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1 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We'll start with the

2 regular meeting.

3 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes. We can call to

4 order and just in terms of the statement, the role

5 call remains the same from the re-org meeting, as

6 well as obviously, the Open Public Meetings Act

7 notice for this meeting as well.

8 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Okay. So there's no

9 need to call the role? Okay. So at this time,

10 we'll call for approval of the minutes from

11 January 8th meeting?

12 COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Motion.

13 COMMISSIONER DELABELLA: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We have a motion by

15 Commissioner Dublin, second by Commissioner

16 Delabella.

17 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Bado not

18 present. Commissioner Delabella.

19 COMMISSIONER DELABELLA: Yes.

20 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.

21 COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.

22 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.

23 COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.

24 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.

25 COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.

R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC.    (973) 239-7252

1 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We'll start with the

2 regular meeting.

3 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.

4 COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.

5 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti

6 absent, Commissioner Peneda absent. Chairman

7 Pestana.

8 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.

9 MS. RAMOS: The minutes of January 8,

10 2020, are approved with six board members voting

11 yes, three not present.

12 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Okay. At this time,

13 we'll open the meeting up for comments from the

14 public? Seeing none, the public portion is now


16 MR. GUERRA: Item number 4 resolution

17 number 2-2020-4 of the Hudson County Improvement

18 Authority authorizing payment of certain costs and

19 expenses of the Authority for the month of

20 February 2020.

21 COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Motion.

22 COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We have a motion by

24 Commissioner Dublin, second by Commissioner

25 Goldsack.

R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC.    (973) 239-7252

1 CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We'll start with the

2 regular meeting.

3 MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Bado not

4 present. Commissioner Delabella.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>COMMISSIONER DELLABELLA: Yes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>absent, Commissioner Peneda absent. Chairman Pestana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MS. RAMOS: Resolution number 2-2020-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>passes in the affirmative, six board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>voting yes, three not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MR. GUERRA: Item number 5 on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>resolution 2-2020-5 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing a contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>amendment for appraisal services with Helix Real Estate. In March 2018, we had received notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>from New Jersey Transit of their intent to acquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>an easement over a portion of the land owned by the Authority adjacent to the northeast corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>This parcel was part of the -- Liz, that might be at the Koppers site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC. (973) 239-7252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | absent, Commissioner Peneda absent. Chairman Pestana. |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes. |
| 3 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes. |
| 5 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin. |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes. |
| 7 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack. |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes. |
| 9 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo. |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes. |
| 11 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti |
| 12 | absent, Commissioner Peneda absent. Chairman Pestana. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes. |
| 14 | MS. RAMOS: Resolution number 2-2020-4 |
| 15 | passes in the affirmative, six board members |
| 16 | voting yes, three not present. |
| 17 | MR. GUERRA: Item number 5 on the agenda |
| 18 | resolution 2-2020-5 of the Hudson County Improvement Authority authorizing a contract |
| 19 | amendment for appraisal services with Helix Real Estate. In March 2018, we had received notice |
| 20 | from New Jersey Transit of their intent to acquire |
| 21 | an easement over a portion of the land owned by the Authority adjacent to the northeast corridor. |
| 22 | This parcel was part of the -- Liz, that might be at the Koppers site. |
| 23 | R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC. (973) 239-7252 |

| 1 | MR. GUERRA: The initial contract was |
| 2 | $5,000, we're increasing it another 5,000, |
| 3 | therefore totaling 10,000, but not to exceed |
| 4 | 10,000. So it could be a little less, but we know |
| 5 | it will never be more. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Any questions? Any |
| 7 | motions? |
| 8 | COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Motion by |
| 10 | Commissioner Goldsack. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER DELLABELLA: Second. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Second by |
| 13 | Commissioner Dellabella. |
| 14 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Bado not |
| 15 | present. Commissioner Dellabella. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER DELLABELLA: Yes. |
| 17 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran. |
| 18 | COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes. |
| 19 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin. |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes. |
| 21 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes. |
| 23 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo. |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes. |
| 25 | MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti |
| 26 | R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC. (973) 239-7252 |
services to repair certain wells that were damaged during the PDM spreading activity. At that time, we had contracted with them an amount not to exceed $78,000. However, this January, we were notified that due to on-site conditions, there were certain circumstances surrounding the drilling of the wells, they hit obstructions which precluded from continuing the boring. Some of these wells went down as far as 86 feet.

