

URBAN GROWTH TARGETS

Final Report



Submitted to the Schumann Fund for New Jersey
By The Regional Planning Partnership

June 20, 2003

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The *Urban Growth Targets Project* was funded by a grant from the Schumann Fund for New Jersey.

Principal Authors: Noelle Reeve, Senior Project Planner
Charles Starks, Planner (census characterization and preliminary Plan Mapping[©] analysis)
Brian Carson, Project Specialist (maps)
Jason McCann, Intern (economic revitalization literature review).

RPP would like to acknowledge the contribution of the following advisors to the project: Andrew Carten, Director of Planning, City of Trenton; Dennis Gonzalez, Director, Housing and Economic Development, City of Trenton; Gwendy L. Harris, Chief of Staff, City of Trenton (now Commissioner of the Department of Human Services), Liz Johnson, The Watson Institute, (now COO of Isles, Inc.); Alan Mallach, former City of Trenton Director of Planning, and William Watson, The Watson Institute (now President, Trent Towne Group, LLC).

We would also like to acknowledge the input of the Trenton Urban Growth Targets Charrette participants and of the Urban/Suburban Dialogue participants.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan* (SDRP) promotes metropolitan areas and centers as the appropriate location for population and employment growth in the State. Smart Growth advocates echo the *State Plan* and call for redevelopment of cities to prevent sprawl on greenfields. The *Urban Growth Targets Project* was undertaken to develop a method for translating state government policy and Smart Growth advocates' slogans about the appropriate location of growth in New Jersey into on the ground targets.

The Regional Planning Partnership (RPP) recognized that a number of gaps would need to be addressed to shift growth patterns away from the current sprawl trend and toward Smart Growth. First, cities needed to be brought into the Smart Growth dialogue. Second, fundamental questions about infrastructure capacity and desire for growth needed to be answered. Third, a target setting process was necessary to move from talk to implementation. RPP, therefore, conceived the *Urban Growth Targets Project* to address these gaps. The City of Trenton welcomed the opportunity to act as a pilot. Funding from the Schumann Fund for New Jersey supported the project.

RPP developed a number of new tools and data sets to undertake the analysis required to develop population and employment growth targets for Trenton, including:

- **Plan Mapping[©] Tool:** After conducting many interviews with the redevelopment agencies and officials involved in Trenton, it became clear that some method was needed to evaluate whether or not their plans were consistent with one another or with the State Plan and to determine how best to integrate competing plans. We developed a template and a process called Plan Mapping[©] for this purpose.
- **Census 2000 Socioeconomic Data for Trenton and Mercer County:** We analyzed available U.S. Census 2000 figures to characterize Trenton's socioeconomic status with respect to Mercer County.
- **Economic Revitalization Research:** We conducted research on recent successful economic development efforts involving central cities whose regional contexts are similar to Trenton's.
- **Trend Shift[©] Tool:** We developed a protocol for assigning to Planning Areas, statewide total projected growth for both the SDRP and the Department of Environmental Protection's B.I.G. Map. The allocations for Trenton provided potential growth targets for the City.
- **GOZ[®] Modeling of Build-out:** We used our GOZ[®] model to determine population and employment under various build-out scenarios including under Trenton's existing zoning, Trenton's redevelopment plans, and a Smart Growth zoning scenario RPP developed for Mercer County called Vision 2050. In Vision 2050, allocations by Planning Area were further refined by assigning growth to specific Centers and Environ areas (to reflect environmental constraints, transit corridor and mixed use development opportunities). These build-out numbers provided additional potential growth targets for Trenton.

- **Trenton Capacity Analysis:** We used interviews and a variety of data sources to analyze the capacity of Trenton’s gray and green infrastructure.
- **Regional Equity Research:** RPP helped found a coalition of non-profit groups to hire Myron Orfield (author of *Metropolitics*) and his firm Ameregis to map the State’s pattern of segregation and concentration of poverty, to provide a regional reference for Trenton.

Public participation was undertaken through two events. RPP staff made a presentation and participated in break-out groups at the *Urban/Suburban Dialogue* held at the Lafayette Yard Marriott Hotel, November 13, 2002. At this meeting, organized by Isles, Inc. and the Stony Brook Millstone Watershed Association, residents of Trenton and surrounding suburbs participated in discussions of Trenton’s future. RPP held an *Urban Growth Targets Charrette* at Thomas Edison College, March 26, 2003 with state, county, and local government leaders and non-profit representatives to develop population and employment growth targets for Trenton.

