how many fines levied and all of the how many businesses did you put out of business to looking at a results oriented approach to measuring the state of the environment, and to try to move the discussion away from talking about the size of the environmental bureaucracy to actually talking about whether the air was cleaner and the water purer and the land better protected.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Twenty-five cents.

Bob Bostock: <inaudible>.

<overlapping conversation>

Nancy Becker: It's a drinking game, every time...

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Whoever says it gets twenty-five cents.

<group laughter>

Bob Bostock: But I think that was a very important thing that helped combat the fact that although the bureaucracy was getting smaller the results in the environment were what really counted. And that helped, I think, change the conversation as the years went on.

Nancy Becker: Gil.

Gil Medina: Let me maybe suggest a counterpoint to Eileen's concern that declaring New Jersey open for business somehow or another gave an impression that we were going to compromise the environment. Let's begin with the fact that prior to Governor Whitman taking over as governor of New Jersey, the state was hemorrhaging jobs. Not only that but our unemployment rate was several points higher than the national average. The perception of New Jersey was incredibly negative. I recall that I went to London to convince a British executive to make a significant investment in New Jersey versus someplace else. And after providing me with a wonderful lunch in a 500-year-old building in his wonderful British

accent he told me that the second to last place he would ever make this investment was New Jersey. And, of course, that concerned me but I wanted to know who was worse than us?

<group laughter>

And he mentioned California. So we had a real serious issue, a real perception issue that New Jersey was not business friendly, that New Jersey was antigrowth. And I think what was critical for the administration was to clearly state that we were trying to change that around. Now, the good thing about history—I was talking to Dr. Shields. I think he stepped out but I started my life out as an aspiring historian but wasn't good enough so I started on other things. But kind of the good thing about history is that you can really look backwards and forward. Right? You can take history today—backwards rather and look what happened in the past ten years and do a regression analysis and it's very predictive. But it's even better when you actually have twenty years to look. So what happened in the nineties? In the nineties New Jersey saw basically one of the greatest periods of economic and employment growth in the history of the state of New Jersey. We were every year averaging at least between 77,000 and 85,000 jobs a year. After Christie Whitman left office and I'm not going to criticize subsequent governors because I think every governor faces challenges. But during the subsequent period we saw a dramatic decline in employment. In fact, we ended the 2000s for the first time in the modern era with fewer jobs than we started with. And the jobs that we lost were jobs that were in core industries in the state. So Eileen I would just say that there was a reason for this that we had to reverse this. I think maybe where we failed was that we needed to make it clear that there is a false choice that a lot of jurisdictions feel they have to make which is between a sound environment and a sound economy. And I thought the beauty of Governor Whitman was that she understood that this was a false choice. That we could choose to grow. That we could choose to protect the environment. That we just had to do things more intelligently. And I was talking to Bob—Bob was my co-secretary of commerce. And many times I would find myself in meetings with the DEP where the DEP professional was agreeing to do things for my constituents that I was not fully comfortable with. So I think—the failure wasn't so much that we announced that New Jersey was open for business but that we needed to really communicate what our approach was to economic growth.

Carol Cronheim: Can I chime in on one thing? We balanced that in a way good way, though, I go back to the campaigns since I know you'll move past the campaign now. But we were really fortunate that the Assembly was so supportive of the government and the campaign, with Mrs. Ogden and Judy, really became a feeder to the Office of Policy and Planning in your campaign office on the all of the environmental issues. We got so much help from them and from a lot of the members of the Assembly. I was still part time with Leonard Lance but also here at Eagleton doing my internship. And it was such a great benefit that even though the main thing was that blueprint for the economy, we had a blueprint for the environment. Eventually, we even had a blueprints for the arts.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: We had lots of blueprints but nobody ever read them but we had lots of blueprints.

Carol Cronheim: Oh no, all of the arts people did. We covered all of the areas. We covered all of the areas and you laid the foundation early behind the scenes, I think, with the environmental people because they knew Assemblywomen Ogden and Judy were working with you and were in your corner. And I have a speech from, I think, '94 and your first sentence says, "We can" underlined, "protect our environment and still ensure that New Jersey is a state which is open for business." And I went back and we had so many speeches and talking points where you always put the two in hand-in-hand.

Nancy Becker: [And they're all up on the Web.](#)

<group laughter>

Carol Cronheim: Yeah, you always put the two hand-in-hand but people just didn't always hear it. But I think behind the scenes you were doing a really good job laying the foundation that was going to carry it through.

Nancy Becker: So I'd like to move now to both Bob and Gary to talk about establishing a results based management at the DEP. Now, do you want to lead off? Or do you want Gary to lead off?

Bob Shinn: Let Gary lead off.

Nancy Becker: Gary.

Gary Sondermeyer: Probably in my thirty years working for DEP the most effective time we had was when we embraced results based management as part of a national program, NEPPS, National Environmental Performance Partnership System. And Commissioner Shinn led us down a path to the first and only agency wide strategic plan in the history of DEP. And it was an amazing undertaking. It took two years to do that. And the plan, a lot of times, when you hear strategic plan and results based management, a light switch goes off but we made it real. And we implemented it and integrated it throughout the agency and well beyond the agency. And what was so elegant about the plan—six goals—that's it, that anybody could relate to, clean air, clean and plentiful water. Healthy ecosystems, healthy communities, open and effective government and abundant open space. I still remember them because they were clear and they were simple. And then we strategically aligned everything we did within the agency to those goals and strategies down to the cubicle level where every employee at DEP could see themselves and had a work plan that lined up with the overall strategic plan. And then the most important part, I think, it goes Eileen to the prior discussion about open for business, I think, as Gil said you've got to look at the total history and the legacy during those eight years and having the time to truly implement something like that plan. We engaged the stakeholders. That's something we had not been

doing at the department I can say from firsthand experience. It was adversarial. It was us versus them which was not healthy for the environment or for results based management. And to finally engage and actually have metrics and have goals that people could relate to, fishable, swimmable waters as opposed to how many fines we levied or how many permits we issued. Opening shellfish beds, you know, this was very, very real stuff. And it was the most effective time of my career at the department.

Nancy Becker: Bob, do you want to add to that?

Bob Shinn: Just thinking back to the beginning when we started this course, sort of taking inventory of what the department was made up of, and I asked for reports and I got what Gary talked about. I got, well, "this many fines" and "this many permits." And I said, this doesn't do it. This isn't a report on the agency. This is them and us. You know, the fines were the big part of the agency. It was how the environmentalists measured what the agency produced basically which was a real fallacy because we weren't doing well from an environmental perspective. We couldn't dredge. And we had a vibrant port business that was a big part of New Jersey's current situation and future. And the mud dump was full. The army corps closed that. No place to dredge. So one of the first efforts was to look at these critical situations and find solutions for them. We ended up with a site that had deep water access, had rail access. We went out to Utah and found people that dealt with hazardous waste that built clay line landfills and knew how to manage it, handle it, and got a couple of people that would bid on it. We made a deal with Hudson County that we would pay them x-number of dollars per ton for the use of this property for a period of ten years. Clearly, we said to the contractor, it's your dollars; you're investing in this and you get it back by your rate for dredging. The contractor did an excellent job. The bulkhead was improved. The site was cleaned up. It was on the superfund list, by the way. The capacity was there. The army corps was skeptical but ready to accept the capacity and excited about it. The big day came when we had a big quantity of dredge coming to that site to payback the contractor and the army corps got a protest and cancelled the award. That was pretty dramatic. It bankrupted the contractor. And fortunately we were able to get another contractor for that site. I felt terrible about what we did to the winning bidder. The army corps did it publicly before they told us. We couldn't get them to take a second read. That's just one instance. But when we started measuring different areas for the strategic plan it looked dim. I mean air was a big issue. We had power plants on the other side of the Delaware right up the river all the way up and the prevailing winds blew that towards us. Second prevailing winds blew the Maryland, Baltimore air up to us and ozone was a huge issue. To combat that—we couldn't combat it just in New Jersey. Through the environmental—ECOS, environment commissioners' state and with EPA's concurrence, in fact, they created a FACA for OTAG (Ozone Transport Assessment Group).

Eileen McGinnis: All right, Bob, that's enough. Four in one sentence...

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: I want to move on.

Bob Shinn: Well, to make a long story short, we lowered the rate. EPA supported it by rule. The vote on the states was thirty-two to five. Some commissioners lost their job over that vote. But it lowered our ozone standard and made a difference for many years, many years that going back to that OTAG standard was a big deal. And it's something that EPA couldn't do by itself.

Bob Bostock: I just want to comment on how cutting edge the whole idea of going to results based management was. I printed it out yesterday—DEP still has on their website the report that you put out, Commissioner, in 2001 on the state of the water, the air, the land and pollution prevention, all measures of those things. Not a single thing about fines or permits or any of that sort of stuff. It tells a great story. I remember now, this is a little off topic, when we went down to EPA, one of the first things the governor says, "We need a state of the environment report." EPA had been there for thirty years at that point since it had been established by President Nixon. This was a radical idea to everybody there, "A state of the—what do you mean?" So we pulled together a group and it took a while. But by the time—

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: A year-and-a-half.

Bob Bostock: It took a year-and-a-half or closer to two, I think.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I think it was closer to two.

Bob Bostock: A few gray hairs. Not for you, of course, for me.

<group laughter>

Bob Bostock: But we got the state of the environment report out. It was a shocking cutting edge sort of thing that we were looking at what's actually going on with the environment. So it was really cutting edge. There's been a lot of slippage in that approach in numerous places around the country. And it's kind of surprising that it hasn't been embraced more. But I think the conversation is so often dominated by the environment lobby who much prefer to talk about particularly if there's a republican administration how you're gutting all of the protections. It doesn't matter you're gutting the protections but the air is cleaner, oh that doesn't matter. You've got fifty less bureaucrats therefore you're gutting everything. I wish this approach would be adopted more widely across the country.

Nancy Becker: Bob, will you leave that with us? That's really an interesting piece.

Bob Bostock: Yeah, I made a copy just for you all even in color.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Terrific. I'd like to move on to open space which is a huge part of the Whitman administration's legacy. Now, the governor's proposal to save a million acres was considered one of the most aggressive land preservation efforts in the country at that time. Let's discuss its genesis, its content, and enactment. And Maureen Ogden would you start us off?

Maureen Ogden: Certainly. By the middle of 1995 when I looked around and I had served, I guess, close to 14 years at that point in the assembly and I looked around at everyone who was sitting in the aisles near me and I came to realize that there were maybe two other people, maybe three who had been there as long as I had. So therefore it was time for me to think of retiring. And my husband was long suffering. He liked to go to the parties that the republicans had...

<group laughter>

Maureen Ogden: ...but he didn't really like the late nights that went on and all of the traveling. And so I really actively started thinking that year that I should not run again in '96. I felt pretty confident that if I ran again I would win but I also thought you know there comes a time when other people's ideas should be part of the statewide discussion. And I shouldn't just continue to do what I'm doing. So I announced that I was going to retire in '96 and not be a candidate again. And after that, Christie Whitman who was the governor asked if I would chair—since there I was with nothing to do in '96 after I had retired—asked if I would chair the governor's council on New Jersey outdoors. And to hold hearings and come up with recommendations of what did the people want in terms of preserving open space? So we held hearings. My vice chair was Tom Gilmore. I don't know whether he was then head of Audubon. Was he?

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: He was.

Maureen Ogden: And so we held hearings throughout the state. They were very well attended. We were pleased that so many people were concerned about this issue. And so as the basis of all of the recommendations that we received, we came up with a recommendation that there should be a stable source of funding. That we shouldn't just have bond acts every few years which is what we had been doing as I think everyone knows since 1961 and here we were in the middle '90s. We did get bigger bond acts as we went through the nineties, from the eighties into the nineties. The first bond act in '61 was for 60 million but by the time we were up in the '90s it was like, you know, 350 million. And we just wondered, you know, are people still going to be willing to support that? And isn't it time to think more strategically in terms of a stable source? So I remember the day we went in to the governor's office to make this recommendation. I talked to Tom Gilmore and he said, "Do you think the governor is going to support a million acres?" And I said, well, I don't know but when we're trying to do something really important we should set our goal high. We should really strive for it. It shouldn't be something that's down here. It should be something that's up there. And if enough people believe in it then we're going to achieve

it.” So Tom Gilmore was really surprised when Governor Whitman supported the idea. I don’t know that any of the other members of her cabinet did.

<group laughter>

But when the word came out that this is what had been recommended and basically this was going to be part of her inaugural speech, there was a lot of excitement and a lot of support. And yes, the governor was supportive. And so we went forward thanks to the governor’s leadership.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: The only issue we had was how are we going to fund it?

<group laughter>

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Bob, I saw you raising your hand. She wanted a tax, a big one.

Nancy Becker: Bob.

Robert J. Martin: I was in the state senate at the time and I guess one of the few Republicans, especially in the northwest, who was a strong advocate of open space. And I remember very strongly this message of the environmentalists which I supported. We needed a stable source of funding. And so in various circles that issue was always constantly brought up and people had different views about it. But I think I’m right on this and I could be corrected, but I believe that the idea came from the mayor of my town and a freeholder Frank Druetzler. We were talking about this and he came up with the idea, “Why don’t you put a fixed small amount on the state sales tax?” And that seemed as good as anything else I had heard and it seemed like it could raise a lot of money but it didn’t seem like it would be that much of a push. And so we went forward. I forget—and I’m not taking credit by myself. There were several of us who then advocated that. I can remember a time being in the governor’s office and we were getting closer to achieving the million acres and working on the idea of a fraction of the state sales tax being applied. And as I recall the late Senator Littell had some misgivings about this. He was the chairman of the state finance committee and he was—and in his way, I guess, he was friendly to the environment in his way.

<group laughter>

But not real enthusiastic. And so we had long discussions. We finally got him. I think it was the governor who at least got him to agree with that proposal. And then I didn’t like this but it in order to make it more acceptable it became a ten-year period and a constitutional amendment to let the people vote on it. I guess they could have done it by a bond but a constitutional amendment arose and it passed in 1998. And I think we got a million acres as I recall.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: We’re getting close.