In addition there was some poor weather conditions, muddy conditions, we had asked them to put that in writing to our LSRP who was John Golden and from PS&S. As a result, they had to relocate some of those wells that they couldn’t drill anymore at those locations, so there was additional cost involved and that additional cost for the additional time, effort, drilling is $9,800, so the contract will go to $87,800. We have that letter of recommendation from our LSRP stating that this is reasonable and acceptable.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Norman. MR. GUERRA: This is in the easement portion of the site, too.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: They were originally drilled?

MR. GUERRA: They were originally set.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: I’m having a hard time hearing.

MR. GUERRA: The wells were originally set in 2007, then there was work that had to be done in -- then they were reset in 2013 because we raised the elevation because of Sandy. And then some of those wells had been damaged probably at that time, and they needed to be replaced, not all of them, some of them. And then some of them were replaced, but some they had some issues with the drilling. They hit a lot of obstructions drilling. Now, I don’t know if it’s the exact same spot or close to it. But there are some sections in the eastern portion of the site where I know I recall a lot of concrete being buried under there from the demolition, from looking at photos way, way back. That’s before the PDM.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Is this from 2013?

MR. GUERRA: 2013 is the last time they were set and they all worked. Since then, probably the last maybe year or two, some others that were damaged. There’s still activity going on that portion of the site, in the eastern portion of the site, too.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Norman.

In addition there was some poor weather conditions, muddy conditions, we had asked them to put that in writing to our LSRP who was John Golden and from PS&S. As a result, they had to relocate some of those wells that they couldn’t drill anymore at those locations, so there was additional cost involved and that additional cost for the additional time, effort, drilling is $9,800, so the contract will go to $87,800. We have that letter of recommendation from our LSRP stating that this is reasonable and acceptable.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Norman. MR. GUERRA: This is in the easement portion of the site, too.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: They were originally drilled?

MR. GUERRA: They were originally set.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: I’m having a hard time hearing.

MR. GUERRA: The wells were originally set in 2007, then there was work that had to be done in -- then they were reset in 2013 because we raised the elevation because of Sandy. And then some of those wells had been damaged probably at that time, and they needed to be replaced, not all of them, some of them. And then some of them were replaced, but some they had some issues with the drilling. They hit a lot of obstructions drilling. Now, I don’t know if it’s the exact same spot or close to it. But there are some sections in the eastern portion of the site where I know I recall a lot of concrete being buried under there from the demolition, from looking at photos way, way back. That’s before the PDM.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Is this from 2013?

MR. GUERRA: 2013 is the last time they were set and they all worked. Since then, probably the last maybe year or two, some others that were damaged. There’s still activity going on that portion of the site, in the eastern portion of the site, too.
for qualifications and authorizing issuance of a
request for proposal for the construction of the
Honorable Frank J. Guarini Justice Complex.

As I stated earlier and as you may recall, the county had set up a selection
cómittee to review the submissions we had received. We had issued the request for
qualifications and we received four responses.
The county designated a selection committee to review those and make the recommendation to us in
order for us to concur with their recommendation and issue the RFP to what’s known as the short list.

And Dave Drummler had prepared on behalf of the selection committee a report that outlines their conclusion. And their conclusion is that out of the four companies, they short listed down to three. And while we wait for Dave to provide you with a little more background, I’ll just go to the conclusion which talks about the three companies that were -- that it came down to.

So it comes down to Gilbane, Terminal, and Tutor Perini, Prismatic was not -- was not short listed.

MR. O’CONNOR: There were four respondents -- the three that are listed in our resolution, Terminal, Tutor Perini and Gilbane, the fourth respondent to the request for qualifications was a company by the name of Prismatic and --

MR. GUERRA: David?

