***Facing Our Future* 2012 FAQs**
(For website and for media who ask for additional information)

What is the goal of the *Facing Our Future* report?
There are three goals: to educate and engage, provide objective information on projected gaps and resulting service elimination or degradation, and provide practical options to begin to address the need for systemic changes and the need to rethink all levels of NJ government. With a better understanding of how our governments work, together we can face our future and make informed, intelligent decisions to address our complex challenges.

Why did CNJG feel this was an important project to undertake?
CNJG represents more than 100 corporate, family and community foundations throughout the state. It took this on because they felt that the philanthropic community can play the unique role of neutral convener. Members of this community are accustomed to taking the long view, which is needed for this challenge. The Council felt bringing this information to light was an important and valuable role it could play.

What are the key takeaways from this updated report?
New Jersey cannot only grow, or only cut, or only tax its way out of the current and well-publicized budget problems. These problems are of long standing and restrict our state's ability to function and thrive for years to come. Because of these problems, we are already several years into a slow degradation of services. We are simply hollowing out government services rather than rethinking them. We will not feel the pain in a single year; rather, it will be in the on-going accumulation of lost services at all levels of government.

The initial *Facing Our Future* report, issued January 2011, identified the systemic gap between available revenue and the cost of services that cannot be addressed by the typical program adjustments that have been used in difficult budget years. During 2011, elected leaders across New Jersey made substantial changes and choices effective with the budgets adopted on July 1, 2011 – including changes to the retirement pension systems, health benefits for current employees, 2 percent cap and arbitration reform. Nevertheless, NJ faces budget gaps similar to those presented by the initial report. The projected gaps between revenue and spending at all levels of government are so large that any future debate is likely to include the potential loss of entire programs at every level of government, and may equate to the elimination or transformation of approximately 20 percent of all current services. Unless we rethink what services we want from our government, and how we want to deliver and pay for them, we will face a starkly different New Jersey.

What information was uncovered regarding NJ government's financial situation?
This updated report looks at projections of how the state, counties, municipalities and school districts raise and spend money. By 2017, state government faces a shortfall of up to $8.1 billion; municipalities face a shortfall of up to $2.8 billion; counties face a

shortfall of over $1.1 billion, and school districts are looking at a nearly $1 billion shortfall. These shortfalls are based on current service projections. The gap does not include the $25.6 billion underfunded liability of the state pension systems, with an additional unfunded liability for post-retirement medical benefits of $59 billion and no funds reserved for future costs. In addition, there is an unfunded liability for municipal and county pension systems of $10.6 billion, and at least $12 billion underfunded for retirement medical benefits.

Everybody knows the broad strokes of New Jersey's fiscal problems: We spend more than we take in, we've taken on too much debt, our taxes are too high (particularly property taxes) and we have too many levels of government. What does this report tell us that we don't already know?
For starters, this report attaches real, objective and timely numbers to those areas and, perhaps most importantly, shows the linkages between the different levels of government and the ways they raise and spend money. By showing the connections between revenue and spending across all layers of government, it provides a more complete view of the effects policy decisions have on all providers of public services. It details government structures – some of which date back to the 19th century – and asks if they remain appropriate in the 21st century.

The Leadership Group also did the work of researching, analyzing, evaluating and presenting best practices that are working throughout the country and around New Jersey in order to ignite discussion around ways to rethink and reshape the way services are provided and paid for now and into the future.

There were many cuts made to budgets across the state in 2011. What didn't those cuts address?
Although many government leaders across all of New Jersey made difficult choices in the past year to achieve a balanced budget, much more needs to be done. For example the projected unfunded pension liability reflects a reduction from last year's projected amount by almost 30 percent – but remains a significant long-term challenge. The payment required for the current FY is $500 million; the payment required in FY2017 is $4.4 billion. Looking one year beyond our five-year period of analysis, the required payment for FY2018 is nearly $6 billion.