Nancy Becker: That slowed down a bit.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Mike and I spent a lot of time on that one.

Nancy Becker: Greg, you wanted to add something.

Greg Romano: Yeah. It was interesting. The original proposal, I think—Maureen’s task force had recommended actually using the gas tax. I think it was a seven cent increase on the gas tax, five cents would be for the Highway Transportation Trust Fund, I think, and two cents was going to be used for this. But the legislature decided that it would be better not to have any new taxes so they just dedicated a portion of the existing sales tax.

Robert J. Martin: I just want to also remember that instead of having it be \$100 million somebody came up with the notion—we came up with a fraction and we’d get 98 million. The public would like that better than the 100.

<group laughter>

Greg Romano: Ninety-eight million, that’s what I remember, as well.

Nancy Becker: Judy, do you want to add...

Judy Jengo: Yeah, one of the beauties of Governor Whitman and Maureen Ogden, Bob Martin, and everyone supporting that is it also saved a lot of money because the bond acts tended to cost us \$2 in interest for every \$3 we spent; in other words, \$1 for preservation, \$2 for interest. When you did GSPT [Garden State Preservation Trust], there was a lot more cash, a lot less bonding, and it flipped. It was more like \$2 for preservation and \$1 per interest. So you got a lot more for your money than ever before. And we also ramped up the rate of preservation to a rate that has never been seen in New Jersey before or since. An incredible rate of preservation in those first GSPT years. Unprecedented. And now it is no longer happening because the money ran out. But the way it was set up was \$98 million for 30 years. The first ten years were the preservation years. And then the last twenty was to payback any of the debt that was due. So that ten years—at least the first several were pretty incredible. Now, we’re in the debt repayment years. That 98 million keeps coming in until 2029. It’s paying back the preservation that occurred then.

Greg Romano: Right, and the 98 million was effectively \$200 million a year annually for farmland preservation and open space.

Nancy Becker: And we're going to talk about that.

Judy Jengo: That’s right, because we were allowed to do some bonding. We then leveraged that. We could frontload the money and do over \$200 million a year...

Greg Romano: A year. Dramatic.

Judy Jengo: ...for those first several years which is really dramatic. It's about \$120 million a year for Green Acres, about 80 million...

Greg Romano: Eighty million for farmland, right.

Judy Jengo: ...for Greg.

Greg Romano: My bank account really. No.

<group laughter>

Judy Jengo: And six million a year for historic preservation, which had not seen that kind of consistent funding probably before or since.

Nancy Becker: Tom.

Tom Wells: I don't want to go against what Maureen said, but I think Green Acres acts, combined acts, had been passed with increasing frequency. And I think the eighth was passed in '92 under the Florio administration, then in '95 another one was passed. And I think at that point the governor was pretty much set before any council came up and made a declaration that she felt that we needed a stable source of funding then and there. Now, it's always nice to have a council to back up what you want to do. But I think if you go back even during the Kean administration there were calls for stable source and nobody got it done. And so I think it's a real testament to the fact that the governor was so focused on this goal that it actually got done in her term. We knew that in running Green Acres that we passed a bond act and two years later we'd be out of money and looking for a next one. It was like an addiction almost. And so it was clear that we needed a stable source. We didn't get it before. And then we did get it during the Whitman term. So I think that's a real credit to her.

Judy Jengo: And it passed by a two to one margin.

Nancy Becker: I want to give everybody a turn. Michael.

Michael Catania: I think one of the genius aspects of this is the governor was able to put together not only a coalition between different interests looking for funding farmland preservation, open space, urban recreation, historic preservation, but this was also one of the best examples of the corporate community working with the environmental community and all of those other communities. So the coalition that got put together was something like 1300 different groups. And this was an outgrowth of something David and I spent a lot of time on—the Stockton Alliance—where we had major corporate leaders saying this is one of the issues that's most important to New Jersey and really buying into your legacy in terms of saying the best thing we can do both for the environment and for the economy is to set aside a lot more land. And that was very, very powerful. I think a lot of people aren't aware that the corporate community, particularly some corporations like public service, had

always played a role in promoting Green Acres bond issues. You know, Jim Ferland probably chaired more Green Acres ballot question campaigns than anyone. But this was on a whole different level. This was corporate leaders basically standing side by side with particularly environmental leaders but also art and the farming community and historic preservation community saying, "This is something that's a priority and needs to be done now." And that made a huge difference. I remember trying to get a meeting with then Speaker Jack Collins, with whom I went to law school. And he made it pretty clear that he was going to give me as hard a time as possible. So we contacted three of the major industries in his district who happened to be members of the Stockton Alliance: DuPont, Mannington Meadows and the company who ran the co-generation plant.

Greg Romano: _____ Industries.

Michael Catania: Yeah. We got him to see Jack a day-and-a-half later for a breakfast meeting and things went a lot more smoothly after that. So one of the really important aspects of this is the extent to which you were able to harness people in very different communities to work together to make it happen.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Well, part of that was due to the work that the commission did, which was laying out how the land was going to be preserved, not just a blanket "we're going to preserve a million acres," but contiguous farmland, contiguous parkland, historic preservation sites in city parks. So it was covering all of the bases but it was well thought out by the commission and that gave us the ability to say this is not just a random piece here and a random piece there because it makes you feel good. It's because this is going to make some sense and make it easier for the farmers to farm and not get people all mad at them when the tractor has to move from one field to the next. It made it easier for them to do their job. And that was what the commission, what they really came up with. We did struggle a little bit with how we were going to pay for it. We had a couple of meetings where we were fighting but it worked out in the end. And the other thing was, as I recall, Mike, you and I were particularly worried about it. I think everybody was. There were what 21—20 or 21 county bond issues on the ballot at the same time. And the fear was, would people vote for the big huge one and not for their local ones? Or would they vote for their local ones and not for the state one? And God bless them they did it all.

Nancy Becker: Dave, do you want to comment on this? You were running New Jersey Conservation Foundation at the time.

David Moore: Right. Well, I suppose, behind every good person is another good person or persons.

<group laughter>

The environmental sector, the charitable sector, was pretty heavily involved in this whole operation from start to end. It always had been since the first Green Acres bond issue in

'61. So when someone like Maureen would say, "I need some help selling something," we were there to try to help. So it takes a team like that, I think, in order to accomplish what the governor managed to accomplish in that period of time.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Yes, most definitely.

Nancy Becker: Bob, I moved over you and then I'm going to have Art because I want you to talk about farmland preservation.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Well, thank you.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Do you want to do Bob first?

Nancy Becker: He's been waiting patiently.

Bob Bostock: I'll just talk briefly about how hard the governor worked in public to make this thing happen. And I found two clips that I have saved because I thought they were so great. One was from the Trentonian just before the election. Lead paragraph, "It's listed on the ballot as public question number one and Governor Whitman has campaigned for it as hard as she has ever campaigned for anything, even her own election." And then right after the amendment passed, in the Jersey Journal, "She's campaigned around the state and even above the state in a blimp to muster public support for the open space proposition. It is certain to be a signature mark of her reign as governor." The backstory behind that is that back in 1998 there were actually Republicans in the country who wanted a moderate republican to come and campaign for them. So in October of 1998 the governor was actually out of state more than she was in state. But every single day she was in state we had her scheduled to do stuff just promoting this—blimp, kayak, hot air balloon.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Horses.

Bob Bostock: Hay rides. Horseback riding. Farms. That's all she did all around the state every single day she was in the state. And that created, I think, such—because she was going to spend so much time on that one issue in that intense period of time, it created such a groundswell of support, not only to get the amendment passed—because we've got a long record of passing these amendments and these bond issues in New Jersey—but also making sure that people knew that this was something that she really cared about and not just put the prestige of her office behind it but her personal prestige behind it. And that, I think, made a huge, huge difference in the margin that this vote carried. And also in the reputation she then had nationally—not just in New Jersey—as a real strong advocate for the environment.

Nancy Becker: Since there were so many different components of this program I wanted to turn to one of the most significant components which was farmland preservation. Art Brown, will you talk about that?

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Well, going back to the stable source of funding, you know, we were living on the bond issues time and time again. And I can remember pretty specifically talking to Governor Whitman about this stable source of funding and the amount of money that we needed to set aside out of that stable source for agriculture. But I was of the opinion that there's an awful lot of environmentally sensitive ground in New Jersey that's going to be there for the next year, the following year, and the following year. Let's set a logical percentage of some of this stable source of funding for agriculture because we're losing agricultural farms on a daily basis. And some of that other land is going to be there. We still will have an opportunity to get it later on. So I think that was a real big push that I had. I felt that was important. And, again, on the farmland preservation side of it, you know, we always loved that little saying that Governor Whitman had—the live, work and raise a family.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: The best place to live, work and a raise a family. You only get ten cents for that.

<group laughter>

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: That's the way I said it.

<group laughter>

But that was great. And, you know, the farmland preservation did a lot for New Jersey. Not only making New Jersey a nice place to live, but a nice place for organizations to get established in business because they always look at the organization for their workers. And we had a very nice environment in New Jersey. And sometimes it doesn't look as good now as it did then. But I think that we were very fortunate to have the leadership that we had. But we had good support from other...

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Oh yes, absolutely.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: It wasn't just agriculture. Bob was the forerunner in farmland preservation when he was in Burlington County as a freeholder before he came to state government. And we worked with DEP and a lot of the other folks came up with a wonderful program. It's a model program. It still is today for other states to follow. Our farmland preservation program has been accepted extremely well. I think right now we have about 200,000 acres under the program in agriculture.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: We preserve more agricultural land percentage wise in the state than any other state in the nation.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: That's right. Exactly.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: On a percentage basis.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: We've had fewer problems, legal problems, compared to a lot of states. Greg can attest to that. But Greg did a wonderful job in running the program when he was at the department. So we're very happy with the program. And, again, we're just happy with the support we got from all of the people that were on board at the time. So Governor Whitman, you're appreciated.

Nancy Becker: Greg.

Greg Romano: Thanks, Art. Out of the million acre goal I think 500,000 was farmland that we were looking to preserve. And I think before you became governor people really had confused or thought of farmland preservation as almost being part of the Green Acres program. You know, out of the bond funds we were averaging, I think, \$15 million a year for acquisition prior to the Garden State Preservation Trust Act. And then after that we were talking \$80 million a year. Judy's right on that. So it was more than a five times percentage increase. And prior to that too, there were—it was basically a grant program to counties. And with the increased funding we were really able to expand the different options. So we had it where the state could buy the easements directly. They didn't have to go through counties for those kind of easements that were maybe too big for the counties to handle or more regionally important than county important. There was a nonprofit grant program so the nonprofits could participate. And Dave was part of that and Michael as well. And I remember Michael Catania was also part of helping to draft the legislation which would—and the conservation foundation with Nancy. I have to throw that in. And so that really expanded the base total. It was not just the agricultural community that was participating in the farmland preservation program. I also just want to bring up the Right To Farm Act which isn't necessarily a land acquisition program. But it also encouraged farmers to stay in farming because it provided protection for responsible farming operations from nuisance actions and unreasonable local ordinances.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Frivolous suits.

Greg Romano: And New Jersey—you signed it, Governor—has the strongest right to farm act in the country. It preempts the municipal ordinances. Stronger than Iowa. Stronger than Nebraska and all of the states we would all think of as being farm and agricultural states. So that, I think, is a real part of Governor Whitman's legacy.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: We haven't spoken too much about the business sales tax but right now they're waiting for the governor to sign the release of funds for the program now to continue on. I don't know what the feeling is in this group.

John O. Bennett, III: Yeah, but that wasn't an original idea on their part. They took the hazardous waste clean-up funds and the underground storage tank funds that we had originally done back in the earlier days and then they just switched the purpose of it by doing it through a referendum. This was much more creative, as the first time to be able to have a new source of stabilized funding source that was in existence and to have a piece of

it put aside. And I think that's where the uniqueness was in being able to get everybody together, especially when we had had a mindset that we were cutting and cutting and cutting but then switching to say, okay, no, we're going to take a portion of what we have and direct it specifically into a positive area. I think that that was a very positive thing to do.

Nancy Becker: Judy, did you want to say something?

Judy Jengo: Yeah, just sort of an interesting farmland stat that came from SADC [State Agricultural Development Committee] recently to just show how important GSPT and your stable funding became. They're saying that 67 percent of all farms preserved in New Jersey have been since the inception of the GSPT funding, 67 percent. And it supplied more than three quarters of all of the funding for all time for farmland to date.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: That's great.

Greg Romano: Another interesting statistic on that is for the eleven years prior to Governor Whitman taking office, I think, about 22,000 acres were preserved and just during Governor Whitman's 7-year term it was around 52,000 acres and with tens of thousands in the pipeline.

Nancy Becker: Michael and then Bob.

Michael Catania: It was also really an idea that struck a chord with people. There was something that united people; it brought together not only a broad coalition but it made sense to people on the street. Governor, I had the good fortune to travel around the state with you and talk with people. It didn't matter whether we were in urban areas in Camden, in rural areas in Burlington County—wherever we were, it's just something that people thought made sense. And it was something that they could kind of wrap their arms around and see how you could make life better in New Jersey. And they all knew what it was like to lose areas that they had loved, whether it was the local farm where they had gone to a farm stand or a place where they could take their kids. People just decided it was a good idea whose time had come and they were bound and determined to do it. So even though we had all of those local questions on the ballot that we were worried about, in the end, it was a pretty amazing example of people choosing to go and raise their own taxes on a local level and support a state dedication of the sales tax to do something that they thought would make the place a better place to live.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Live, work and raise a family. The best.

<group laughter>

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: You'll get it.

Michael Catania: I probably knew that at one time.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Bob, you wanted—

Bob Shinn: When this was going on we were targeting farms with our Pinelands development credit program. And we bought 2094 rights and preserved 10,500 acres in that timeframe.

Nancy Becker: In the Pinelands.