MR. O’CONNOR: So there were four respondents to the request for qualifications, which the Authority board authorized us to issue that request for qualifications in November. So there were four respondents. The selection committee, which had four members, one of which was a representative of the Improvement Authority, a representative of the county administration, a retired Superior Court Judge, and a Freeholder.

MR. GUERRA: This is Dave. David?

Sounds like somebody is jumping on.

MR. O’CONNOR: So that was what constituted the selection committee. And so pursuant to this process, this selection committee was referred -- provided with those responses. And along with Ted Domuracki, who’s our construction manager and advisor and our special counsel, who I think was trying to call in also, Leslie London, present along with Dave Drummler --

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Do we have do 7 before we do 8?

Mr. O’Connor: 7 is -- yeah. And we apologize, 7 was in -- we’ve been trying to do this according to a schedule that the county originally wanted to proceed on. And we’ve been -- we’re ready to do it. And so the 7 was the underlying lease and development agreement, that’s really based -- that’s really also the financing mechanism for this project, which is upwards of $325 million. The county has not finalized that yet and so we’re proceeding under our redevelopment power and with the acknowledgment and authorization of the county that they will want us to proceed with this process. We’re proceeding with resolution 8,
resolution 7 is withdrawn and that will be brought back to you, hopefully, in March for you to have and be able to review a lease and development agreement, which is the basis of our relationship with the county to finance this project that we're doing -- working on --

COMMISSIONER DORAN: I'm sorry, Norman, you're fading out again.

MR. GUERRA: It's Mike O'Connor. He's got to talk louder.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Should we have a vote to table number 7?

MR. O'CONNOR: I think we can withdraw it because we're not asking you to consider it.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Okay.

MR. O'CONNOR: So I think we can just withdraw it from the agenda.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Should we vote on the withdrawal or just withdraw it?

MR. O'CONNOR: I don't believe -- we're not offering it for your consideration, so we're going to withdraw it from the agenda.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: It's on our agenda.

MR. GUERRA: There were two, that's why we were going to withdraw it -- well, let's vote to withdraw it.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Should be a motion.

COMMISSIONER DELABELLA: Then shouldn't this resolution become number 7?

COMMISSIONER DORAN: I you make a motion to withdraw it. I didn't hear much of the conversation any way.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Table or with will you be --

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: The proper way of doing it is making a motion to remove number 7, so we can all vote on it and then we vote on 8.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: But is it a motion to table or to --

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: They want to table it -- they could bring it back when they want to do it. Even if we remove it, they can still bring it back.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Okay. Do we have a motion to withdraw resolution number 7?

COMMISSIONER DELABELLA: Motion.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We have a motion by Commissioner Dellabella.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Second.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Second by Commissioner Goldsack.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Bado not present. Commissioner Dellabella.

COMMISSIONER DELABELLA: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes.

MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti absent, Commissioner Peneda absent. Chairman Pestana.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Commissioner Dublin would like an explanation from David.

MR. GUERRA: Jeff, you want to walk down this end.

MR. DRUMMLER: I'm here, I'm having a little tough time.

MR. GUERRA: We could hear you loud and clear.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: We can just get a basis from David.

CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Commissioner Dublin would like an explanation from David.

MR. GUERRA: Jeff, you want to walk down this end.

MR. DRUMMLER: I'm here, I'm having a little tough time.

MR. GUERRA: We could hear you loud and clear.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: We can hear you.

MR. GUERRA: Commissioner Dublin has a question.

MR. DRUMMLER: You're fading in and out a little bit, so please forgive me.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Can you just go over the overall review that you had and give us your summary?