Another example is that four spending areas dominate the state budget – school aid, Medicaid, pension obligations, and health benefits for current and retired employees. In FY2012, these four spending areas represent 53 percent of all state expenditures, and will increase to 60 percent by the year 2017. The growth in these four programs is twice the projected increase in the income tax, and exceeds the growth in all revenue sources.

What impact will the gaps that were uncovered have on the state?
Over the next five years, New Jersey again will be unable to achieve the balanced budgets as required without significant service, programmatic and personnel-related costs at state, county, municipal and school district levels.

Business as usual cannot continue. To date, we have had only a limited response that adapts, streamlines or rethinks government. As a result, we are just hollowing out services rather than redesigning them. Many of New Jersey's service delivery practices, structures and processes, at all government levels, were designed for a 19th century state. Services are duplicated across public entities in the same municipality or county and across differing levels of government. New Jersey needs a 21st century government to meet the 21st century needs of its citizens.

Has the picture changed since the initial report was issued in January 2011?
The conclusion presented in our January 2011 report remains unchanged: there is a significant shortfall at every level of New Jersey government in available revenue sources to maintain current services as measured by the base year appropriations.

There was, however, one surprising local government finding in our updated report: The use of surplus funds to offset loss of state aid and locally generated miscellaneous revenues actually declined in 2010 because the surplus funds were no longer available.

During this past year, elected officials throughout New Jersey made changes and choices effective with the budgets adopted on July 1. In addition, citizens are asking for ways to address the current problems – and anxious for ways to improve future opportunity. They recognize the need to rethink and restate not only to provide current services, but to innovate and invest for the future.

What new information does the 2012 report provide?
In this follow-up to the initial *Facing Our Future* report, the Leadership Group once again used objective, nonpartisan budget data and their analysis again shows the complexity and intertwined nature of government programs and spending throughout all levels of New Jersey government. The new research recalculates the projections and updates the data by one year into 2017, and continues to show a fiscal environment spiraling out of control.

Where this report differs from last year's is that it incorporates real questions, suggestions and feedback gleaned from hundreds of discussions and dozens of meetings and presentations across New Jersey. This report looks at what is working in state or local government across the United States – and especially in New Jersey – to provide insight into practical, proven ideas and presents options of how we can start to rethink government in New Jersey.

The report reflects the experience and judgment of the *Facing Our Future* Leadership Group – and distills the results of a review of nearly 750 best practices to deliver more than one dozen specific, successful options for how we in New Jersey can address critical questions:

- How do we establish priorities for critical services and government operations?
- What investments are necessary for economic growth?

- What are the possibilities for change to meet the challenges of the 21st century?
- How do we increase government effectiveness and efficiency?

What outreach did you do in 2011?
We held numerous individual briefings and presentations with a wide variety of associations and interest groups throughout the state. We placed op-ed pieces and articles with news outlets, and sought interviews on public issues programs on radio and TV. We held forums with community leaders, interest groups and citizens organized through Guarini Institute for Government and Leadership at Saint Peter's College, the Walter Rand Institute for Public Affairs at Rutgers - Camden and at a PlanSmart NJ forum at the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University. We established a website to provide public access to the report, research and related articles. In short, we used many opportunities to get out the *Facing Our Future* message to a wide audience.

How does the updated *Facing Our Future* report respond to the Governor's Budget Message? What is *Facing Our Future*'s position on the proposed income tax decrease?

As with the original 2011 *Facing Our Future* report, the 2012 updated report deals only with the current facts – historic budget numbers and enacted laws. We used that information to develop revenue and appropriation projections for the next five years – to 2017. Therefore, no adjustments were made to any revenue, spending or other assumptions or estimates based upon the Governor's proposed budget. Specifically, no adjustments were made to this report to reflect any proposal presented in the State of the State, in the Annual Budget Message, or by any member of the State Senate or General Assembly. Before enactment, any proposal requires an affirmative vote by the State Senate and General Assembly, and then signature by the Governor.