The project produced the following results:

- **Plan Mapping Summary and Maps:** Among the more than twenty plans and proposed projects analyzed, a number of plans had complementary proposals while only a few direct conflicts were identified between competing proposals for the same location. (See figure 8.)
- **Census Characterization of Trenton and Mercer County:** The Census 2000 data on population, housing, employment and labor force revealed a wide gulf between the City and its surrounding County. Trenton has a younger population made up of the majority of African Americans and Hispanics in the County. While Trenton’s population and employment have been declining, the County’s have been rising. Trenton has a 6.6% unemployment level compared to the County’s 3%. Poverty in the County is concentrated in Trenton where the family income of \$36,681 was only 42% of the County’s family income of \$88,017.
- **Economic Revitalization Alternatives:** Two types of local strategies for urban revitalization in a regional context have been reported in the literature: infrastructure development and fiscal development. Trenton has many of the attributes needed for these strategies to work, however, it currently lacks a comprehensive vision. The Downtown Master Plan process beginning in June 2003 may provide that vision.
- **Range of Potential Growth Targets:** Potential growth targets were developed ranging from historical highs (128,009 residents in 1950) to trend projections of continued decline (81,850 residents and 60,000 jobs in 2025). The Trend Shift[©] Tool and GOZ[®] model build-out of redevelopment plans provided additional potential targets (see Table 22). The potential targets were mapped, where possible, to facilitate discussion.
- **Trenton’s Capacity for Growth:** Trenton’s gray infrastructure has the capacity to absorb a significant increase in population and employment growth (up to 23,000 additional customers for water supply and 60,000 residents or 200,000 jobs for waste water treatment). Although Trenton has a strong street tree

program, it is less well served by its current green infrastructure. However, redevelopment offers the opportunity for improvement and plans are moving forward to expand the park system along the Assunpink Creek.

- **Trenton's Urban Growth Target:** State, county and local government and non-profit participants at the March 26, 2003 *Urban Growth Targets Charrette* used the results of the Trend Shift[©] tool, GOZ[®] model build-out of redevelopment, and other projections as the basis for their discussions. They ultimately proposed a population growth target of 20,000 additional residents and an employment target of 49,000 additional jobs for Trenton by 2020.
- **Regional Equity Context:** The data gathered by Ameregis show how Trenton fares in relation to other cities in New Jersey, and support RPP's thesis that the incentives and strategies New Jersey has in place to direct growth to cities are not ambitious enough to tackle the problems of economic and racial segregation.

RPP's next steps to follow up on the project in Trenton will be focused at two different scales. At the local level, RPP has been asked by the City of Trenton to take the population and employment targets agreed at the charrette and use GOZ[®] to develop a Smart Growth scenario for distributing the projected growth within the City. At the regional level, as part of our work on the Mercer County Master Plan, RPP will compare the Urban Growth Target to projected growth for Mercer County and work with all the municipalities to determine what strategies they can use to facilitate growth in the City.

RPP believes the Urban Growth Targets methods also have value statewide and is pursuing discussions with the Department of Community Affairs on statewide application.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
1) PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT	1
2) METHODOLOGY	3
2.1) Plan Mapping [©] Tool	3
2.2) Census 2000 Socioeconomic Data for Trenton and Mercer County	4
2.3) Economic Revitalization Literature Review	4
2.4) Development of Potential Growth Targets	4
2.4.1) Historical and Trend Projections	4
2.4.2) Trend Shift [©] Tool	4
2.4.3) GOZ [®] Modeling of Build-out: Existing Zoning, Redevelopment Plans, and Vision 2050 Smart Growth Zoning	7
2.4.4) Urban/Suburban Community Dialogue	7
2.4.5) Urban Growth Target Charrette	7
2.5) Capacity Analysis: Gray and Green Infrastructure	8
2.6) Regional Equity Research	8
3) RESULTS	9
3.1) Plan Mapping [©] Summary	9
3.2) Census Characterization of Trenton and Mercer County	16
3.3) Economic Revitalization Alternatives	32
3.4) Range of Potential Growth Targets	43
3.5) Trenton's Capacity for Growth	46
3.6) Trenton's Urban Growth Target	52
3.7) Regional Equity Context	53
4) NEXT STEPS	54
4.1) Smart Growth Neighborhood Targets for Trenton	54
4.2) Regional Equity and Regional Economic Linkages	54
FIGURES	Follows Pg.
Figure 1 Mercer County State Plan Planning Areas	4
Figure 2 Mercer County B.I.G. Map	4
Figure 3 City of Trenton 1989 Zoning By-law and 1990 Land Use Plan Composite Zoning	8

Figure 4	Mercer County Vision 2050	8
Figure 5	City of Trenton Vision 2050	8
Figure 6	1990 Land Use Plan for Trenton	12
Figure 7	City of Trenton Redevelopment Plans	12
Figure 8	Complementary and Conflicting Plans	14