Bob Shinn: There was also one other purchase that sticks—it wasn't a purchase really. It was PSE&G under new source review for their permit for new plants in South Jersey. Between new source review and a penalty resolution we got 17,500 acres in the Morris River watershed area. And that was big eagle territory. We had big problems with eagles with shell thickness. And that was the beginning of focus on PCBs which were part of the problem with shell thickness and premature hatching. The eagles—when we started there were ten nesting pairs. Some of them were imported from Canada. When we left there were 30 and now there are 200-and-some nesting pairs alive and well. And that particular area in the Morris River is big eagle country as is the Pinelands. There's enough land mass to preserve and bring back a species in a very short time frame, comparatively. And that's a great story.

Nancy Becker: Does anyone have anything else to add about the farmland component?

Carol Cronheim: Just one thing. The research that was done was so critical because you all had done some research ahead of time saying that we needed to keep a certain amount of acreage until we had a viable farm industry. That turned out to be really critical going forward because everyone could see how much more vulnerable the farmland was because the eighties were so go-go and the mansions were popping up all over our farms. Then we had the recession and there was a lull but then as the economy improved everybody knew it was coming back. Farmland was so vulnerable that that research you all did said, we need something like 600,000 acres, a certain amount of farms and acreage to make it viable. And I think that research really helped. That was something with the bond issue also. There was research on so many different levels, behind what you were saying. We weren't just picking a number out of the air.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: And I like to think those little signs we designed have also solidified in people's minds and it was worth it. When they see the preserved land and it's a private land, public trust, at least they know their money actually went to something.

Robert J. Martin: It might have made it more viable. But I think to make it more sellable putting in three components together really paid off. There were some people, even with historic development or preservation, excuse me, where they wouldn't have ordinarily been enthusiastic. But there were groups that I found that had displayed an interest in those

communities. The urban environmentalists came out with the idea of pocket parks and so forth. And so it was a wonderful sort of gathering of some diverse elements. And for those of us who might have been more focused on just open space, farmland and historical preservation proved to be real important in putting together a winning package.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: What about the counties? Don't you think that that had some impact? A lot of the counties started assessing one or two cents or per thousand whatever it was to set aside monies for farmland and Green Acres programs within their own communities. It seemed like that was a wonderful program. They raised a hell of a lot of money over the years. They're still doing it, as a matter of fact. And it's actually been going on for years.

Tom Wells: It's actually at the local level and the state level. I mean that reservoir funding that we had during the GSPT years catalyzed so many locals because they were only eligible to get grant funding on an environmental incentive grant which we gave to let people do it. It was almost like a mini block grant. But you can only tap that funding if you had an open space tax. So the funding we had was an incentive for people to pass their own taxes which is counterintuitive but it worked really well.

Michael Catania: All 21 counties and something like 325 municipalities did. So it leveraged an awful lot of public investment.

Tom Wells: And many of those funds have trailed off since that funding was available.

Gary Sondermeyer: But David could talk especially to that because I know in some of the big preservations in North Jersey you would get pieces from the state and from the county in some cases, municipalities and maybe some contributions from private citizens. But a lot of those bigger expensive purchases were combinations of the various levels starting with the Green Acres and then working down to the counties and municipalities.

David Moore: The fund, the stable source of funding, was really a tremendous advantage because it allowed all of these various public agencies and private interests to leverage funds among them. So we were able to accomplish much, much more than if the state had been doing it on its own or a county had been doing it on its own. That combined with things like in the Pinelands, the Pinelands Development Credit Program, provided even more leverage. So we had a lot going for us as a result of that stable source.

Michael Catania: And one little known aspect of it, governor, you also signed a bill creating a state income tax deduction for a donation or a bargain sale so that not only the nonprofits but local governments and Green Acres and the SADC in negotiating transactions could work with landowners to structure a below market value sale. And some of that could be recouped through a charitable contribution deduction. It worked on the federal level and the state level. And let us go out with our spreadsheets and show people that it made real

sense to sell your land for preservation. And, again, like in the case of farmers it was a real benefit because that gave them more cash to reinvest in the farm.

Nancy Becker: Let's move on to historic preservation. Carol, will you take that piece of it?

Carol Cronheim: Sure. I'd be happy to. Well, of course, that was part of the GSPT bond issue, but a lot of people—some people alluded to it—it wasn't wildly popular necessarily with the open space people. We were more simpatico with the farmland people because historic homes and barns were on farmland and not in the middle of the forest, with a couple of exceptions. It's no coincidence that the history advocates award for historic preservation is called the Maureen Ogden Award for Historic Preservation because Mrs. Ogden really fought for that. I have to say my old boss Leonard [Lance] also promised me he would absolutely make sure it was in there. The governor completely understood that. There was some pushback on historic preservation. As you can see, as Judy alluded to, history hasn't done that well in the last twenty years. They've never had money in the trust like they had. It's always a struggle to keep the money going. So research helped again because Governor Whitman signed, in '96, the History Taskforce Commission and there was a four volume report. I have it in the car, a sealed one if you want one, that came up with five recommendations and one of those was a bond issue, support of this bond issue. So that was critical, I think, also helping it move forward. In the meantime there was the Bagger Bill, Rich Bagger's bill and you signed that very willingly, which gave four million for operating. It's nice to have historic sites but what good is it if they're not open to the public, they're not visitor ready, they're not interpreted correctly—all of those things. History does not get the full four million anymore even after the hotel/motel tax. But it made a big difference to see that some governor, someone was caring about what was going on in history. It was a really good time for historic preservationists to get money and it was only a teeny tiny bit of the bond issue. It was six million for ten years. And because the demand is so great even now they would do it in two-year rounds so every round would be a twelve million round. I can't remember what Judy did exactly but Treasury wanted to keep some percentage of that money to administer it. And Judy went out there and had it out with Treasury and I can't remember but she came back and she said, "Okay, it's taken care of."

<group laughter>

Carol Cronheim: But it was a long...

Nancy Becker: Don't mess with Judy.

Carol Cronheim: Yeah. It was a loud conversation as I recall.

<group laughter>

Carol Cronheim: We were going to administer the program on history at \$6 million a year, seriously, out of \$2.8 billion bond act, and we're paying for this? It didn't seem fair. So one

of the great things I remember that I really enjoyed was when I was Acting Secretary. Secretary Brown and Commissioner Shinn and I would go to a bunch of different places around the state touting this. And my favorite was Fort Lee. As we stood and we looked out at the river, we were having this long conversation and the press actually was interested about how Washington was going back and forth between the two rivers, through New Jersey and how this was so important. If it hadn't been for the GSPT I think we would have lost a lot more places than we've lost lately and we've had a lot of losses lately. So history still has a long way to come but it would be so much farther behind without Governor Whitman's work. I'm on the Hunterdon County Cultural Heritage Commission. And just the little bits of money—the counties still have that desire to do this. At least some of them do, at least your county does, governor. They're still preserving farmland. They're still preserving history. They're still trying to match grants in this. I think it was a transformative eight years. I think without this, New Jersey would be a lot poorer.

Maureen Ogden: Another key supporter was Rod Frelinghuysen.

Carol Cronheim: Oh yes.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Oh yes. Bob was always.

Maureen Ogden: He and I used to be advocates for the environment. But since I chaired the Environment Committee or Natural Resources Committee and he chaired the Budget Committee, we decided that we would hold a joint hearing and we would invite all of the history people to come and talk about the state of their financial affairs and what would they like to the legislature to do. And that was wonderful because we had a huge turn out and a lot of support and a lot of people saying the poor history community badly, badly needs money. And so thanks to the governor we included what was it 60 million?.

Carol Cronheim: Sixty total for ten years.

Maureen Ogden: Sixty total. That well-funded, I think, it was close to 300 sites. So that was terrific.

Carol Cronheim: Yeah, and you also jumped in and helped Morven. Eileen knows one of my first memos in '94, which said, now that we're back in office, what are we going to do about Morven? It's been closed.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I don't think my cousin's forgiven me for making her chairman of that board.

<group laughter>

Carol Cronheim: She's still there so that's another good thing you did.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: No, she's leaving now. You'll have to help me come up with—I'm supposed to send some remarks.

Carol Cronheim: But that was the greatest thing. That's one of our most historic sites. You also made a big difference for Monmouth Battle Field. You made a big difference for the Old Barracks which was leaking when you started.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Oh yeah. But then we had the Indian—we uncovered that Indian burial ground.

Carol Cronheim: Oh yes. Thanks to Chief Crazy Horse who would deal with things. But yeah, it made a huge difference. And a lot of sites are now open and visitor ready. You also signed the Cultural Trust Bill which provides every other year money for operating for history and every other year money for the historic trust. So that cultural trust bill has been floating the historic trust in the lean times and that has made a difference, a big difference because there really wasn't much money for them to give out in some of those years. It's kept a small pipeline because there's no foundation funding for history and very little corporate funding.

Nancy Becker: Eileen, do you want add anything?

Eileen McGinnis: No. I think it's interesting for me to go back down memory lane about all of this. I guess the take away for me, for other administrations, would be Michael's point about a broad coalition and corporate sponsorship. I forgot how Lawrence Codey's really stepped up on a lot of different big things. He was the person I really learned from—sort of corporate citizenship—how the corporations could play a big part in policy. And I think PSE&G has been a good corporate citizen. And then Bob's point about just the governor's personal time. And building on what the legislature had done in prior years. So I think there were lessons learned from this big major initiative—those three things.

Nancy Becker: I didn't skip it deliberately but let's go back and talk a little bit about increased Pinelands protection that certainly occurred during the Whitman administration as well. Do you want to lead off since you poked me?

<group laughter>

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Yeah. Well, it's always been a very strong topic of conversation in Atlantic County. It goes back to the late seventies when I was in extension with Rutgers and that's when it first was signed back in '78 or '79. And so one of the things that was always at issue in Atlantic and Burlington County was the loss of compensation for farmland and other property owners that were in the designated area. When I first came on board in '82 that was one of the things that I was hoping to resolve before I left office. I had said I was looking for some type of compensation for Pinelands property owners. And I'm not sure the final date on it but it was around 2001, I guess, it finally came to be. We came up with a

formula that would compensate property owners based on the amount of PDC's they had. And Greg spent a lot of time working on this but it was a long time coming. We had a lot of input from farm groups and other people. And finally, when we came up with a firm policy of how to pay for PDCs that's when Art Brown left state government after twenty years.

<group laughter>

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: It only takes twenty years to get something accomplished so that wasn't too bad.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: And I'm just going to say PDC, Pineland Development Credits.

Michael Catania: Yeah, so what you really need to know is that the SADC means state agriculture development committee, meeting in Chesterfield, in the fire house of Chesterfield, Greg and I are there. It's the only time I've ever seen Art Brown cry when the motion was approved and there were people from the environmental community, Dave, myself were there endorsing this. Art just broke down into tears. He said, "This is the happiest day of my life."

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Nothing wrong with that.

Michael Catania: This is something that's bothered me for a very long time. It was an example of what doesn't happen anymore. People with different perspectives finding common ground, coming together and making it work. It was beautiful.

Nancy Becker: Greg, do you want to say something?

Greg Romano: There were zero farmers in the Pinelands participating in farmland preservation before that formula, which was authorized by the Garden State Preservation Trust Act. And after that, we had thirty-five applications and they all preserved their farms in the Pine Barrens. That was just during your administration and it's been since.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Of course, some of my appointments to the Pinelands Commission were very controversial with the environmentalists because we put some farmers on meaning they'd have a stake.

Michael Catania: And working with the ag community to do that, I was running the Nature Conservancy at the time, we were able to buy a lot more land after that new valuation form got put into place because of people like Bill Haines and Steve Lee. The word got around that these weren't crazy people from Mars who are tree huggers, who are trying to put you out of business. These are reasonable people you can do business with. So it had leverage in terms of opening doors. That really helped protect a lot of land.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Those farmers believed me that you weren't absolutely crazy.

Michael Catania: Thank you, again, for vouching for me.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Dave, do you want to add to that at all?

David Moore: Only that one of the things that also sold this whole process was a couple of people took leads in the farm community and discovered that they could make money by either selling development rights or trading development rights both in terms of the farmland preservation program and in terms of the Pinelands credit program. That really made a difference. News travels pretty quickly in the agriculture community probably faster than any other place I know of. And once somebody had actually turned a profit from dealing with the farmland program it instantly became the thing to do. So that's probably has much to do with what happened in the Pinelands as anything else.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: I don't know if they would necessarily profit but they sold their rights.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: They got some money they could invest.

David Moore: Yeah, that's right. Not only that, but when you put the two pieces together, you sell the development rights, and then you sell the farm. In some cases it came out to be more money than the place would have been worth otherwise. Because it turned out that preserving farmland was not a negative. It was a positive and that really made a big difference. It was probably a big trigger.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Going back to that farmland issue that you just mentioned, it's pretty interesting because when I first began pushing the farmland preservation program, which I thought was a great idea, I was more concerned about saving land for young future farmers to be able to continue farming. And that's one thing that I flunked. It started off well but it didn't end up well for the farm community—for young farmers. For example, if a piece of property was worth \$10,000 full market value, they went in and they appraised its ag value. They said it was worth \$5,000. So, the landowner gets \$5,000 development easement monies. That farmer hangs onto that land now and you'd think it's going to be available if he wants to sell it to some young farmer to get started in farming. It hasn't worked that way. A lot of that land was sold, preserved, for \$10,000, \$15,000. It's like a small little estate that people with money go in and buy and it's all preserved around them and they can go in there and have their house on that piece of property. It's still available for agriculture, don't get me wrong. You can go in there and lease it. But as far as buying it, you cannot afford to pay that kind of money and go out and make a dollar on the farming. So it worked well in one way and not in another.

Nancy Becker: Interesting. I skipped over this because Jane Kenny, who wanted to talk about preservation of Sterling Forest, won't be here until three o'clock but I think we'll talk about it anyway and if she wants to, we can add anything when she gets here. I believe that was one of the first acts that the administration did. The preservation of Sterling Forest which when people looked at it they said, "What is New Jersey doing trying to preserve..."

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Buying land in New York.

Nancy Becker: ...buying land in New York. So who would like to begin that process or discussion. Go ahead, Judy.