MR. DRUMMLER: Sure. First of all,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. there were four responses to the RFQ. They were from four different firms, Prismatic being one, Gilbane being a second, Tutor Perini being a third, and Terminal being the fourth. The committee reviewed all four proposals and then they met on the 29th of January to discuss the proposals and how everyone felt about them. The discussion primarily resolved on Prismatic's submission and whether or not Prismatic met the requirements of the RFQ, primarily being whether they ever performed any project of a similar size and scope of the one we're looking for. And it was universally felt they had not. And also the discussion with regard to the bond capacity, that it might not be high enough for our particular job. So despite that fact, we decided -- you know, the committee decided that they're going to score all four proposals and see how that works out. And when we ended up scoring the four proposals, the top three, Gilbane, Tutor Perini, and Terminal, all cleared with high marks somewhere around 92 and I believe 95 percent of total possible points. And Prismatic's score was down at about 61 out of the possible score.</td>
<td>1. So basically whether we look at the scoring or we looked at whether or not they met the requirement of RFQ, either way, their response was somewhat dismal. And the recommendation by the committee was not to have Prismatic go forward. There's going to one? MR. GUERRA: The three, now we're going to issue at some point -- MR. DRUMMLER: Out of the four, we'll issue the RFP to three of the four. MR. GUERRA: Three of them are going to receive the RFP from us, they'll have a chance to respond. And those responses are again reviewed by the committee and they'll make the appropriate recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC.  (973) 239-7252</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Does anybody have any other questions regarding number 8? COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Thanks, Dave. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Do we have a motion? COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Motion. COMMISSIONER DELLABELLA: Second. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: We have a motion by Commissioner Goldsack, second by Commissioner Dellabella. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Bado not present. COMMISSIONER DELLABELLA: Yes. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Doran. COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yes. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Dublin. COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Yes. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Goldsack. COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Yes. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Lorenzo. COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Yes. MS. RAMOS: Commissioner Martinetti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC.  (973) 239-7252</td>
<td>1. absent, Commissioner Peneda absent. Chairman Pestana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Yes. 4. MS. RAMOS: Resolution number 2-2020-8 passes in the affirmative, six board members voting yes, three not present. 7. MR. GUERRA: David, thank you. If you want to stay on, that's fine. But Ted's going to do a couple minute overview of the project, which I'm sure no one knows better that you know as to where we are with it today. 12. MR. DRUMMLER: Totally true. And Ted's far smarter than I am. 14. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Thank you. 15. MR. DRUMMLER: I appreciate everyone's help and I appreciate everyone's support on this project. 18. MR. GUERRA: Thank you. 19. MR. DRUMMLER: Thank you, bye. 20. CHAIRMAN PESTANA: Bye. 21. MR. GUERRA: Okay, Ted. 22. MR. DOMURACKI: I have a two or three minute overview of where we stand, so I'll just give some history how we got here. A selection committee was formed by executive order of four</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. O'CONNELL ASSOCIATES, INC.  (973) 239-7252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
people that went through an RFP process for an architect to do a needs assessment, a master plan, and bridge documents. Under the same process that you experienced at the Hudson County School of Technology.

The selection committee selected Rafael Vinoly Architects, they did an assessment that took about six months. It started in June 2018, it was completed in December. They recommended that a new courthouse be built for criminal and family courts of approximately 405,000 square feet and a garage of 459 cars for courts administration and judges.

It’s going to replace the existing county courts administration building, the existing building is about 401,000 feet, the new building will be 405,000 feet, plus the garage. The new building is going to have ten criminal courts, twelve family court, landlord-tenant court and judicial processing. Some of those courts will be on the first floor. Additionally, Rafael Vinoly recommended that there’s two spaces in the existing Brennan courthouse, that’s a landmark building where the county exec sits. We’re going to renovate two spaces there for two civil courts.

So the RFQ has been issued. It was supposed to be selected in January, so we’re about four weeks behind. Now we’re going to issue the RFP to the three respondents. The RFP process is going to take about ten weeks. Then there will be interviews, a recommendation will be made by the same committee that selected the short list. And groundbreaking is scheduled for around June of this year for completion in 42 months, by December of 2023.

The project costs, for the record, I just wanted to state is between 280 to 320 million, that’s total project costs, that’s not hard construction costs. Questions?

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Which is Newark Avenue, this one here?

MR. DOMURACKI: Okay. So one thing I want to mention. Yes. So as part of the plan the county has agreed to vacate Cook Street, which is in the middle here and they’re going to extend Central Avenue in front of the building, so it’s becoming a two way street. And on the back side, Oakland is going to be extended to a two way street. And this is the garage and this is Hoboken. Hoboken is going to be vacated as a pedestrian walkway. This is the garage, this is the entrance from Central Avenue for the public.

