

## PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 1

## GREEN ACRES, CLEAN WATER, FARMLAND AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOND ISSUE

Shall the "Green Acres, Clean Water, Farmland and Historic Preservation Bond Act of 1992," which authorizes the State to issue bonds in the amount of \$345,000,000 to provide moneys to meet the cost of public acquisition and development of lands for recreation and conservation purposes, to provide moneys for farmland development easement and fee simple absolute acquisitions, to provide grants for soil and water conservation projects, to provide grants and low-interest loans to local government units and matching grants to qualifying tax exempt nonprofit organizations to help meet the cost of acquisition or development, as the case may be, of lands for public recreation and conservation purposes, to provide matching grants to State agencies or entities, local government units, and qualifying tax exempt nonprofit organizations for historic preservation projects, to provide moneys for State high-hazard dam restoration projects and State projects to restore inland waters, to provide low-interest loans to local government units, qualifying private lake associations, and qualifying owners of private dams for dam restoration projects and for projects to restore inland water, and to provide moneys for loans to local government units for wastewater treatment system projects; and in a principal amount sufficient to refinance any of the bonds of the same will result in a present value savings; and providing the ways and means to pay and discharge the principal and interest thereof, be approved?

## INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT

Approval of this act would authorize the sale of \$345,000,000 in State general obligation bonds to be used for acquiring and developing lands for recreation and conservation purposes, purchasing farmland or development easements thereon, and funding farmland soil and water conservation projects, historic preservation projects, dam restoration projects, projects to restore inland waters, and wastewater treatment system projects. The revenue raised for public recreation and conservation purposes from the bonds would be used for State projects, for grants and low-interest loans to local governments for local projects, and for matching grants to qualifying tax exempt nonprofit organizations. The revenue raised for farmland preservation purposes from the bonds would be used for State and local government efforts to purchase farmland development easements, for State projects to purchase farmland, and for grants to qualifying landowners for soil and water conservation projects. The revenue raised for historic preservation purposes from the bonds would be used for matching grants to State agencies or entities, local governments, and qualifying tax exempt nonprofit organizations. The revenue raised for dam restoration purposes from the bonds would be used for State high-hazard dam restoration projects and for low-interest loans to local government units and to qualifying private lake associations and qualifying owners of private dams, as co-applicants with local government units, for dam restoration projects. The revenue raised for the purposes of inland waters restoration would be used for State projects and for low-interest loans to local government units and to qualifying private lake associations and qualifying owners of private dams, as co-applicants with local government units, for projects to restore inland waters. The revenue raised for wastewater treatment system projects would be used for loans to local governments for the purpose of constructing or upgrading wastewater treatment systems. The act also authorizes the issuance of bonds in a sufficient amount to refinance any of these bonds if the same will result in a present value savings.

COUNTIES	YES	NO
Atlantic ....	48,091	18,292
Bergen ....	232,796	82,406
Burlington ..	102,188	39,243
Camden .....	121,208	39,451
Cape May ....	26,484	10,727
Cumberland ..	23,690	12,547
Essex .....	125,139	41,136
Gloucester ..	76,332	22,674
Hudson .....	81,274	27,038
Hunterdon ...	28,160	13,874
Mercer .....	79,693	31,270

COUNTIES	YES	NO
Middlesex...	138,449	55,192
Monmouth ...	153,687	61,572
Morris .....	126,609	48,307
Ocean .....	99,887	49,214
Passaic ....	68,444	29,039
Salem .....	15,817	9,413
Somerset ...	70,617	25,774
Sussex .....	38,481	15,148
Union .....	99,130	37,697
Warren .....	25,956	11,233
TOTAL .....	1,782,132	681,247

## PUBLIC QUESTION NO. 2

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE  
STATE FUNDING OF THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Shall the amendment to Article VI, agreed to by the Legislature requiring the State to assume by July 1, 1997 certain costs now borne by the counties through the county property tax levy in connection with the judicial system, be adopted?

## INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT

Adoption of this amendment would require the State to assume by July 1, 1997 certain costs now borne by county taxpayers in connection with the judicial system. County employees employed by the court system and all employees of county probation departments would become State employees by that date. The State would be responsible for their salaries, health benefits and pension payments. As of that date, all judicial fees and probation fees would be paid to the State Treasury.