Judy Jengo: I can say a couple of words about that because I love that story so much.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: We were shaming the next state.

<group laughter>

Judy Jengo: It was so incredibly forward thinking to buy land in another state and, of course, it was you who did it. Ten million dollars to buy land in Sterling Forest, New York that saved New Jersey hundreds of millions of dollars of water treatment costs that would have been necessary if that land had gotten developed. Not looking at the political borders but looking at the common sense math of it. So it was wonderful and as far as we could tell at the time unprecedented. I don't know if that's ever been proven not to be true but I haven't seen another example before.

Eileen McGinnis: Was that legislation, Judy?

Judy Jengo: It was done in legislation. So the legislators who were involved in that were great and then the governor signed it. So everyone was involved.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: After that, George Pataki then bought more land, preserved more land because that was the fear that there was a big chunk and there were developers that had proposals in to do it and nothing was preserved.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: The land that he purchased, governor, was that adjacent to Sterling Forest?

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Yes. He bought more of the Sterling Forest. We just bought—we couldn't afford the whole thing especially not in New York. But we bought the lower portion, as it were, and he came in afterwards and preserved more of it, more of the watershed there.

Judy Jengo: I remember some math being between \$200 and \$300 million would have been the cost otherwise. Plus ongoing maintenance costs every year forever for the treatment plants. Versus this was a onetime purchase of ten million. It's a bargain.

Michael Catania: I remember Senator Bob Littell was wildly enthusiastic.

<group laughter>

Michael Catania: He wanted us to spend more of our Green Acres dollars in New York.

<group laughter>

Judy Jengo: That's pretty impossible.

Robert J. Martin: As I recall, it was not unanimously lauded in the legislature. The argument was, we've got enough things to be concerned about for money in New Jersey without worrying about New York.

Michael Catania: I didn't have any problem to set up the appropriations committee, though. We went right through.

Robert J. Martin: The argument made sense.

Carol Cronheim: But I think you kept making the point, and I'll now go back to speechwriting, I know that we said over and over again, sprawl costs money. Because Judy was giving us such good data and research all of that time saying that all sprawl is going to cost us money, we kept having to go out there and say this is a bad thing. We don't want to do this. I think that really was sort of balancing off. It will be both good for business and keep our costs down and keep us on budget. Those were the kind of things that we were trying to sell to the rest of the coalition, the business part of the coalition—these sorts of things that made sense economically.

John Weingart: Does anyone know where the idea originated? And who was the first person to say let's buy land in New York?

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I can't remember. I mean it was an issue in the press at the time and it started to come up about how much the developer—I can't remember who the developer was—that there was a big—

<overlapping conversation>

Michael Catania: Actually, Rose Harvey was then the regional director for the Trust for Public Land. Rose is really good at tapping different pots of money and was looking for money to put together this gigantic deal. New Jersey had lots of live acquisition money and said, "Hey, how do you feel about sharing some of that?"

Robert J. Martin: I think that was a great initiative as I recall.

Tom Wells: One aspect of it too is that there had been such a massive public investment in Wanaque Reservoir and then Monksville adding on to it, spent by the state to preserve this water that it would make no sense to then...

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Let the watershed go.

Tom Wells: ...have those compromised by one development on the state's border. So it did make a lot of logical sense to protect those investments that we made.

David Moore: That was no news to New York. After all, look at what New York City has done in terms of protecting their watersheds. So they eventually came around even though the watershed they were protecting fed New Jersey and that's the reason why they were reluctant in the first place. It wasn't their watershed. It was somebody else's.

Nancy Becker: Before we move on to the next area does anyone have anything to add in terms of open space preservation? Farmland preservation? All right.

Maureen Ogden: Well, maybe one thing I'd like to say. Nancy, the connection with open space is that we were really following in the footsteps of Newark. You know, it was around the turn of the century and I'm talking about 1900 when Newark bought so much land to protect their water supply in the highlands. And they never would have had the beer industry they had there if they hadn't had excellent water.

Robert J. Martin: There was a town I was the attorney for, for a number of years, West Milford. The largest land area north of the Raritan River in northern New Jersey and one third of its land was owned by the city up north. That's where all of the reservoirs are that go into the City of Newark.

John O. Bennett, III: Are they reservoirs of beer?

<group laughter>

Robert J. Martin: Well, they also had the worst bear problem in the state.

Nancy Becker: And Newark doesn't have a beer industry anymore does it.

Robert J. Martin: I'm getting my beers and bears mixed up.

<group laughter>

Robert J. Martin: He said before Mars tree lovers. I thought he said Morris tree lovers. I was like wait a minute, hold on.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: So let's move on and talk a little bit about air quality protection. And there was an innovative—did you say anything Ruth?

Ruth Mandel: No.

Nancy Becker: Okay. Sorry. There was an innovative program to purchase energy credits to reduce emissions that was coming from the Department of Environmental protection. So Eileen will you and Bob lead us in that part?

Eileen McGinnis: I want to tell a story about Bob and this is a true story. I'm not exaggerating the story, Bob. Governor Whitman sent Bob and me down to EPA before it moved to Pennsylvania Avenue in the middle of the inspection and maintenance debacle. Bob and I were supposed to negotiate some sort of timeframe. We were in the Office of Air down there. We finished our meeting and then I noticed sort of every fifteen minutes or so people would be coming from different parts of the agency to meet Bob. Then somebody would say, "Wait a minute Bob, don't leave somebody else wants to meet you." And I remember thinking, gosh Bob's like a rock star at EPA because he had done so many things on a national level that we really weren't paying a lot of attention to in New Jersey. Bob was chairing the ozone—we teased Bob a lot in the cabinet because he used Nox and Sox and OTAG and OTC.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Nobody could understand Bob.

<group laughter>

Eileen McGinnis: But quietly and diligently Bob was doing a lot of things on air credits and trading mechanisms that other states were paying attention to and certainly EPA was paying attention to. When you're in the state a lot of things are adversarial. You step back and see where you fit in nationally. That day was a real eye opener for me because I saw what Bob was doing on a national level really mattered. And then a lot of what he was doing on this trading was a precursor for what happened with REGGI [Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative] and a lot of other trading schemes. So I really gave Bob a lot of credit because people at EPA were really in awe of what he was doing during those trading programs. That's a true story.

Bob Shinn: This really got started when we were trying to figure out how to deal with these indicators that were horrendous. And then realizing we couldn't get it done as New Jersey as an entity, we had to go outside the box and try and get partnerships with other states to help us clean our air and by virtue cleaning their air. We had the Ozone Transport Commission which was comprised of twelve states. But it was missing key states like Pennsylvania, Maryland.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: West Virginia.

Bob Shinn: The New England complex, I called them, were active and sort of set the agenda for OTAG. We needed OTAG—Ozone Transport Assessment Group—and that took years to get to a standard. It was a nightmare. I'll give Mary Gady a lot of credit. She chaired that and I vice-chaired it. And she loaded me up in the process. But the bottom line is that it broke down. When it came to voting it broke down into four quarters—the midwest, the southwest, northeast and the southeast. Basically all of the leaders in those four quarters brought back votes of thirty-two to five. It was a pretty amazing effort by environmental commissioners to make that happen. The other thing that we did that was sort of outside the box—everything in New Jersey was pick it up and haul it someplace. It wasn't remediation on site or using technology to remediate on site. I think of that because the governor was looking for at me one time and finally found me and I called her back and she said, "Where are you?" I said, I'm at the Pentagon. She said, "What are you doing at the Pentagon." She said, "Wait a minute, I don't want to know."

<group laughter>

But what I was doing at the Pentagon, governor, after all of these years I was lining up funding for our effort for ERIIS, which is environmental infrastructure to develop technologies and train on those technologies. New Jersey has this site mitigation group. I was very much involved in leading that effort on gathering the technologies that were real and trying to drive them through EPA, which at that time was very difficult. But the Army, the Navy and the Air Force committed big money because they had big expenditures on remediation and they wanted to use the technologies. The Department of Interior contributed to that. So we ended up with an annual funding mechanism. The EPA joined us ultimately. At first, they thought we were challenging them. Then they decided, no, we were on the science and it was a good thing. But those were still training at zero cost for participants in states. Many of our hazardous waste folks were leaders in that effort and were training the trainers. It started out with the southern energy states. And the concept was so good, and they were doing southern energy states activity. We took over their organization and made it national and then it got funded. We had commissioners that, I think, might have gotten fired for their OTAG vote like Don Schregardus. He ended up being Assistant Secretary of the Navy. He was from Ohio and that was a tough vote for him. Basically he came through leading the funding from the military to make this thing happen. You could never get it done just in New Jersey. You had to go make things happen. And we were fortunate enough to get Carol Browner. After surviving the shock when I told Jean Fox we weren't taking her \$17 million from EPA because it cost us more than that. It was a lot of duplication. We had to get on the same wavelength and it panicked Jean Fox. I quickly got a meeting with Browner and I explained to her what we were doing. We had limited resources and we had a big job to do. We needed all of the resources we could muster and the biggest bang for the buck. And then PPAs and PPGs—performance partnership agreements and performance partnership grants—got created. We started to get together. We were all in the same environment, doing the same job and we had to cooperate. That's still alive and well. That survived. So that's a short story.

Nancy Becker: Gary.

Gary Sondermeyer: Just two short additions to the story. Commissioner, you hit two topics: air and also technology. On the air end, the regional focus, as Eileen painted it, was so important because our air is being impacted so significantly by midwest power plants. But I think it was a very clear focus that we ought to practice what we preach in New Jersey. I remember Commissioner Shinn being behind locked doors with the president of PSE&G negotiating very significant upgrades to the coal burning power plants in New Jersey. From that effort the Hudson generating station and the Mercer generating station both added selective catalytic reduction technology for foreign particulates, in particular, at a cost of—I think—Hudson was about 600 million and Mercer was about 400 million. So we're not talking about chump change. These were very significant "practice what you preach" upgrades for air quality in the state of New Jersey.

On technology, the commissioner mentioned all of these agreements. Picture this, we actually had an eight state memorandum of agreement with major states like California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois on technology reciprocity. Big word. What does that really mean? Any time you have a cutting edge technology for environmental management—good stuff that we should support—you have to go up through the entire chain of command from the cubicle level up to the top to get approval. This agreement actually said we will recognize a technology for cyber mediation, for air management, for storm water, whatever it is. If it goes through one of the eight states as part of this agreement, we will recognize it and accept it in our state. Imagine that. And we actually got that done. And if I'm not mistaken we even had four international agreements with Israel, Canada, France.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I came back with an agreement from France and then the state department didn't like it.

Gil Medina: We could not sign it because we're not a sovereign state.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Well, we were a sovereign state but we weren't a government. They got a little upset with that one. That was the one with champagne where nobody could understand what was being said because we were talking in French. And we had champagne at eleven in the morning.

Bob Shinn: Well, we actually traded credits with the Netherlands. I don't know whether you want to go down that road or not.

Nancy Becker: We're going to talk about the Netherlands after our break.

Bob Shinn: Okay. I didn't see that on the agenda.

Nancy Becker: The Green and Gold taskforce, etc., and the Netherlands. Does anybody want to add anything on air quality protection?

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: No, except I think it's important to say that what we did, what everybody did, on that work because I think it was in the McGreevey administration that they did a look back and saw that the air was better—had been cleaned up—more than 60 percent of industrial pollutants reduced. They even gave us credit for that. Everybody's worked hard even though sometimes it's hard to see the long term impact it really was. It has worked. It did make a difference.

[BREAK]

Nancy Becker: Let's spend a little time talking about water quality enhancement in terms of ocean, harbor and shore protection. And Bob, I'd like you to start off, again, on talking about the bonds that were passed to upgrade local water treatment facilities.

Bob Shinn: When we did our water quality monitoring and tried to have the maximum impact on improving water quality, we found one of the biggest problems was CSOs—combined—storm sewer overflows. We looked at the different plants and really decided we'd get the biggest bang for the buck with Passaic Valley. They had the biggest capacity. If we doubled their capacity we could dramatically reduce CSO discharges that were having a major impact on water quality. We worked with the legislature on bonding. We worked through the environmental infrastructure on low interest loans. It made a major difference. The governor can take credit for bringing back barnacles in the Hudson River and Passaic.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I sort of like that oysters or something not barnacles.

<group laughter>

Bob Shinn: It's a form of life that came back, though, governor.

<group laughter>

Bob Shinn: It was so beautiful to see.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: How about the mussels?

Bob Shinn: Better than that, they have kayaks and canoes there now and things that are recreation vehicles. But using that bond money that was provided through the legislature with the Governor's support, and the Environment Infrastructure Trust—we just got a lot of cooperation from folks that saw the data, saw the indicators, and were convinced they could make an investment cost effectively and improve water quality. It joined us with some very strange partners, from a political standpoint. But when you have solid indicators and you can show them what the contaminant is, where it's coming from, and it's not Art Brown's manure piles....

<group laughter>

This is coming through CSOs and there's a way to fix it. And we really got good cooperation from a host of diverse strong political bastions in Northern Jersey. I give them a lot of credit. But it made a big difference. And it was the only way to get there.

Nancy Becker: Do you want to elucidate who those strange partners were?

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Democrats.

Bob Shinn: I'll tell you one of my big partners that sort of led me through the maze was [Joe Doria](#) with Hudson County. You know, he really did a great job. He deserves a lot of credit. And John Bennett did a great job getting us out of bonding for hazardous waste mitigation. Every superfund site was 90/10. We got 90 percent federal dollars, 10 percent state dollars. So having that money available when we needed it, when we ranked up to a superfund site, we sailed that right into the EPA and we were very proficient at doing that—getting them ranked, getting them acceptable and getting that 90/10 funding because it really leveraged their dollars. I can't thank the various legislators enough for the support they gave the governor and me in making those dollars available because it's hard enough to find the source of contaminant. Then you have to find the best way to control it. Usually you're across the aisle because that's where the dense population is. We had a good liaison and we were able to do some things that were sort of outside the box and really got support for it. I can't thank everybody enough for all of that.