Our updated 2012 report contains projected gaps at all levels of government – state, municipal, county and school district. The projections contained in the *Facing Our Future* report – slow to moderate revenue growth and more aggressive revenue growth – continue to show that New Jersey cannot grow its way out of the systemic budget problem. The projected gap between revenues and the current services budget is large. Furthermore, even if taxes were increased, the increase would never be sufficient to address the long-term gap facing New Jersey. In no year of our research – from 2013 through 2017 – is New Jersey able to achieve a balanced state budget without significant service, programmatic and employee benefit changes.

As to the Governor's proposed budget, our report is based on current law. This report used projections based on slow to moderate revenue growth and more aggressive growth.

With whom have you shared this report and the results?
We briefed the Christie Administration and legislative leaders about the *Facing Our Future* effort, but we are just now sharing detailed information about the report's findings. No one has had input into the report other than the research team and the

Leadership Group. The analyses presented were developed by the research team, and the discussions of the Leadership Group were based on that information.

Why didn't you provide cumulative totals for the revenue gaps? Would it be accurate to add up the numbers for the four levels of government?
No. By law the state can't have a deficit; therefore, there is no carryover deficit. This is why the 2017 gap has had to assume a balanced budget at each year. You can't just add the gaps from year to year and get a cumulative number.

Did the Administration and Legislature know this report was coming? Did you consult them while you were doing this report? Have they indicated a willingness to use this report as the starting point for substantive discussions about New Jersey's fiscal condition?
We briefed the State Treasurer and his staff, various senior staff in the Office of the Governor and legislative leaders about the *Facing Our Future* effort, but we did not consult them in creating the report. They have indicated a great interest in understanding what the report indicates and how it can help inform the public.

Did you time the release of these findings to exert pressure on the Governor and Legislature to act?
No, we did not. Our plan has always been to release the report when it was completed. As with last year's report, we hope the 2012 report will be a tool that can be incorporated into the difficult discussions of revenue and spending decisions that are coming up. Our emphasis is on understanding the systemic problems that exist at all levels of New Jersey government, and on the imperative to rethink how – together – we can retool the delivery of services across all levels of government. Without that, we will face a starkly different New Jersey.

Who conducted your research and analysis?
Two separate and highly respected providers of independent research and analysis – both deeply steeped in New Jersey knowledge and experience – were retained to conduct the budget research and analysis.

Richard F. Keevey is "Distinguished Practitioner in Residence," School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University - Newark. Governors Kean and Florio appointed Keevey as the State Budget Director and State Comptroller for New Jersey. In addition, he has held appointments by the President as the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and as the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Financial Management.

Raphael J. ("Ray") Caprio, Ph.D. is "University Professor" named by the Rutgers Board of Governors to work with the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers – The State University of NJ. Until December 31, 2011, Dr. Caprio served as Vice President for the Division of Continuing Studies at Rutgers University and

Executive Director of the Center for Executive Leadership in Government (CELG) at Rutgers University, and a Professor of Public Administration.

The Leadership Group used three independent researchers to provide assistance in obtaining financial data and description(s) for the selected best practices or "options."

Joseph Blaney is an independent consultant with more than a decade of experience in research and government policy.

Kathe Callahan, Ph.D. is the Associate Director of the Center for Executive Leadership in Government (CELG) at Rutgers University, and provided the *Facing Our Future* Leadership team research and analysis on local government for both the initial report in January 2011 and the updated report.

Paul Saeman is Director of Workforce Development at The Nicholson Foundation. He has developed and implemented welfare reform initiatives in several states, with a special emphasis on employment and training.

How were the "options" in this report identified?

In May 2011, *The Facing Our Future* Leadership Group began gathering initial ideas about the variety of current best practices in government management, efficiency, cost savings and innovation. Through use of public information, online databases and published reports, we identified hundreds of existing best practices from within New Jersey and across the country.