COUNTIES	YES	NO
Atlantic ....	41,175	26,584
Bergen ....	177,724	125,604
Burlington ..	76,094	62,405
Camden .....	123,165	62,769
Cape May ....	21,838	14,701
Cumberland ..	18,436	17,040
Essex .....	123,252	43,818
Gloucester ..	42,625	53,799
Hudson .....	73,720	31,606
Hunterdon ...	17,763	23,173
Mercer .....	60,045	47,261
Middlesex ...	111,689	85,361
Monmouth ....	118,374	90,095
Morris .....	96,564	71,532
Ocean .....	92,086	71,665
Passaic .....	59,650	35,644
Salem .....	11,444	13,719
Somerset ....	51,084	42,779
Sussex .....	26,128	25,728
Union .....	84,775	52,888
Warren .....	18,486	17,820
TOTAL ....	1,446,117	1,015,989

PROVIDING IT IS NOT CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT TO IMPOSE  
THE DEATH PENALTY ON PERSONS WHO PURPOSELY OR KNOWINGLY  
CAUSE DEATH OR PURPOSELY OR KNOWINGLY CAUSE SERIOUS BODILY  
INJURY RESULTING IN DEATH

Shall the amendment to Article I, paragraph 12 of the Constitution providing that it is not cruel and unusual punishment to impose the death penalty on a person convicted of purposely or knowingly causing death or purposely or knowingly causing serious bodily injury resulting in death who committed the homicidal act by his own conduct or who as an accomplice procured the commission of the offense by payment or promise of payment of anything of pecuniary value be approved?

INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT

This constitutional amendment would provide that it is not cruel and unusual punishment under our State Constitution to impose the death penalty on a person who is convicted of purposely or knowingly causing death or purposely or knowingly causing serious bodily injury resulting in death if that defendant committed the act himself or paid for another to commit the act.

COUNTIES	YES	NO
Atlantic ....	49,696	19,589
Bergen .....	235,509	82,210
Burlington ..	108,282	34,340
Camden .....	124,038	37,648
Cape May ....	27,618	9,794
Cumberland ..	25,898	10,182
Essex .....	112,650	56,491
Gloucester ..	75,736	22,530
Hudson .....	77,670	31,311
Hunterdon ...	30,230	11,699
Mercer .....	81,093	31,439
Middlesex ...	146,925	56,901
Monmouth ....	161,167	53,971
Morris .....	130,871	44,412
Ocean .....	119,452	39,657
Passaic .....	71,535	25,552
Salem .....	19,594	6,134
Somerset ....	64,141	30,146
Sussex .....	41,760	11,765
Union .....	102,062	40,570
Warren .....	29,276	7,917
TOTAL ....	1,835,203	664,258

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND REGULATIONS

Shall the amendment to Article V, Section IV, paragraph 6 of the State Constitution, agreed to by the Legislature, authorizing the Legislature to review existing and proposed administrative rules and regulations and to invalidate them or prohibit them from taking effect when those rules and regulations have been found to be contrary to legislative intent, be adopted?

## INTERPRETIVE STATEMENT

This proposed amendment modifies the New Jersey Constitution to allow the Legislature to review existing and proposed administrative rules and regulations and to invalidate them or prohibit them from taking effect when those rules and regulations have been found to be contrary to legislative intent. To do so, either House must hold a public hearing on the invalidation or prohibition of the rule or regulation and a majority of the authorized membership of each House must vote in favor of a concurrent resolution providing for invalidation or prohibition, as the case may be, of the rule or regulation. A concurrent resolution would not be subject to a gubernatorial veto.

COUNTIES	YES	NO
Atlantic ....	37,365	27,964
Bergen ....	178,408	112,064
Burlington ..	71,612	61,867
Camden .....	79,603	70,375
Cape May ....	20,470	14,921
Cumberland ..	17,540	16,351
Essex .....	93,747	62,255
Gloucester ..	54,786	33,390
Hudson .....	64,350	34,376
Hunterdon ...	21,361	18,032
Mercer .....	54,400	49,754
Middlesex ...	99,716	87,399
Monmouth ....	115,713	84,430
Morris .....	99,066	64,748
Ocean .....	91,942	65,731
Passaic .....	49,687	40,651
Salem .....	13,498	11,349
Somerset ....	54,273	39,924
Sussex .....	33,333	17,251
Union .....	78,983	53,124
Warren .....	22,246	13,035
TOTAL ....	1,352,099	978,991