Nancy Becker: Gary, do you want to add anything?

Gary Sondermeyer: Yeah, I would simply add it wasn't too many years before the governor's tenure that we still were dumping sludge in the ocean. Our waste water treatment plants were very substandard. We all remember the late eighties where we had sludge balls literally washing up at the Jersey Shore and threatening the economy of our state.

Robert J. Martin: And needles.

Gary Sondermeyer: And needles and syringes and medical waste and other stuff. It's not a lunch discussion, right. It was really horrendous. And I think it's one of the greatest environmental success stories in our state to upgrade all of our waste water treatment plants from simple screening technology or primary treatment to digestion technology or secondary treatment and in many cases tertiary or chemical treatment. That dramatically affected our next topic which is ocean water quality. The commissioner mentioned it a couple of times. A little known secret in the state is the Environmental Infrastructure Trust which is this organization that provides low interest, half interest rate financing to do these major infrastructure projects. Gosh, I wish it was broader to be in the transportation world today with the infrastructure issues that we're all facing. But extremely successful and I think a tremendous testament to improved water quality in the state.

Nancy Becker: Does anyone want to add anything to that? So let's talk a little bit about the New York/New Jersey harbor ocean and shore protection cleanup. I mean I recall that as being very controversial and certainly a lot of pressure by the governor on...

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: And a lawsuit or two against New York.

Nancy Becker: So why don't you start that talk.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Well, it all fits. We had one pump out station for boats when we came into office because that also made a difference along the shore. There were seven or ten when I left, I think. But there was only one for the boats to get rid of their sewage. The controversy with New York—first of all, you had the harbor and dredging. That was a big one that we worked on for a long time, on how to get the harbor deep enough for the new boats that were coming in and whether to take it down to 50 or to 70. It was a big controversy. But then also the garbage—the garbage that was coming in from Staten Island. We had a couple of major contretemps with the other side of the river in order to get them to treat it differently, to stop putting it on barges and shipping it right past us and dumping it, which is what happened. They claimed it was a storm every time that made the garbage accidentally slip off.

<group laughter>

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: And almost every spring for a while during the first couple of years we did cleanup, beach cleanup.

Eileen McGinnis: But Gil, you recall, there was a big economic development issue with the dredging. A lot of business community was asking—

Gil Medina: If you look at the economy of New Jersey and the contribution that direct investment makes when companies invest here, the jobs that are created because of trade, it's a very significant part of the state economy and of our employment base. At the time, governor, when you were governor I believe that I was able to run some numbers with the help of the U.S. Department of Commerce. We came up with about 600,000 people. One of the big challenges is that you have to get ships in and out. With the Panama Canal there was a real issue because the ships were going to be bigger, and bigger ships don't mean more cargo. What it means is the cargo can be moved more efficiently because you can spread out the cost over many units. But still it was a threat to our ports. I know Eileen that you and the governor went out and recruited this guy Frank McDonough to come and spearhead this effort. Frank was in my department. Frank was like a mad genius and absolutely relentless. He was able to help work with Bob to bring together the stakeholders which were at every level. It was city of New York. It was the state of New York. It was the federal government. It was the Army Corps of Engineers.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Port Authority.

Gil Medina: The EPA, the Port Authority. Frank ended up becoming the person who orchestrated all of those pieces and brought them together with Bob's support. We were able to really help Bob with some of the things that you did at DEP, allow not only the dredging, disposition of the dredging spoils. And by the way, we were able to even dredge the channels.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: The draft.

Gil Medina: We were able to really fortify the shipping industry in New Jersey. And I think Governor, that was a very, very successful venture and it was very complicated.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: It took a long time.

Eileen McGinnis: Judy, do you remember any stories about ocean dumping and the governor was against it. The business community was upset with her and then some parts of the environmental community. I know they're not monolithic. They made an agreement to allow some portion of it. Do you remember that at all?

Judy Jengo: Yeah, I kind of remember the whole controversy of you being strongly against the dumping of dredge materials and a lot of the groups actually being behind that and almost surprised at that but happy about that. Then the controversy you spoke of with some folks. But then it went away because you just stuck to your guns on that as I remember.

Gil Medina: Some of the materials were really, really toxic. The problem was that it was almost irresponsible to take this and put it back in the ocean. So the idea was to try to find a way to separate the dredge which was toxic with the ones that were less so, and come up with schemes of disposals that would be different for each. But it was a real problem, Judy. Some industries were just being irrational. Their fears were driving irrational thinking. They were the ones that really were opposing ocean dumping. I mean they were upset at the government opposing ocean dumping.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Tourism is the second largest industry for the state, which was a big part of the shore issue. You don't want your children walking down the beach and stepping on a needle, on a hypodermic needle and we were getting that. That was coming from New York and that was coming from the landfills, the Kill Van Kull. We had a go around with them on that one but finally got them to change the way they did it. I think at the end of the day you were able to do the toe test. You go in the water and if you can look down and see your feet then the water is clean. You hadn't been able to always do that on the shore.

Gil Medina: Oh no, and talking about metrics, which I really like, the fact that Gary and Bob really stressed how this was a tax driven policy effort. You know, one of the things that was accomplished during the Whitman administration was that the number of beach

closings—we used to have a lot of beach closings prior to 1994—were almost completely eliminated.

Gary Sondermeyer: And along those exact lines, the state was actually recognized as having the most comprehensive beach monitoring program in the United States of America. Through our strategic plan we set an immediate goal within a year of making all of the lake beaches in the state swimmable. And within 5 years all 125 miles of drop dead gorgeous beach shoreline in the state of New Jersey was suitable for swimming. We basically achieved those goals. It was absolutely right. Very dramatic.

Robert J. Martin: You can almost forget how bad it was in the eighties. I mean a beachgoer on LBI—red tides, green tides—when you got a nice day it was like thank you God. And that went away. It really did.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: You had to have Carbona down at the shore to take the tar off your feet when the kids came back.

Michael Catania: A lot of people think it was just sewage sludge, but it wasn't. There were several dump sites. There was sewage sludge coming from all of the treatment facilities. But there was a site where the burn barges would go out and burn pieces of wood. In order to cut corners and save money they were allowed to dump the ash in the ocean but they would frequently just dump wood that was only partially burned which was really great if you were coming along in a pleasure boat and came across a chunk of wood the size of these tables. That was a real navigation hazard. We had a demolition waste site. We had the mud dump site. And it was a really complex issue. So it was a major accomplishment to end ocean dumping.

Carol Cronheim: And tourism numbers showed it, too. We climbed up every single year that you were governor and it really dramatically paid off.

Nancy Becker: Does anyone have anything else to add on water quality? Hi, Jane. Perfect timing.

Jane Kenny: Hi, everyone.

Nancy Becker: We're running a tiny bit ahead of schedule so I was getting slightly nervous. Let's talk about some other initiatives. Let's talk about the State Plan. The legislation had been enacted in the previous administration but the actual implementation of the State Plan occurred during the Whitman administration. Joe Maraziti, you were the Chair of that planning commission, would you start us off?

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: I will. And I'm glad that Jane arrived for this conversation because—well, first of all, I went back to the second inaugural address and reread it.

Carol Cronheim: We always do that.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: It's an amazing document that laid out a vision that is manifesting itself. I'm going to talk about that in more detail. But it talked about the preservation of the million acres. It talked about revitalizing cities in order to make New Jersey the best place for people to live, work and play.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: And raise a family. You're almost there. Fifteen cents.

<group laughter>

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: And so when I got the call and was asked to chair this commission I was overjoyed at the opportunity and very humbled by it. The first thing that happened was this big controversy, which was, Jane will remember, to move the Office of State Planning from the Treasury Department to the Department of Community Affairs. We had to go before a legislative hearing. I was fresh to the whole thing. I'm thinking why are we arguing about this right now when there are other things to do? But I came to understand the value of that because then we had Jane who was absolutely fantastic in overseeing everything we were doing on the State Planning Commission, and was such a wonderful resource to work with and person to lead this effort. So I saw the wisdom of that move over time. I don't know how it's going now because frankly there isn't anything going.

Gil Medina: It's not going.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: But what your inaugural illustrated with respect to the State Plan—and you mentioned the State Plan multiple times—is the absolute importance of gubernatorial leadership on an initiative like that. There hasn't been anything like that since. During those years I had the instruction from Jane that, "We're working on the governor's legacy, Joe. You know, we've got to make sure this is right." You talked about the sense of urgency in the address because of what you had seen as you were campaigning and driving around the state and seeing the importance of open space and the need to revitalize cities. So I came in when the State Plan was in the process of being redone. It took us actually three years to get it done because it went from this cross acceptance process. We were having public hearings in every county in the state. In every county in the state, when I opened the public hearings the same question was raised addressing our first stated goal of the plan which was to revitalize New Jersey cities and towns. And people would say, "It's never going to happen. There's too much crime. The schools are no good. It's not going to happen. This is ridiculous." Well, I don't know if you've noticed in the last month or so the Star Ledger has had graphics of the state showing where people are moving and where people are leaving. This is an illustration of the fact that the goal and the vision that you set is working. How did that happen? It happened because of the double barreled approach of protecting and preserving the areas that we wanted to preserve through, what we were hearing about earlier today, the open space initiatives coupled with the focus on revitalizing cities. You talked about the need to do that. The plan asked state agencies to incorporate in their own plans efforts to do that sort of thing. I've read that there are something like 28 areas where that's happened. I know with respect to the Infrastructure Trust there are

bonus points for projects that serve areas in the areas that we want to develop under the state plan map which became controversial later. But what I'm able to say is that I have a front seat in seeing that this is working. The State Development and Redevelopment Plan is working because I practice redevelopment law, and I represent primarily public bodies in urban areas. And it's as hot a topic as you can imagine. Newark is just bursting with opportunities for redevelopment. This effort to preserve and promote is having its day because it is reflected in the development decisions. It's harder for developers to go where we didn't want them to go. And they're realizing that they have to come back. Now, they're aided by market forces, of course. It's not only the plan and the policies. Market forces of millennials and nesters wanting to go to these walkable communities. But what I think is a real driving force is the public policy behind this that made it accelerate in New Jersey because of putting the money into the process of preserving areas. And also promoting the urban revitalization. There are others around the table who know more about the detail of that. But the framework is there. and despite the fact that no administration since has bothered to do what they're supposed to do every three years and look at the plan again, I'm happy to say that our plan that was adopted in 2001 is still valid and a legally effective state plan in New Jersey. The public policy portions of that are driving this and assisting this market initiative. So as I said, I can see it playing out in daily life in New Jersey and it's because of what all of you have talked about here today having promoted this big picture of how to change and transform this state. There are some regrets I have. And one of my biggest regrets is that you left us.

<group laughter>

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: You left us before we adopted the plan.

Robert J. Martin: You can run for governor after one term out.

<group laughter>

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: I was going to suggest that. There's an open seat coming up. But I regret that for many reasons and one of them is that you promised us \$1 million for a PR campaign to roll out the State Plan. And by the time March—I don't know, there's so many governors in the middle there—by the time we got to the paycheck it was \$75,000. We had an opportunity to really make this a big deal but you went on to do more important things for which we appreciate.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I'm sorry. I apologize. We all make mistakes in life.

<group laughter>

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: When I saw you holding up the ballot with the hanging chad, I said, uh-oh. I think something is going to happen here. But I think the way this worked was it worked with local governments, county and municipal, to endorse the plans that they

would adopt that were in conformance with the State Plan. One of the things I'll never forget because it doesn't happen to me very often—I had the idea of taking the State Planning Commission meetings out of town to get around New Jersey. And we went to Florence, New Jersey to adopt and endorse the 130 corridor. Twelve communities got together. They didn't usually talk to each other but they got together. They had a plan. They wanted us to endorse it because the selling point was the communities endorsed the plan and it was consistent with the State Plan. Then state agencies would do everything in their power to help implement that. When we voted on that, there was a standing ovation. I never saw that. I mean you're experiencing that a lot, I'm sure. But as a lawyer you don't get standing ovations very often.

<group laughter>

We went to Hudson County where Hudson County wanted to have their whole urban center. They thought that as a county they really established the idea that this was a center, just the whole county. We went there and that is paying off in overtime as well because it was a plan for Hudson County. It's being played out in many ways. So the state plan while we all, at least I am, assume, that the State Planning Commission is kind of quiet now and there's not a lot that we hear is going on, the framework was set in place. The vision was established and it's out there. It's a battleship that's moving and it is having an impact and the ripples are being felt in many places.

Nancy Becker: Barbara Lawrence, you were running New Jersey Future at the time working on advocating for the State Plan.

Barbara Lawrence: It was an interesting time. And all of this time in retrospect you look back and you remember in vague ways the thousand little battles. Joe's told about the victories but there were the thousand little battles that you fought all of the time. In all of my years working on these issues, we've never worked as cooperatively with an administration as we did with the Whitman administration. With this woman I thought I had an open line sometimes. Maybe I shouldn't say that now. But I think we did—we worked very cooperatively together. I think to the benefit of the policies that we were advocating for.

Judy Jengo: Yeah, you were phenomenal.

Barbara Lawrence: I mean in the first four years when you were both in policy, in the State House, in the policy office, yes, right, with Eileen, and there was sort of one dynamic that was very cooperative. To Joe's point about moving the Office of State Planning to DCA for me to step back and look at it, it made a lot of sense because of Jane. How you think about these kinds of things over time, it didn't make sense for the next DCA commissioner. It probably didn't make sense for who would have been the treasurer either. So where do you put an agency that has a mission to tie together a lot of the activities of the cabinet departments? We wrestled with that. It was wrestled with when the State Planning Act was

written. And then when it came to DCA and it worked well for the Jane Kenny DCA years. But it hasn't worked well since then with no leadership from the top.

Jane Kenny: There's no been leadership from the top since Governor Whitman left so I think that might even be part of it and I'm not at all biased when I say that.