We narrowed or expanded the original list through discussion with residents and people who work in NJ through the *Facing Our Future* outreach effort and at meetings of the larger Leadership Group. Additionally, we conducted follow-up conversations with representatives from almost 20 different organizations within New Jersey and across the country to determine additional best practices or innovative ideas that met the *Facing Our Future* guidelines for identifying options that could be considered for practical application in New Jersey. The guidelines were:

- Consider only ideas that were in practice and could be transferable to NJ
- Disregard any ideas that merely moved the problem around (e.g., transferred the problem from one level of government to another)

In addition, we sought to serve as an ongoing reference and catalyst for other ideas that address our need to establish priorities and enable state government and service delivery to meet 21st century needs. The options don't provide a blueprint of all solutions, nor are they intended to close the funding gaps that exist at all levels of government.

Based upon the above process and guidelines, the 2012 *Facing Our Future* report identifies more than a dozen examples of best practices in government – options that we can consider and adapt here in New Jersey.

What are the "options" and what impact are they having in places where they are in use?

The options – which were identified as practical examples and catalysts for rethinking government in New Jersey impact not only the financial concerns, but how services are provided and how governments interact with their citizens and other stakeholders to meet their 21st century needs. (See attached addendum for more information)

- Adopting an Internet sales tax
- Centralizing emergency response systems
- Combining efforts to maximize special services
- Consolidating Information Technology (IT) services and updating aging infrastructure
- Expanding e-government and integrating one-stop resources
- Exploring transition of developmental disability services to home- and community-based care
- Identifying – and incentivizing – successful implementation of shared services
- Identifying creativity and change in purchasing operations
- Implementing county administration of school districts
- Right-sizing deployment (police, fire, emergency responders)
- Sharing examples of municipal consolidation
- Supporting countywide tax assessment
- Using Medicaid for health and behavioral health services in county juvenile detention centers (pre-adjudication)

How was the Leadership Group assembled?

The Council of New Jersey Grantmakers (CNJG) assembled a volunteer Leadership Group to drive the discussion and research effort on behalf of *Facing Our Future*. The Leadership Group reflects bipartisan – and nonpartisan – perspectives, and includes individuals who offered their time and deep knowledge of New Jersey to consider the important fiscal and strategic issues facing our future. The group demonstrates lifetimes of commitment to New Jersey, supported by careers with extensive senior-level experience working within diverse areas of this state and other jurisdictions. The group represents government, law, politics, the foundation community, business and academe. It includes two former state treasurers, three former attorneys general – one of whom also served as chief justice – a number of former state cabinet members and other high-profile officials of both parties.

Who are the members of the *Facing Our Future* Leadership Group?

Nancy Becker
William H. Byrnes
Raphael J. ("Ray") Caprio
Sam Crane
Kathy Crotty
Christopher J. Daggett
Hans Dekker
Robert Del Tufo
W. Cary Edwards

John Farmer

Feather O'Connor Houstoun
Robert Hughey
Beth Kiyoko "Kiki" Jamieson
Richard F. Keevey
Deborah T. Poritz
Oliver Quinn
Ingrid Reed
Robert L. Smartt
Charles Venti

See addendum for full credentials

Who led the Leadership Group? Who were the most active in this effort?
We did not select a chair for the group but worked collaboratively, sharing the leadership roles, throughout. Every member of the Leadership Group was involved in the creation of the final report through review and contribution to multiple drafts over a period of many months and they were especially involved in review, research and discussion of the options.

A number of members of your leadership group have served in state government, in varying capacities and representing all three branches: the Legislature, the Executive branch, the Judiciary. It could be argued that some of you were in public service at the time many of these problems were starting to become apparent. Why weren't these problems dealt with when you were in a position to do so?
Like last year's report, this updated report was written with a focus on current and future conditions, not in an attempt to look back at past decisions taken, in some cases, decades ago. What is needed now is an objective assessment of current conditions to help us deal with the immediate problems, try to forecast future trends as best we can, and come up with a plan to put the New Jersey on a path to address the needs of the 21st century. We undertook this effort because we care deeply about our state and are collectively offering our expertise to begin a dialogue that we hope will lead to the kinds of systemic changes needed to address our complex fiscal problems and our need to rethink government –and how to avoid the continuing hollowing out of services. Part of this approach is to continue a statewide discussion on what our priorities should be.