TABLES

Table 1	City Population Characteristics 1990-2000	16
Table 2	Population Change by Sex 1990-2000	17
Table 3	Population Change by Race 1990-2000	17
Table 4	Population Change for Selected Ethnic Groups 1990-2000	18
Table 5	Population Change by Age 1990-2000	19
Table 6	Density Comparisons 2000	19
Table 7	Households 1990-2000	21
Table 8	Families 1990-2000	22
Table 9	Single Family vs Multifamily Units	22
Table 10	Owner Occupied vs Renter Occupied Units	23
Table 11	Rooms per Unit	24
Table 12	Units Built Before 1960	24
Table 13	Median Value and Rent of Occupied Housing Units	25
Table 14	Trenton Municipal Finance Data	25
Table 15	Private Sector Jobs in Mercer County and Trenton	26
Table 16	Private Sector and Government Jobs	26
Table 17	Private Jobs by Sector	27
Table 18	Jobs to Housing Ratio and Vacancy Rate	28
Table 19	Unemployment in Trenton and Mercer County	28
Table 20	Income and Wages in Mercer County	29
Table 21	Labor Force in Trenton and Mercer County	30
Table 22	Labor Force By Industry and Occupation	31
Table 23	Potential Urban Growth Targets	44
Table 24	Mercer County Sewer Utility Capacities	47

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	GOZ [®] Model Description	55
Appendix 2	Plan Map Template Applied to Canal Banks Plan	59

BIBLIOGRAPHY		63
---------------------	--	-----------

1) PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The Issue

Smart Growth advocates and the *New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan* (SDRP) both call for most new growth in New Jersey to be directed to existing cities and other developed areas. However, New Jersey's public involvement process for deciding the policies of the SDRP (called Cross-acceptance) was undertaken through counties. Because most counties are dominated by suburban interests, the residents and leaders of New Jersey's major cities and developed areas have been largely on the outside of SDRP discussions. They have also been excluded from most Smart Growth discussions because, in New Jersey, advocates have focused primarily on open space preservation, not on directing growth to developed areas.

When we began this project in 2001, no one had found a way to engage the cities of New Jersey in Smart Growth in general, or the State Plan in particular. No one remembered when he or she said that growth should go to the cities, that no one yet knew how much capacity or desire the cities have to grow. No one was looking at how the investments that were being made in cities would enhance or detract from cities' capacity and desire to grow. And no one was examining whether the strategies in place would attract the desired growth to the cities.

For these reasons, Smart Growth advocates and state planners alike knew little about:

- how much growth cities would like,
- how much growth their infrastructure could support,
- what types of growth cities would like, and
- where cities would like to see growth occur.

RPP believed that without specific targets for growth, the appropriate public investment decisions to support growth where it is determined to be "smart" would not be made. The process of developing targets would also introduce cities' wants and needs into Smart Growth decision-making.

A Pilot Project in the City of Trenton

The City of Trenton agreed to be the pilot for developing a method to translate state government policy and Smart Growth advocates' slogans about the appropriate location of growth in New Jersey into on the ground targets. As the state capital, it is particularly pivotal for revitalization to occur here. Also the City was agreeable to the project as they had a number of transportation and land use issues outstanding that impeded their ability to give the Department of Transportation growth projections it needed to advance some important improvements.

The Role of Targets

Almost every municipality, not just Trenton, has plans without growth targets. Most master plans and redevelopment plans, if they have any numbers at all, have only trend projections for some plan horizon date, usually twenty years from when the plan is developed.

Trenton's trend projections were flat or negative, according to different sources. It was clear to everyone who cared to look that the trend projections were not going to bring about a rebirth of the City's former vitality. RPP questioned why we should be planning for trend if trend was not desirable. RPP believed, instead, that Trenton could use growth targets for population and employment based on its capacity and desire for growth to reframe its plans for the future and rethink the implementation strategies needed to achieve its goals.

RPP began the Urban Growth Targets Project to answer the questions:

- how much growth can the City of Trenton take,
- how much growth does the city want, and
- what strategies could it use to attract that growth.

RPP's intention was to provide a new approach to urban redevelopment in Trenton that would be of benefit to cities statewide.

It was RPP's hypothesis that if we could get agreement on specific growth targets for population and employment, we would be able to see how ambitious the targets were when compared to trend. We would then be able to evaluate existing or proposed strategies in terms of whether or not they were likely to achieve the targets. And we could help move the various players to evaluate their actions in relation to those targets.

2) METHODOLOGY

2.1) Plan Mapping[®] Tool

Many communities face the problem of multiple agencies undertaking multiple plans and projects at the same time without regard for the goals, strategies, and impacts of one another. Unnecessary conflicts and duplication often result from this lack of coordination and communication. When each plan focuses on a specific issue or geographic area, solutions that could address multiple problems are often missed.