<group laughter>

But Barbara to your point, yes, I embraced it and had passion about it. You know, it came from the top, the leadership. But it also was DCA, at that point, was the place where their programs were really coalescing with the Urban Coordinating Council and all of the programs that we were supporting. While we were balancing that million-acre goal, and the governor never stopped talking about this, you know, a million acres, revitalize cities. A million acres, revitalize cities. And that was our mantra. It was very clear. The focus was very clear which really helped.

Barbara Lawrence: Which became a perfect vehicle for that.

Jane Kenny: And the State Plan was a perfect vehicle and Joe running all over the state to talk to people. He was exhausted most of the time when I saw him, but he was really engaged.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: I'm just old and I just look that way.

<group laughter>

Jane Kenny: No. No, Just really engaged in reaching out to get that input from municipalities. So I think that even though I had the passion, it really made a lot of sense.

<break in recording>

Nancy Becker: Jane, we were talking about the State Plan and you were talking. Wherever I interrupted you, please. I apologize.

Jane Kenny: No, just the idea of that balance with the million acres and the urban program and the fact that DCA was housing so many of the programs with urban renewal, the Housing and Mortgage Finance agency, the balanced housing money for grants. We did market rate housing mixed in with affordable housing. So it was getting the developers to feel that there were some really good reasons to go into the cities and those built up areas to take the pressure off open space. Judy will remember and Maureen and Bob will remember when we went to the Netherlands and we talked—

Nancy Becker: We're getting to that.

Jane Kenny: ...but that's the Green and Gold Taskforce. So I mean I think that's sort of my segue.

Nancy Becker: Not yet. I'm not ready for your segue.

Jane Kenny: I...

Nancy Becker: I'm the moderator. I'm not ready for your segue.

Jane Kenny: Oh, you're in charge? Okay. I'll wait.

<group laughter>

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: Can I say one other thing about state planning? What made my day one day was when I read that the governor took action against the movement by Treasury to build a building in Hamilton. Do you remember that? We really stepped forward in a very high profile way to say no. No this is not what we want to happen even though a lot of money had been spent on the prefabricated building or whatever it was. But I thought it was money well spent to just say no to that and illustrate that we mean business about this plan. We mean business about revitalizing cities and that goes to the governor's leadership.

Jane Kenny: And just the last thing I'll say about the State Plan moving to DCA. If you remember, we always got mixed reviews from the press for everything. Who reads editorials? But there were nine favorable editorials to vote for the State Plan. Those were the day we actually had newspapers.

<overlapping conversation>

Jane Kenny: There were nine. I remember because I used to say that in my speeches all of the time so I should look that up. But in favor of that. There would be a department where implementation was possible through our operations, as opposed to Treasury which is really just kind of looking out for the budget. <laughs> The mere financial.

<group laughter>

Ruth Mandel: Are they doing it in Treasury?

Nancy Becker: Barbara Lawrence when you and I had a conversation about today you were talking about the Sustainability Report. So would you talk a little bit about that?

Barbara Lawrence: Well, that comes out of the Netherlands.

Nancy Becker: Start with the Netherlands.

Barbara Lawrence: Just go to Jane's segue.

Nancy Becker: Jane's now got a phone call.

Jane Kenny: I'm going to turn this off, I'm sorry.

Barbara Lawrence: And that starts with Dave as the initiator of the Netherlands connection.

Nancy Becker: Okay. So Dave, before we get to the Green and Gold Taskforce, will you talk about the Netherlands, which in all honesty as your lobbyist, I really had hoped you would invite me to go with you but you didn't.

<group laughter>

David Moore: Well, you're the only one in the room that didn't go.

<group laughter>

David Moore: Nonprofits, charitable organizations often try to figure out what to do when there's an election coming up as to how to attract the attention of candidates to environmental issues, at least the environmental organizations. So one of the things that was traditionally done is that we would send a questionnaire or something like that to prospective candidates and find out where they thought they were going and what they thought they would do. When Governor Whitman was running we sent an invitation, thanks to the Netherlands embassy in Washington, to both prospective candidates telling them that if they won, their consolation prize was a trip to the Netherlands to study the Netherlands Environmental Policy Plan. And Governor Whitman won. So we put in the request together with the Netherlands embassy and the governor not only kindly but smartly asked a number of people on her staff and some of her commissioners and a couple of legislators to take the trip and see what the Netherlands Environmental Policy Plan was all about and we did so. Well, I think there are seven in this room.

Jane Kenny: Several of us here.

David Moore: Two, three, four, five, six, you went...

Barbara Lawrence: Second trip. There were two trips.

David Moore: Well, it doesn't matter. So there are seven or eight of us in here.

Jane Kenny: And John Bennett on the second trip.

David Moore: Yeah, well, I was counting him. I was counting an empty chair.

<overlapping conversation>

Robert J. Martin: Can I tell you, it's taken almost twenty years but my wife has never let me forget. And Tuesday we are flying to Amsterdam.

<group laughter>

Robert J. Martin: She wants to see what I...

Barbara Lawrence: It took her twenty years.

David Moore: Well, I had had the opportunity to go the year before to take a look at the environmental policy plan thanks to the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation. Scott McVay was chair of it then, president then, had an invitation and he didn't feel like going. He asked me to go in his place and for me that was a pretty lucky break. They really had their stuff together. I was so impressed after a week of exposure to that plan that it, together with the Dodge Foundation, let us come to the conclusion that we had to expose people in New Jersey who were policymakers and thinkers to that experience and so we did. A lot of good things happened as a result. The governor, with the aid of her commissioners and others who were involved, understood what was going on. We made a number of moves as a result. Unfortunately, a lot of that has gone the way things usually go in politics. But some things stayed around, not the least of which is the reunion we're having today. A lot of the policies that were put into place including pieces of the State Plan are still there. A lot of the things that happened in the Department of Environment Protection which Bob Shinn's already talked about and will probably talk more about also are still in place, not the planning portion unfortunately nor the State Plan. But a lot of other things have stayed including some of the sustainability state initiatives that are now happening. At the local level, they've never been adequately welded into state government at least after the governor left but I think better days are coming, even along that line. So that's the Netherlands story. We went back—I think the Netherlands embassy put together four trips altogether that involved different segments of New Jerseyans including the corporate sector. I thought frankly that would help a lot if we got some of the New Jersey corporations involved. As it happened a lot of them were members of the Stockton Alliance which was another one of those things that serendipity took over where the environmental and the corporate community were tired of suing each other and decided to talk to each other instead. That resulted in, as Michael related, a fairly substantial lobbying force to get the stable source of funding through the process. So that's the Netherlands story.

Nancy Becker: Gil.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Tell your wife not to feel bad, I didn't go on any of these trips. I had other things I had to do.

<group laughter>

<overlapping conversation>

Gil Medina: So Nancy, I think if I were going to summarize the Whitman administration legacy in the environmental arena I would start with the fact that there was significant space preservation achieved. High environmental measures obtained and I think Bob and Gary talked about the metrics that were achieved. And my role as Secretary of Commerce was one that was well rewarded because the governor's policies also basically created one of New Jersey's greatest periods of employment growth. I think it's kind of hard for us to appreciate the fact that our legacy is lasting. The Whitman administration legacy is a lasting legacy in spite of the fact that the political scenario in New Jersey has played out in a way that has made most of us unhappy. And Joe, you know, you talked about some of the things that are happening today, how these policies helped push forward some trends that now are dramatic. We have to be very happy about that. You know, I work for the largest commercial real estate company in the world, CBRE. It's the only commercial real estate company that's both a Fortune 500 and an S&P 500. I represent a lot of corporations and companies and people who are developers. It's just very interesting to me how those forces are somewhat aligned to push forward some of the policy that we were trying to promote. I have [a PowerPoint presentation](#) which I'm not going to go through Nancy because you're absolutely right, it's crazy. I feel like Robert Browning, somebody asked him what one of his poems meant and he said, "When I wrote it God and I understood it. Now, only God understands it."

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: But you can give it to us.

Gil Medina: Yeah, that's right. But this one summary page is kind of interesting because what it talks about and it's related to Rutgers. In December of 2012, Dr. Jim Hughes and Dr. Joseph Seneca wrote a paper which documented something that all of us in the real estate business were beginning to feel. It's almost like we felt the tremors but we didn't realize that we were in the middle of a tsunami. Basically Dean Hughes and Joe Seneca documented the fact that there had been a dramatic demographic shift, particularly in New Jersey because we're the first postindustrial state, but throughout the country. Those changes from a demographic standpoint are that there's a new preference for living in urban centers and in transit hubs. These were almost buzzwords from the Whitman years. So we've seen, as Joe began to indicate, and Joe Seneca and Jim Hughes have been kind of at the forefront of publishing all of this that the suburban communities in New Jersey that ring all of New Jersey are for the first time beginning to actually lose population. We're beginning to see places like New Brunswick, we're beginning to see places like Jersey City, Newark, Hoboken and you can go right on down the line almost every urban center of New Jersey is experiencing population growth.

Well, what's outstanding to me coming from Philadelphia is that Center City, Philadelphia in one decade from 2000 to 2010 increased its population by 10,000 people which when I was there it was incomprehensible. We've seen how places like Brooklyn have come back to life. So this trend line has been very exciting. From a real estate standpoint, we also have seen

that the real estate industry is now beginning to basically implement the policies that we were advocating. So in the 1980s in a short period of time New Jersey went from almost being not on the map in terms of office real estate, commercial real estate. Then in the 1980s we began this build out office and commercial real estate in New Jersey. Eighty percent of existing office structures in New Jersey today were built in the 1980s. And how were they built? They were built the way people then built things, suburban office campuses, basically white collar factories on green fields separated from everything. And I believe Carol you're the one who said one of the things that we talked about was sprawl costs money. Well, just imagine this, we're building all of this infrastructure sewage, roads, and everything to support these isolated campuses, factories of white collar workers. And they were spread throughout New Jersey.

Now what's happening is that workers don't want to be living in these environments anymore. They want to live in urban centers, 24/7 dynamic environments. What's happening is that these centers now are closing. Now we have a problem in New Jersey called the stranded asset crisis where you can go down the line—Merck, BASF's headquarters, Alcatel Lucent's facilities in Whippany. But what's happening that's really interesting is the developers now are taking all of the concepts that the Whitman administration was trying to effectuate through public policy and they're implementing them. So not only are they now building more and developing more in places like Jersey City where infrastructure exists to support it. But now they're taking these stranded assets and they're basically turning them into live, work, play, communities where there's an employment opportunity there. There's housing there. And there's services there to limit the number of trips that people have to make in their cars. In many ways, if we look at the legacy that the Whitman administration was trying to create, sometimes it's easy to be pessimistic when we see the fact that subsequent efforts have faltered. But I think ultimately the legacy and the goals are demonstrating that they're successful.

Nancy Becker: Dave, you told me something on the phone when we talked that you managed to create a friendship between several disparate individuals so tell us that. And then we'll see who else wants to talk about it.

David Moore: Well, this isn't the first time that I've sat between these two guys.

<group laughter>

David Moore: On the airplane over to Holland, Gil and I happened to get stuck sitting next to each other.

Gil Medina: No, that wasn't a coincidence. I organized that.

<group laughter>

David Moore: So I managed to give him a little philosophical lecture for five hours.

Gil Medina: Little, yeah, we needed sleep. You know, I'm trying to get sleep and David wasn't...

<group laughter>

David Moore: And then when we were on the trip these two guys hadn't been getting along too well beforehand. In fact, they were taking potshots at each other in the newspapers occasionally, right? Well, maybe not you.

Gil Medina: It was me. It wasn't Bob.

<group laughter>

Gil Medina: But Jane called me and got me straight on that issue in her usually very kind and easy way.

<group laughter>

David Moore: In any case, one evening, the three of us decided to go out for a beer and took a train to Utrecht which was about what, 20 miles away.

Jane Kenny: The beer is really good there, I hear.

<group laughter>

David Moore: I don't know why we did that but we did. Anyway, we had quite an adventure.

Gil Medina: David got us on the wrong train. We ended up in Zutimeyer instead.

<group laughter>

David Moore: So we got lost. But we finally made it back. I think after that trip we all recognized that we should be good friends and we have been ever since. So that's one of the benefits of foreign travel.

Gil Medina: I didn't tell the conclusion to this trip to London because I had told the governor, governor, this company is not going to invest in New Jersey and we've got to go try to get them. She said, "You know, you better come back with a success story to tell." So I went and the executive told me that the second to last place he would invest in was New Jersey and California was the last which was rather startling. But anyway, I got him to agree to meet with Bob and his staff to work through the environmental issues. You know, you were right, I mean it was more a perception issue. It wasn't that DEP was going to give this company a hard time. But the company had convinced itself that it's just too much brain damage for us to do this. To make a long story short Bob did my job for me because he got this company to make the investment in New Jersey.

Nancy Becker: Are they still here?

Gil Medina: Oh, yeah, they're still here. They tend to last when they make big investments.

Bob Shinn: My favorite line was, I'm from DEP. I'm here to help you.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Jane—Bob, sorry.

Bob Shinn: The real thing that came out of the Netherlands, if I can jump on the Netherlands, we did an agreement internationally that the state department approved to coordinate our planning. The second one, we developed a plan where we would put infrastructure to energy efficiency that involved a Burlington landfill, methane to energy. It involved a Camden landfill. They made aluminum shapes and had a common boundary with the landfill. So we used methane gas to heat the aluminum to extrude it so it was direct—very energy efficient. That was very successful in its own right. The third one was the Cumberland landfill. And I forget that was also an energy—do you remember what Cumberland did? I think it was energy related, and we traded credits. They were supposed to pay us 80 percent of our cost of putting in that infrastructure. They would take those credits back to the Netherlands, and because Cheney blew up the climate change program about midway through the process they still let us trade. They accepted our credits because our reductions were 3.5 percent by 2005 and their reductions were 6 percent by 2005. They were going to do three percent and they were going to buy credits for the other three percent. So we were part of the credit sale to a utility like PSE&G and that actually happened. We did those landfill improvements and traded those credits and that utility took those credits and did their thing for their credit. So it actually materialized and was very successful. And the relationship with the Netherlands just kept going with the department until the next commissioner didn't want to do it anymore and it just stopped.