Who funded the research?
Initial funding for *Facing Our Future* was provided by William Penn Foundation, The Fund for New Jersey and a private donor. The Prudential Foundation, The Nicholson Foundation, Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, Verizon Foundation, PSEG Foundation and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation® provided additional support for the 2012 report.

What prompted Council of NJ Grantmakers and other members of the philanthropic community to take on this project?
Facing Our Future grew out of a targeted briefing provided by the Council of New Jersey Grantmakers (CNJG) in early 2010. The purpose of the briefing was to provide an understanding across the state's foundation community on how New Jersey's government officials construct the state budget and on the looming, long-term fiscal crisis facing the state. Almost simultaneously in those same early months of 2010, informal discussions occurred with people who wanted to do something – and were in a unique position to make a difference. They had diverse backgrounds and extensive senior experience in state government. Their collective experience crossed party lines, and many of them had served multiple New Jersey governors, both Republican and Democrat. Because many of the participants in that informal discussion had attended or been aware of CNJG's briefing on the state budget crisis, a natural synergy emerged – and the concept of *Facing Our Future* was born. As a neutral convener – without hidden agenda, political motivation or bias – CNJG was well positioned to help shape an informed discussion for New Jersey's citizens.

Now that the report has been updated and released, what would you like to see happen? Are you planning more outreach or developing other next steps where this information can be put to use?

We will:

- Engage in an active outreach effort
- Work through and with other organizations to continue and expand the important conversations and fact finding that was started with the 2011 report
- Encourage further analysis of the ever-expanding number of options and best practices

The next steps for New Jersey are:

- Build consensus and establish priorities
- Identify the areas necessary for public investment and economic growth
- Seek incentives for governmental effectiveness and efficiency

ADDENDUM

Is there any additional detail available for any of the options examples?

Yes. The *Facing Our Future* report contains a short description of each option example, and provides a summary of the location, description, selected highlights, financial impact and applicability in New Jersey for each option. Additional information can be found online at http://www.facingourfuture.org. A brief bullet-point description of each option is presented below in alphabetical order.

- **Adopting an Internet sales tax**: There have been discussions recently in New Jersey and in other states related to Internet transactions, and also some anticipation that Congress would allow states to collect more of this revenue. Many Internet and out of state transactions are excluded from the sales tax – and the Internet base is increasing. In suggesting this option, we considered recent study by the Rutgers' Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy. The study explored the issue and provided an analysis of the estimates of New Jersey sales and use tax losses resulting from e-commerce. Working with other states and the United States Congress, adoption of an Internet sales tax is an issue of fairness for our New Jersey-based businesses and for our state as a whole.

- **Centralizing emergency response systems**: At least two counties in New Jersey – Gloucester and Morris – show success in centralizing the emergency response systems for all or at least part of their jurisdictions. Our option focuses on the experience in Gloucester County. It recognizes the high priority that the citizens place on emergency services, and in continuing to provide them through local government at the same or higher levels of service than provided in the past. Although not part of our analysis, there are municipalities in Monmouth County that also have undertaken centralized emergency response to retain and improve the service and avoid service diminution.

- **Combining efforts to maximize special services**: Also in New Jersey, there are 92 school districts across 8 counties joined to maximize cooperation to provide special services. We've selected the Sussex County Regional Transportation Cooperative (SCRTC) as an example of the possibilities presented by this option. Another example of successfully maximizing special services occurs in Gloucester and (parts of) Atlantic County, which have joined to reduce per-pupil transportation costs.