So Brennann courthouse will become the civil court building for the county and it will house eight civil courtrooms.

So the new courthouse is going to be five stories as you see here. The first floor is going to be open, predominantly to a lot of public circulation that comes goes, to restrict the circulation up through the building. The second floor is going to be the criminal courts with judges’ chambers. The third floor is going to be for the family courts with judges’ chambers. And the two top floors you see there are office administration space. The fourth floor is for courts administration and the fifth floor is for prosecutors.

So Rafael Vinoly finished their master plan and completed their bridge documents this past December. The document was approved -- the master plan document, which projects through 2038, a 20-year plan, was approved by the Freeholders last February and they completed bridge documents in December, in anticipation of the RFQ process that we just talked about.

So the RFQ has been issued. It was supposed to be selected in January, so we’re about
parking problem on other parcels that the county owns.

MR. DOMURACKI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: But --

MR. DOMURACKI: Then you --

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Now, the probation and everything is still going to be in the new?

MR. DOMURACKI: Probation is all on the first floor. The first floor --

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: -- cafeteria.

MR. DOMURACKI: -- not accessible,

there's a cafeteria on the first floor, jury assembly is on the first floor, surrogate's office is right here. Some of them have their own --

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Sheriff.

MR. DOMURACKI: Sheriff's department is in the basement, with holding cells for defendants and back of house for document storage and building and grounds.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: Where's the parking?

MR. DOMURACKI: It's right here. The courts administration comes in on this side. And on the other side is restricted parking for judges, prosecutors, and sheriff.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: So they can enter the building through the parking lot?

MR. DOMURACKI: It's a hardened, structured for 50 spaces, okay. And the rest of the garage is for courts administration.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: One level or more?

MR. DOMURACKI: This is six levels of parking. This is five stories but some of the floor-to-floor heights are about 20 feet. So this is 99 feet, 120 is still smaller than the existing administration building and it's less in height than Brennan courthouse. And it's in kind with the 2060 Jersey City redevelopment plan, we're as-of-right, we didn't ask for any variances.

MR. GUERRA: And the parking deck is being built over the Bergen arches?

MR. DOMURACKI: -- tunnel. The materials are meant to compliment Brennan courthouse. This is going to be granite and some of the other side are metal panel. On the back of house side is the judges' chambers, it's all high impact, bulletproof glass, based on courts design guidelines.

The top is mechanical space where the mechanical units are, these are circulating --
MR. DOMURACKI: 459.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: It's 459 administrators that the going to be working in that courthouse?

MR. DOMURACKI: It's still close to not being enough. It depends how many -- right now, you have 40 spaces on the surface parking lot for jurors. So there's going to a combination for some juror parking, but not the capacity where you go through jury selection.

COMMISSIONER LORENZO: That green spot, is that --

MR. DOMURACKI: This is a green roof, it's not accessible. Because the first floor is a bigger footprint than the rest of the building. And the reason it's that way is for blast protection for the building. If there's a blast, the building had to be set back, based on courts guidelines. Oklahoma City, they made it a whole standard.

So we had to consulted -- we had the RFQ asked for a whole host of consultants, one was for blast protection.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Was there ever any consideration made for public parking?

MR. DOMURACKI: At the beginning, there was no garage, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: I understand, but it’s ridiculous, you know, that you go to jury duty, you get paid 2 and you have to pay 20.

MR. DOMURACKI: So the only thing I could respond is there's a couple buildings that are happening with some parking and you still own property within this distance, within a couple blocks, the county does. Something we have to solve in the next four years, before they move out of the existing building.

COMMISSIONER GOLDSACK: Beautiful building, the concept is very nice.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: The Brennan parking lot, that needs to be updated?

MR. DOMURACKI: Brennan is going away, that's going to become a park.

COMMISSIONER DUBLIN: Along with the parking spaces?

MR. DOMURACKI: That's going to be reconditioned to a park, that whole entire space, your existing administration building and the existing parking is all going to become a park.
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