Gil Medina: I want to tell a Governor Christie Whitman, story. So we were—

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Careful.

<group laughter>

Gil Medina: Christie Whitman was really well liked internationally because here we had a Republican, a woman Republican with a passport who had used it and actually spoke more than one language. There was always an environmental bent to what we did to our trade missions. We did a mission to France and the staff for the minister, environmental minister in France and I, my staff worked out all of the protocols. It was a kabuki dance of a meeting. And everything was supposed to be orchestrated. So we start the meeting that's going well and the minister, the French minister and the governor start talking in French. All of a sudden they walk away and we're sitting there saying wait a minute, what happened to

the program. They open up a cabinet, she opens up a cabinet and offers Christie Whitman a glass of champagne. And all of a sudden we had an agreement with them to do some of the similar things that we were doing with the Netherlands. But the State Department got really upset because they said, "Wait a minute. You're not a nation. You're a state. You're not supposed to be signing treaties if you look at the Constitution."

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Well we had just done—what we said basically was our environmental standards are strong. France's environmental standards were strong. If a company gets through either one we will waive the process in our state. But, of course, for us that opened up all of the E.U. so it was going to be really good for our businesses and I guess that's what set the State Department off. They didn't like that. Overstepping bounds.

Nancy Becker: Jane, what was the Green and Gold taskforce?

Jane Kenny: When we got back from the Netherlands we really understood—you know the Dutch are great environmentalists and they have to be for lots of reasons but also they're supreme business people. We saw that there was this great balance. Regulatory issues needn't get in the way of doing good business in the state. You can do both. So we actually asked New Jersey Future to broker this because we felt we might look like we have a bias if we try to do it from our department. But we were very involved in it. I was still in the policy office at the time. Judy and I had been to the Netherlands as had Gil and Bob. So we kind of got together and we had a bunch of open meetings with different sectors. And at the end of that we came to the conclusion that it would be great to have a sitting committee representing both the environment and the business community and that would be sitting in DEP but New Jersey Future—

Barbara Lawrence: I got a green and gold dress.

Jane Kenny: You had a green and gold dress.

<group laughter>

Jane Kenny: So that was your input? Well, that was very important. But I know we did so many things. Talk about this a little bit.

Barbara Lawrence: May I transition into the Sustainable State?

Nancy Becker: Yes, go back to where I put it.

Barbara Lawrence: Because that was the most important thing about going to the Netherlands, from my perspective, and seeing the impact was the relationships that were built. Plus the confidence that you could make these kinds of changes. This was a country that was living in a way that we said we wanted to live. They had been willing to make those compromises, and were proceeding and seemed to be doing well economically and environmentally. They were living the dream that we had. One of the things we wanted to

do that came out of this initiative was to measure, like Bob was talking about measuring, what's important at the DEP. We created a report in cooperation with the administration called the Sustainable State. What would it mean if New Jersey were sustainable? And we gathered the baseline data with a great deal of difficulty.

Jane Kenny: And Barbara, not to interrupt, but this is so important because, I think, most administrations would not want to be so examined because obviously we did—

Barbara Lawrence: And nobody did again.

<group laughter>

Jane Kenny: We didn't but we did. We allowed New Jersey Future and others to get these data points so we could know and improve ourselves, which I think says a lot.

Barbara Lawrence: I think it was a remarkable document. I didn't bring mine today. I should have like Joe. It's still in my office, and we still talk about it. The impact of doing that, of measuring where you are on these twenty-something indicators and then the sub-indicators was an amazing process. And then New Jersey Future repeated it again a few years later and then—

Jane Kenny: Then you all got put in jail, right?

<group laughter>

Barbara Lawrence: Yeah. That's right. And then there wasn't the kind of progress on all of those measures and there's a little less enthusiasm for them when you're not making progress. But it was a remarkable undertaking. And there was a great deal of cooperation from the governor's office from DEP and the rest of the administration.

Jane Kenny: So many things that came out of the trips to the Netherlands I think really did galvanize a lot of the discussions we had been having. You know, I sat during the governor's transition at these listening sessions and we were already talking about a lot of this stuff. But I think to see a country with the same attributes as New Jersey and how they succeeded helped us a lot. The issue of regulatory reform became something that we were committed to in terms of we need business here. Obviously, to thrive we need to get business back into the state. But we also want to preserve what we have in this very densely populated state and we want to preserve the environment. So all of our programs were really focused on how do we do that? And there was such a range depending on the departments and what they had to offer. But when you have that focus and you know then you can map that. For example, in DCA and this was 1999, we introduced a sustainable housing program. Nobody was doing that fifteen years ago but that was part of this when we put it on the table. Here's some money so a developer can come up with housing that's thirty percent more efficient. That was our goal. Developers came because there was money on the table but we got something out of it because we were able to show that it wasn't a

prohibitively expensive thing to do. I think that we were all thinking that way. You know, we would meet a lot. We had the Urban Coordinating Council. Am I out of turn bringing that up because we're not there on the agenda yet?

Nancy Becker: Not yet.

Jane Kenny: I know I got in trouble.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Right.

Jane Kenny: I think my point is with this last section we really were in sync with what we were trying to accomplish, even to this day, because there are some mayors of cities that are still there that were there when we were there. They will say to me, "You know, we really worked with them more than any other administration, Democrat or Republican, since."

Barbara Lawrence: Let me pick up on the long term impact of that. Now we have an organization Sustainable Jersey that's working in the vast majority of municipalities and have these green teams of citizens who are working. That's all an outgrowth of the initial trip to the Netherlands, the second trip of the Whitman administration. The sustainable state and now Sustainable Jersey which continues working at the statewide policy level. But at the municipal level.

Jane Kenny: Yeah, very much so.

Barbara Lawrence: Right, at the municipal level. So it's another indication of when you drop that pebble in the water you don't know where those ripples are going to go years later.

Nancy Becker: Gary.

David Moore: Who knows, maybe we'll get another governor like Governor Whitman that will pick all of that and make it into state policy.

Nancy Becker: From your lips to God's ear. Gary.

Gary Sondermeyer: Yeah, I was just going to amplify what Barbara mentioned. Jane and I have the pleasure of sitting on the board of Sustainable Jersey. I think there are 434 towns that are now actively engaged in seeking either bronze or silver certification. And for the first time we're trying to define the gold standard of sustainability. And again, to Barbara's point this all goes right back to that living with the future in mind, goals and indicators report that had this cross cutting report card for the quality of life in the state of New Jersey. That's such a legacy item, as Gil was saying, with his presentation. It's great to

look at the positives that have continued. This one is off the charts. We've even expanded to sustainable schools to take those same concepts beyond the towns, to try to get to every single school and school district in the state.

Gil Medina: Well, just imagine Gary, we reserve space, right, and then we create these very compelling incentives to develop around town centers, urban centers and transit centers. I mean the outcome eventually is going to be that that's the direction development is going to go. I see that Whitman policy succeeded. One of the things Eileen that you and I discussed is you also created the Office of Sustainability after the Dutch visit and that office was very consciously, again, just the way David Moore sat next to me, placed in the Department of Commerce. Our responsibility was to get the state to embrace sustainability policies but also to point out to companies that sustainability, as I think you all pointed out, could actually be economically beneficial. So we were getting contractors, for example, to recycle bricks or recycle others things from buildings they were tearing down and reusing these materials. And they found that it was actually profitable to do some of this work.

Robert J. Martin: The experience really does kind of reinforce the lesson that if you can find a model that's workable. I remember David's enthusiasm about having found a place, as I recall, he said, "It's kind of similar to New Jersey in size and urban density."

Gil Medina: Double the size and the same population density.

Robert J. Martin: And he said, "They've been able to do the things we want to do. You've got to see it. You've got to see it." And it's kind of remarkable just hearing, again, today, how much sprung from your initial inspiration to have others because it gives you some optimism that things can work. When you can see a government that was really working in cooperation—I remember talking to some of the private people in private industry talking about how they worked collaboratively and cooperatively with government. You could look around, you could you really see and feel that that kind of synergy could really make a difference.

Nancy Becker: Let's move on to brownfields redevelopment which is another example of using an underutilized asset and making it something that became an asset to both business and the state. Eileen, will you lead off on that.

Eileen McGinnis: Actually, I wasn't really involved in that.

Nancy Becker: You weren't involved. Do you want to talk about it?

Jane Kenny: Yeah, sure. The Governor was the first governor and New Jersey was the first state in the country to have a brownfields law. She immediately created a taskforce figure out and first do an inventory: where are these lands? What could be helped? It was interesting because we talk about this all of the time, now brownfields and redevelopment and redeveloping on contaminated land. But at the time there were a lot of people who

didn't want to come forward and say, "Yes, this land is contaminated." Mayors and others were very concerned about what was this going to mean? This is going to mean EPA is going to come in and sweep in and make this a superfund site. But what we did in this taskforce was work and tell them this is really about cleaning up sites and putting them back into productive use. Nobody's benefiting from these sites that are just laid to waste and there really could be some good economic progress as well as aesthetic et cetera. So the taskforce actually was given money to put on the table for municipalities to come forward and plan or start to do some cleanups. It consisted of people—I'm sure you were on it Gil and Bob. I know I was on it. We had people from a couple of law firms and outside people that had been involved in redevelopment activity. But it was one of the tools in the toolkit for doing the redevelopment of areas that were so underutilized. Again, it became very much part of the language of looking at a place and thinking about what could go there and we got a lot of interest. Of course, when you put money on the table...

Gil Medina: Well, Jane, it was the money, right? Because what came out of that was the brownfield and contaminated site remediation program.

Jane Kenny: Right.

Gil Medina: This program was the first of its kind in the country. Basically what it did, if you were a developer, and you wanted to redevelop a brownfield site you could recover up to 75 percent of your cleanup costs from future taxes generated at the site. Unlike a lot of other programs it wasn't a tax income financing. It was every state tax that was generated at the site so it could be your personal income taxes, corporate business taxes. So developers knew that they could really clean these sites up and get the money reimbursed quickly. In addition to that, what this legislation did—I mean you still talk to developers today they're all using this program. And you know, we'll joke and talk about it.

<group laughter>

<overlapping conversation>

What it also did, which was really great, is that not only did it take away some of the financial risk but it also mitigated the environmental risk because once you cleaned up the site to the standards that DEP and the developer agreed to you would have a letter of no further action. So your environmental liability was also mitigated. So it was a brilliant piece of legislation Joe. You as a person who's benefited the most from it maybe can talk about it.

<group laughter>

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr: You exaggerate a little bit. But Jane is right, way back people wouldn't touch a contaminated site. If somebody dropped a bottle of aspirin on it they'd walk away from it. Now, it's very routine to be part of the redevelopment process in urban New Jersey. It's just part of the conversation how much is it going to be to clean it up?

When are we going to get the RAO [Response Action Outcome]? How much can the HDSRF [Hazardous Discharge Site Remediation Fund] grant provide to that? That's a big funding mechanism. So that's very routine now. But I remember when property owners were horrified at the idea that their property would be on this contaminated list. But that's all changed. It's just part of doing business.

Robert J. Martin: It also created a whole new industry. The number of people who work in cleanup is large.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr: Absolutely.

Gil Medina: Well, it is interesting, as Joe pointed out, in New Jersey, now, people aren't afraid of brownfield sites. But prior to 1994 there was this terror of touching a brownfield site.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr: Yes, exactly right.

Nancy Becker: Bob, you were going to add something?

Bob Shinn: Yeah. One thing we haven't talked about, the first in the nation climate change program. New Jersey adopted it somewhere around 2000, 1999, something in that area.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Yeah, it was right at the end.

Bob Shinn: Three-and-a-half percent below 1990 levels by 2005. And we incorporated that into our silver and gold track programs where a gold track member would agree to make climate change reductions. And we had players in that realm. We also had a lot of the corporations that were silver track members doing environmental programs with environmental groups—tree planting, lending equipment, just a whole array of things. We had 56 colleges and universities opting into it, demonstrating everything from micro turbines on campus to geothermal to you name it. There were just a lot of programs different colleges and universities went into and started talking about CO2 reduction. Now, we sold the program not talking about CO2 reduction even though that was the result of the program. We talked about sea level rise and we held a couple of hearings at the shore. We had data that said sea level is rising since 1900, 6 inches of sea level rise and 6 inches of subsidence. So we got a 12-inch net siege impact which means you have 127 miles of beach to refill. We brought that out in the hearing and basically said, we can do some simple things, that energy efficiency and pollution prevention are the two driving forces to make this program work. We got corporate cooperation and colleges and universities buying in and we've got good support in both of those hearings to do the program. Never about climate changing, global warming, all of the argument issues, but sea level rise is something people can relate to. Energy efficiency and pollution prevention people understand—prevent pollution in the most practical way possible. It's a no brainer. If you drove climate change

by energy efficiency and pollution prevention you'd get there. P2 plus E2 equals S2, pollution prevention plus energy efficiency equals sustainability and stewardship.

<overlapping conversation>

Jane Kenny: I was in EPA, they all talk like him now.

<group laughter>

Bob Shinn: I had one thing to add. The governor set me up through the State Department.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I never set you up.

Bob Shinn: I got a call from the State Department that said "Commissioner, we would like to have you testify before the United Nations." I said, really. And I thought it was a prank call. And I said, "What about?" And they said, "Your sea level rise program." I said, okay, how many countries are going to be there. They said, "Oh, about twelve." Okay. I can do that. So on April 21, 2001 I go to New York and sign up and go in a room. 75 countries are there. I'm behind a podium like I am in the legislature so it was like home and there are 20 countries that want to speak on climate change. The guy from the State Department says, "Are you ready?" I said there are twenty countries that want to speak. He said, "When you raise your flag you'll speak." I raised my flag, "United States." So I talk about our sea level rise program, what our goals are, some of our experience with the Netherlands and trading and whatnot and sat down, no questions. The guy from the State Department goes, "I can't believe you're not getting any questions." I said, well, I'm leaving if it's okay. So I'm out of there. But I figured you did that to me.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Moi?

Bob Shinn: Well, it was your program.