- **Consolidating Information Technology (IT) services and updating aging infrastructure**: During the period of our research, the Governor of New Jersey introduced a nearly $6 million state program to address technology deficiencies. This is an important start – and more is needed. Our research looked at several examples identified in the area of technology, including the efforts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to engage in reform for cost-cutting and to create efficiencies through technology update/refresh and improved technology policies across state government. We've chosen to highlight the potential benefits in two technology areas:

  - Washtenaw County and City of Ann Arbor, Michigan consolidated applications and infrastructure for a government data center, resulting in a $2.5 million savings
  - According to the Brookings Institution's report "Saving Money through the Cloud", government agencies that have moved to cloud computing have generally achieved between 25 and 50 percent savings associated with information technology operations

- **Expanding e-government and integrating one-stop resources**: Washington State was the first state to establish statewide standards for e-government systems. South Dakota uses its e-government initiative to provide education reform. Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Utah implement 'one-stop' websites through a single site rather than through individual departments. We've selected four varied examples of innovation, efficiency and effectiveness in the area of e-government: City of Albany (Oregon), Access Washington (State of Washington), MCUrgent – Morris County (New Jersey) and a national approach to using social media in policing – readily adaptable to local governments and for other government services.

- **Exploring transition of developmental disability services to home- and community-based care**: New Jersey's proportion of individuals with developmental disabilities living in institutions is one of the highest in the country. We have been the slowest state to move individuals to homes in the community, and we've lagged in providing in-home services to those living with family members. States with systematic closure of institutions and transfer of individuals to community settings reduce per case costs and are able to serve persons on waiting lists for services. Research is strong that quality of life and functioning improves for transferred individuals. Numerous states – including California and Minnesota – have improved quality of life and decreased costs by closing two or more State Developmental Disability Centers and encouraging developmental disability transition.

- **Identifying – and incentivizing – successful implementation of shared services**: As budget pressures have increased, there has been a nationwide explosion of activity in shared services. More than a decade ago, Virginia adopted the Virginia Competitiveness Act to create incentives for shared services. Among its features was a grading system on shared services that awarded points that then figured in the distribution of a state 'pot' of money. ICMA provides critical information about a number of topics including shared services and possible obstacles to sharing services. Other examples we reviewed are Michigan's Shared Services Community website and information provided by the Rutgers University/New Jersey State League of Municipalities research on shared services.

- **Identifying creativity and change in purchasing operations**: Across the country, there are numerous examples of creativity and change in purchasing operations. Some of the examples we reviewed included the p-Card program in El Paso County, Colorado; e-Payables in Multnomah County, Oregon; and Pre Pay to improve cash flow and decrease delinquency in Isle of Wight, Virginia. In New Jersey, Hunterdon County's Education Services Commission (ESC) was organized to provide a wide

range of services for a variety of local governments. The cooperative covers a wide range of goods and services, including grounds maintenance and supervision. Kent County, Michigan uses a reverse auction approach to save tens of thousands of dollars annually.

- **Implementing county administration of school districts**: Recommended by the New Jersey Committee on Shared Services and Government Consolidation, this change consolidates certain school governance functions at the county level – enabling reduction of redundancies without affecting the delivery of academic services. Countywide school districts operate in many states. Because of the many similarities to New Jersey, we selected the operation in Fairfax County, Virginia for our options review.
- **Right-sizing deployment (police, fire, emergency responders)**: The increasingly detailed data for New Jersey's municipal budgets shows that more than 20 percent of all municipal spending goes to one area: Police. Clearly, this identifies a priority area for municipal government. When added to the spending for other emergency or safety services (e.g., Fire and EMS, Other Public Safety), the total percentage increases to nearly 27.5 percent – more than ¼ of a municipal budget spent on a single priority. Not surprisingly, police and safety services have been areas subject to cost reduction and hollowing out of services. The International City/County Management Association (ICMA) encourages local governments to make more informed deployment decisions – rightsizing deployment – for police, fire and other emergency services, enabling better resource allocation for these priority services.
- **Sharing examples of municipal consolidation**: Princeton Borough and Princeton Township provide an immediate example of citizen initiative for change through their recent vote to consolidate – the first municipal consolidation in New Jersey in 14 years.
- **Supporting countywide tax assessment**: Possibly the most widespread best practice in government, countywide tax assessment increases accuracy and fairness, reduces appeals, eliminates the need for costly revaluations and ensures annual assessment. Our options example presents the pilot program already in existence in New Jersey (Gloucester County).
- **Using Medicaid for health and behavioral health services in county juvenile detention centers (pre-adjudication)**: California has recently enacted legislation – modeled after a program in New Mexico – to reduce cost of healthcare and rethink services for selected health and behavioral health services. This program uses Medicaid for health and behavioral health services in county juvenile detention centers, and focusing on pre-adjudicated youth.