Nancy Becker: Last on our agenda is talking about urban redevelopment. You may wonder why we are talking about urban redevelopment. Well it continues with the theme that we've talked about in terms of the State Plan and planning and how all of this kind of fits together. Jane.

Jane Kenny: Well, I think we covered a lot of the programs that helped with urban redevelopment. But the point was that we decided—the governor said she would like this group of people, a cadre of people from every department, to get together and really think about using their resources to support a plan that the city and some nonprofit group with the city mayor comes up with. So it was a challenge that we put out in her first term to the urban mayors and the community groups and said get together with your mayors and get together with your community activists and come to us with a plan. We'll pick a few and we'll work on supporting that with all of the resources that the state could bring to the

table. It was interesting because right after you spoke [Elizabeth] Mayor Bollwage walked in my office and put down a piece of paper and he said, "We want to be first." He already had his nonprofit lined up. He had his plan, what he wanted to do. So we started working in Elizabeth but soon after we wanted to work in Trenton because that was where we were. So we really encouraged Mayor Palmer to work with some of the nonprofit groups. We worked in Perth Amboy. Throughout the time that I spent in government, government was in municipalities and was working in areas. But the Department of Health would be somewhere and EDA [Economic Development Authority] would be somewhere else, and Community Affairs would be in another part of town. This was a real coordination of resources focused on the areas that the towns themselves felt were most in need of redevelopment. The assets that we brought were that. We also would give the town a community director to work directly with the mayor on the particular program that we were supporting. It really was very interesting because we saw results pretty quickly. Talk about a legacy! You can go to these cities and the things that happened then are still there.

Gil Medina: Chris Bollwage still talks to me about that, about our administration and how it was the most user friendly administration he's ever worked with.

Jane Kenny: So that was the plan. The programs we focused on and tried to develop with our authorities and with our state entities were really focused. This is what we're trying to do in Asbury Park. This is what we're trying to do in Long Branch. Look at Long Branch. When you think about legacy, you just go there. All of that started with you and that program.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: It had some dips and bumps. <inaudible>

Jane Kenny: Yeah, but it finally worked. Transit Village. We had programs with HMFA [Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency] which were for first time homeowners. We were trying to encourage the people in those towns where we were working with subsidies to buy a house in that particular area. The UHOR program, a funny name, but it was all urban redevelopment and millions of dollars were put out in the financing from HMFA to do redevelopment in urban areas. Just recently we were talking about Morristown. Both Morristown and New Brunswick hadn't seen any market rate housing for about twenty-five years before we were there. No market rate housing. And someone in DCA actually came out with this program. It was an old federal program. He said, "I think we can use this money. Maybe we can challenge two municipalities to do some market rate housing." And Morristown and New Brunswick came forward. The stuff that you see if you go home along 18 was the first market rate housing in New Brunswick in 25 years that we helped finance. In Morristown, right around the green there's some market rate housing.

Robert J. Martin: Morristown is hot.

Jane Kenny: It's hot. And so is New Brunswick, by the way. New Brunswick has a skyline, by the way.

<group laughter>

Jane Kenny: It's quite amazing.

Carol Cronheim: A wonderful art scene.

Jane Kenny: Yeah, I mean that was the beginning. I remember too when we had demolition money for unsafe buildings. You know, it all worked to really encourage people to think about our cities and to get back in there and make some money in the process. Lastly, I'll just bring up the rehabilitation sub code, maybe some of you...

<group laughter>

<overlapping conversation>

...might remember. But that was sort of regulatory reform for DCA. The people in codes, and the people in the fire and it was really just me whipping, saying come on. When are we going to get this done because I want to have something to give to the governor for her to show that we had regulatory reform. It was basically when you wanted to redevelop or refurbish an older house or building you had to go back and use the codes as if it were a new building and it was so prohibitively expensive. Even if a corridor was 32 inches wide, it had to be 36. You know, everything had to be brought up to code. So all of the beautiful buildings with good bones were really being left and either demolished or abandoned. And this code mapped it out for what you can do if it's an older building. Actually other states then adopted it, Delaware, I think, and Connecticut. I mean there were several states that came forward and it got us a lot of attention which was really great because it really put a lot of attention on a lot of the other programs that were going on in the city. We, as an administration, cared about our urban communities. So it was very active. We were very busy but it was very much a team. I got to lead the charge based on the charge from her. I got to lead it. But all of us were very committed to that in her cabinet and, of course, the people in the departments that had been working on these programs and were working in the wilderness, for a while, got a lot of attention and elevation for the first time.

Nancy Becker: So we've talked about lots and lots of extremely positive things that happened. So let me just ask a question, were there any missed opportunities? Were there any mistakes that were made in this area?

Jane Kenny: No.

<group laughter>

Jane Kenny: It was pretty perfect.

Nancy Becker: Carol.

Carol Cronheim: I don't want to say missed opportunity but one we didn't mention was that the governor did come in and she doubled the arts funding by 2000.

Nancy Becker: That's not on this agenda.

Carol Cronheim: That is this agenda because it's the urban agenda. New Brunswick, Red Bank, Collingswood, Asbury Park, all of those. Hammonton. They're all back because of the arts because people need to be there at night. I remember Harriet Derman used to name all of those programs like, "I can't believe it's a mortgage" and all of these crazy names.

Judy Jengo: Too good but it's true.

Carol Cronheim: So one was like, "upstairs downtown" and that really went hand in hand with that because without things going on at night people don't feel safe in the cities. So they're part of that.

Gil Medina: Carol, you'll be pleased to know that Don Katz, the CEO of Audible.com, is very committed to Newark. He gave the commencement speech at the Rutgers Newark Campus. One of the things that he said will lead the way to the revitalization of urban centers like Newark, are the arts. So there are a lot of people who feel like you do that it's a vital part.

Carol Cronheim: And we finished that.

Jane Kenny: That was going on forever.

Nancy Becker: But any missed opportunities?

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Bob has one, or two or three.

Bob Shinn: Fortunately, the Netherlands is a peace loving country but their commissioner, the aid commissioner, came over to look at our greenhouse which we built in Burlington twenty years ago, I guess. We borrowed all of the technology from the Netherlands at that time. What amazed them about the greenhouse is they look at greenhouses in the Netherlands as pollution centers. We recycled our pollutants and we were running on a methane boiler. We weren't putting all of these pollutants into the environment and she was very impressed with that. We went back for a lunch and we were in the greenhouse. I pulled the chair out for her and I don't think they do that in the Netherlands. I'm not sure. She sat down and the chair wasn't there. And they were folding steel chairs and it was a concrete floor and the chair sort of came down on top of her and the international press corps was around the table. I'm trying to regroup as best I can and get her up in the chair and she's very embarrassed. And we got through that.

<group laughter>

But when you talk about mistakes there was a little international briefing I missed on pulling the chair out.

Jane Kenny: Well, there was one urban program, what was it the parks, where you went to the swing.

Nancy Becker: That was the Bangs Avenue Playground.

Jane Kenny: The Bangs Avenue Playground.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: That was another photo op. But that was only fortunately the trooper that has the photo, I think, where we were inaugurating in Asbury Park.

Jane Kenny: Yeah.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Inaugurating a nice playground that was very environmentally friendly and everything. And I thought I'd get on a swing and see what the swings were like. Well, it was one of those—it wasn't the hard board swing, you know, those nice sort of soft leather whatever the heck the plastic they were made of. So grabbed hold of—and I was in a skirt. And I grabbed hold of the two chains and leapt up and went right through over backwards.

<group laughter>

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: And landed upside. It was not one of my finest moments.

Nancy Becker: Do we have that photograph? We won't post it.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Jimmy has it. He has a whole sequence. And I turn around here and the troopers are supposed to be protecting me and they were all with their back to me.

Jane Kenny: Their faces were red. They couldn't stop laughing.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: They couldn't stop laughing. We went to lunch and they'd go <laughs> and look at each other and then look at me and then start to laugh.

Nancy Becker: Judy.

Judy Jengo: One environmental story I have to add, and you'll know why I'm saying it as soon as I do, is what Governor Whitman did for the—and Eileen you used to joke with me about this—for the international importance of shorebirds.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: The horseshoe crab.

Judy Jengo: And that was to really step up to save the horseshoe crabs. The eggs of the horseshoe crab, as most of you know, are the crucial food for a number of species [of birds] passing through Delaware Bay from around the world without which they would not make it to the Arctic breeding grounds. Horseshoe crabs were literally crashing in New Jersey. There were very few of them left. There were very few shorebirds left. The ones that were left were starving and dying on the beaches. And there was one day when there were scientists from all over the world combing the New Jersey beaches in a panic. I had been asked to go down there for someone to take a look at all of this and it was really a spectacle of people—scientists from all over the world on our beaches in a panic. Saying, “This is the place in the whole world that’s so important for these creatures and everything is crashing.” So what do we need to do? “We really need your governor to ban harvesting horseshoe crabs immediately or we’re talking a total collapse.” Governor Whitman did that almost immediately and it made a huge difference, still a problem today.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: A lot of the fisherman were not too thrilled and a lot of the people...

Eileen McGinnis: You remember Mike Murphy was running the second campaign and was furious at the governor. He called me and said, “What?” He was not happy.

Judy Jengo: And the horseshoe crab fisherman, they were really very few, but they were filling tractor trailers full of these creatures and selling them to other states for bait.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: They were taking the eggs for the elvers too who were using them as bait—using the eels that they caught to bait for the bluefish. Then we put a ban on the size of bluefish that you could take that didn’t make—we were not particularly popular in South Jersey for...

Judy Jengo: Your action is one of the only reasons...

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Now they love it though because the size of those bluefish are huge.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: Yeah, there’s one in the paper this morning thirty pounds.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: Really? A thirty-pound bluefish.

Nancy Becker: Greg.

Greg Romano: I don't know if this was an opportunity—well, it’s actually how we dealt with a small crisis in the farmland preservation program. Do you remember there was criticism about the County Agriculture Development Boards, which are the county governmental bodies—a potential conflict of interest because the farmer members were applying for farmland preservation, even though they were abstaining or recusing themselves from the vote and discussion on their own individual parcels. I think the papers,

a few of the Gannet papers, ran a series of articles about potential conflict here. It didn't really address the state body, the State Agriculture Development Committee, because we already prohibited that kind of relationship—anybody who was a member applying—but the counties did not. So there would be the appearance where I would recuse myself from my application but I would vote on Gil's and then Gil would recuse himself from his application and I would vote for him. So we proposed in the regulations, actually, and it was passed, that we would prohibit those County Ag Development Board members from applying. And I think it really precluded a larger ethics issue that could have really damaged the farmland preservation program if we hadn't addressed it. We addressed it rather quickly. I know Eileen was involved in that and we had talked about that. And we were always wondering whether legally we could tell the county government that they couldn't do this but we did it anyway through regulation. And I think it showed how we can address those controversial issues with little damage to the credibility of the program which was our main concern.

Arthur R. Brown, Jr.: It even included the Secretary of Agriculture. I had to wait ten years after I left office.

Greg Romano: That's right.

<group laughter>

Yeah, we wanted to make sure you were clean.

<group laughter>

Nancy Becker: Any other comments?

Gil Medina: Nancy, my biggest regret is that I didn't get with the program faster.

Nancy Becker: You hadn't met Dave Moore.

Gil Medina: I remember I started in February of 1994 and in March I gave a speech where I said, I've got 400 people in my department trying to put people into business and DEP has 4000 trying to put them out of business. When Jane, in her usual very diplomatic and kind and sweet way, called me and said, "You can't do that." And the good news was that once Jane brought it to my attention and she explained to me how this was impacting Bob personally, not just in terms of his function as commissioner of DEP, I called Bob and apologized. And from that moment on I was very careful with what I said but that was just my mouth. My heart was won over when David wooed me for six hours.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr.: You know, on the subject of Gil Medina getting with the program, early on in the time that I was on the State Planning Commission there was this initiative led by Marty Bierbaum to have state implementation teams in every department of state government. The first such meeting was with the Secretary of Commerce. He invited me to come and I said, sure, why not, I'd like to see what this is like. Well, I'll never forget this

Gil, and I think you may remember, you were the only one in the room. Your staff didn't arrive. You were furious.

Gil Medina: All of my assistants decided this wasn't important.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr: Yes. You were furious. You got them all back in. You reprimanded them. You said, "This is the governor's legacy. What are you doing here?" I went back to home thinking what have I gotten myself into?

<group laughter>

If the state agencies are this clueless about this, this is going to be hard. But you really took the reins of that. And I'll never forget how impressed I was.

Gil Medina: One of the things about the Whitman administration—why I thought the trip to Netherlands was kind of nice because in the Netherlands every sector in the community came to the table and helped formulate the policy. They would win some policy arguments and lose some. What I thought was so good about Governor Whitman was that her way of managing and the way that Jane and Eileen and the other people in the front office managed was in the same fashion. I don't recall one time in the seven years that I served with Christie Whitman that there was a big policy debate in which I was involved where I didn't have an opportunity to present my position. Even if my position wasn't accepted I felt that I got an opportunity to be part of the conversation. And after that, when the governor made a decision I mean it was imperative for the departments to execute.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr: You made that point.

Gil Medina: And I think her management style really helped. I think all of us really understood it was important.

Joseph J. Maraziti, Jr: I was impressed.

Nancy Becker: Any other comments? Governor, I'm going to turn to you for closing comments.

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: I know there were a lot of missed opportunities and mistakes we made. It's just we prefer to forget them.

<group laughter>

Gov. Christine Todd Whitman: They don't come immediately to mind. But, again, I want to reiterate the way I started which is not only to thank all of you for taking all of this time to be here today, but to thank you for your service both in my administration, before and then after and the work that everybody is doing. And I hope it's been—it's nice to listen to this particularly because we might talk about the good things but to think that some of the

things that we did that were difficult that we didn't really see immediately a big impact or we thought they're sliding away actually do come back and form a base for future growth and development along the right lines. And I think everybody who was part of that, all of you, should feel very good about the roles that you've played and continue to play and I thank you because I got to benefit from it all. So thank you all and thank you for being here.

<applause>