What is the experience and credentials for the *Facing Our Future* Leadership Group?

Nancy Becker, Program Development Associate, Program on the Governor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University; Vice Chair of the Board, Capital Health Systems. Becker was president of Nancy Becker Associates from 1976 to 2006 and served as Vice Chair of the Board, NJ Turnpike Authority from 1994 to 2002.

William H. Byrnes, Vice President of Grants, F.M. Kirby Foundation and Chairperson, Council of NJ Grantmakers. Byrnes was previously with the Morris County Department of Human Services, Morristown Memorial Hospital, the March of Dimes and the Boys & Girls Club of Trenton.

Raphael J. ("Ray") Caprio, "University Professor" named by the Rutgers Board of Governors to work with the Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy at Rutgers. Caprio also served Rutgers as Vice President, Division of Continuing Studies, Executive Director of the Center for Executive Leadership in Government and as a Professor of Public Administration. In addition, he has chaired various departments at Rutgers and has worked as the school's Senior Associate Academic Dean at the Newark College of Arts and Sciences (NCAS) and Acting NCAS Dean, Associate Provost.

Sam Crane, Principal, CraneConsulting LLC; Trustee, Council of NJ Grantmakers. Crane was Senior Vice President - External Affairs, Maher Terminals LLC from 2000 to 2008 and President, Regional Business Partnership from 1994 to 2000. He also served as NJ State Treasurer from 1992 to 1994.

Kathy Crotty, Retired Executive Director, NJ Senate Majority Office; Visiting Associate, Eagleton Institute of Politics; Trustee, New Jersey Policy Perspective.

Christopher J. Daggett, President and CEO, The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation. Daggett previously served as Deputy Chief of Staff to the NJ Governor from 1982 to 1983 and Cabinet Secretary to the NJ Governor from 1983 to 1984. He was Regional Administrator for the US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 from 1984 to 1988 and Commissioner of the NJ Department of Environmental Protection from 1988 to 1989.

Hans Dekker, President, Community Foundation of NJ and Past Chairperson, Council of NJ Grantmakers. Dekker was Executive Vice President, Baton Rouge Area Foundation and was a member of Southeastern Council on Foundations' Community Foundation Committee. He also served as Commissioner for the Louisiana Housing Finance Agency.

Robert Del Tufo, Of Counsel, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, LLP and Affiliates. From 1990 to 1993, Del Tufo served as NJ Attorney General. He was Commissioner for the NJ State Commission of Investigation from 1981 to1984 and US Attorney for the District of NJ from 1977 to 1980. He also held the position of NJ's First

Assistant Attorney General from 1974 to 1977, was the Director of the Division of Criminal Justice from 1976 to 1977 and Assistant Prosecutor in Morris County from 1962 to 1967.

W. Cary Edwards, Cary Edwards was a life-long New Jerseyan and an important voice and participant in the early discussions that resulted in *Facing Our Future*. Cary served as Chairman of the NJ State Commission of Investigation, and was NJ Attorney General from 1986 to 1989. He was also a Member of the NJ General Assembly from 1978 to 1982. Cary was deeply committed to this effort, and we were saddened by his death on October 20, 2010.

John Farmer, Dean, Rutgers School of Law – Newark. Farmer was previously Assistant Counsel, Deputy Chief Counsel, and Chief Counsel for the Office of the Governor in 1999, NJ Attorney General, from 1999 to 2002 and Senior Counsel and Team Leader for the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly known as the 9/11 Commission). Farmer is President of the Board of Trustees of the New Jersey Institute for Social Justice and a Member of New Jersey Governor's Ethics Advisory Board.

Feather O'Connor Houstoun, Retired, but currently serving as a member of the Philadelphia School Reform Commission. Houstoun was President of the William Penn Foundation from 2005 to 2011, the PA Secretary of Public Welfare from 1995 to 2002 and CFO for the Southeastern PA Transportation Authority (SEPTA) from 1990 to 1995. She was also NJ State Treasurer from 1986 to 1990.

Robert Hughey, Principal, REHughey, LLC, Hughey served as County Administrator for Atlantic County and Commissioner for the NJ Department of Environmental Protection from 1982 to1986. He was also Chief - NJ Economic Recovery in 1993; and was the Associate Vice President for Strategic Initiatives at the New Jersey Institute of Technology.

Beth Kiyoko "Kiki" Jamieson, President, The Fund for New Jersey. Jamieson is the former Director of the Pace Center for Civic Engagement at Princeton University and a Lecturer in Politics at Princeton. She previously held teaching posts at the University of Pennsylvania, Haverford College and Rutgers University.

Richard F. Keevey, "Distinguished Practitioner in Residence," School of Public Affairs and Administration, Rutgers University – Newark. Keevey was the NJ State Budget Director and Comptroller under Governors Kean and Florio, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Finance and Chief Financial Officer for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. He is the former Practice Director at Andersen LLP and Unisys Corporation.

Deborah T. Poritz, Chair, Board of Trustees, Legal Services of NJ; Member, Board of Trustees, Fund for New Jersey; Vice Chair, Board of Trustees, Princeton Health Systems;

Visiting Jurist Emerita-in-Residence at Rutgers Schools of Law Newark and Camden; Of Counsel, Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP. Poritz served as NJ Supreme Court Chief Justice from 1996 to 2006 and NJ Attorney General from 1994 to 1996. She was also Chief Counsel to the Governor in1989.

Oliver Quinn, Senior Counselor, Taft and Partners and President of the New Jersey Public Policy Research Institute (NJPPRI). Quinn was Vice President of Prudential Financial from 1995 to 2009. He served as Deputy Solicitor for the US Department of Labor from 1993 to 1995 and Deputy Commissioner for the Department of Labor from 1990 to 1993. He was an Administrative Law Judge from 1988 to 1990, Counsel/Chief of Staff for NJ Public Advocate from 1985 to 1988 and Executive Director, Urban League of Essex County from 1983 to 1985.

Ingrid Reed, Retired New Jersey Project Director, Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers. She currently serves as Board Chair for njspotlight.com, she chairs the Governor's Task Force on Local Government Ethics, is the founder and a member of the Board of NJ Future, and is Past Chair of the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation.

Robert L. Smartt, Currently retired but served as Deputy NJ State Treasurer from 2001 to 2007 and 1992 to 1994. Smartt was also Administrator, NJ Office of Telecommunications & Information Systems from 1990 to 1992 and Deputy Director of the Assembly Majority Office from 1976 to 1983. Additionally, he has held senior management positions in planning, policy analysis and public affairs at the Port Authority of NY & NJ.

Nina Stack, President, Council of NJ Grantmakers (CNJG) and Former Director of External Affairs for the NJ State Council on the Arts (1988 to 2005).

Charles Venti, Executive Director, The Nicholson Foundation. Venti was Deputy Director at The Nicholson Foundation from 2002 to 2010 and served as Director of New Jersey's Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS) from 1998 to 2002. From 1975 to 1988 he worked in various capacities within DYFS.