The Regional Planning Partnership developed a method for “mapping” plans that helps to expose the strengths and weaknesses of the overall planning landscape in a community. Our Plan Mapping[®] Tool involves four steps:

- Obtain copies of all the currently effective planning documents pertaining to the geographic area in question, and arrange personal interviews with agencies that have active planning or redevelopment projects in the area.
- Transfer the information obtained from the documents and interviews into a common template organized into goals/objectives, data, and strategies/recommendations, etc.
- Sort the elements of each plan by functional category (i.e., housing, stream corridors, waste collection), as well as by geographic area. The goals, objectives, data, strategies, and recommendations of each plan can then be compared easily.
- Create a GIS map to illustrate the location and central themes of the various maps. Through build-out analysis using RPP’s GOZ[®] model, demonstrate the potential impacts of these plans.

From this process, we can quickly begin to draw conclusions about the state of current planning efforts in that locale. The types and diversity of strategies used for each functional category can quickly be seen, as well as any conflicts by geographic area. Areas with strong and weak planning can quickly be identified, as well as areas with synergies that could be exploited, and areas in which rethinking is needed to better coordinate agency goals.

Plan Mapping[®] can be used to draw different stakeholders away from their own plan to engage in the process of making a single vision, with a single comprehensive supporting action plan.

2.2) Census 2000 Socioeconomic Data for Trenton and Mercer County

RPP gathered Census 2000 socioeconomic data for Trenton and Mercer County in three areas: demographics, housing and employment. While there are many other ways to characterize a city, the data presented for these three areas begin to paint a picture of both the city’s resources and its challenges.

Demographic data collected include information on: race, ethnicity, age, population density, households, and families. The demographics of the city are compared and contrasted with those of Mercer County as a whole.

Key features related to housing in Trenton, compared and contrasted with housing issues in all of Mercer County were also identified. Census figures provide a means to accurately bring to light the strengths and weaknesses that characterize Trenton's housing market compared to the total Mercer County housing market.

Employment, jobs, and the resident labor force in Trenton, were also compared with the larger county. Data on jobs in the city and county, employment statistics for city and county residents, and the connections (and disconnections) between the two were collected. Also, labor force data have been included.

2.3) Economic Revitalization Literature Review

A web-based search, literature review and personal interviews were carried out to identify successful techniques for urban revitalization within a regional context used elsewhere in the U.S.

2.4) Development of Potential Growth Targets

RPP prepared a range of potential growth targets for discussion by the *Urban Growth Targets Charrette* participants reflecting historical data, trend projections and changes to trend.

2.4.1) Historical and Trend Projections

RPP gathered historical data on the growth of Trenton and Mercer County from previous census reports and Master Plans. We also gathered trend projections from the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), the Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR), and the *State Development and Redevelopment Plan* (SDRP).

2.4.2) Trend Shift[®] Tool

RPP developed a three-step protocol for allocating statewide total projected growth to Planning Areas based on State Plan policies. We call this protocol the Trend Shift[®] Tool because it shifts the allocation of growth in the state from the current trend of sprawl development to centered development. Trend Shift[®] allows us to plan for a future different from the past, using a policy framework based on the State Plan, to distribute expected statewide growth to counties and local jurisdictions.

RPP used the Trend Shift[®] Tool to calculate two potential growth targets for Trenton. The first was based on State Plan Planning Areas for Mercer County (see figure 1). The

second was based on DEP’s refinement of State Plan goals as expressed in its Blueprint for Intelligent Growth (B.I.G.) Map (see figure 2). (The essential difference between the two calculations is a reduction of Planning Area 2 available for development under the B.I.G. map scenario as well as a greater emphasis on growth within cities.)

Scenario 1 – State Plan-Based Targets

The first scenario we developed with the Trend Shift[®] Tool was based on the following State Plan policies:

- Encourage growth in Planning Areas (PA) 1 and 2
- Accommodate growth in Planning Areas 3, 4, 5
- Focus growth in Cities, Centers and Transit Cores
- Protect the Environs – stable neighborhoods and rural and environmentally sensitive lands.

The three steps of the Trend Shift[®] allocation process are described below. Steps 1 and 3 are policy choices based on State Plan goals while Step 2 is a simple numerical ratio of acreages. Although the SDRP was used as a guide, it does not provide enough specificity to complete the protocol. RPP held a charrette with planners and development professionals to explore appropriate allocations. The allocations described below could be altered to reflect other decisions, but the weights are appropriate to achieve SDRP goals.

Step 1 – Allocate Statewide Growth Increment Based on State Plan Goals

The SDRP calls for most of the growth increment to be “provided for” in PA 1 and 2 (pgs. 190, 196) with growth to be “accommodated” in PA 3, 4, and 5 (pgs. 201, 208, 217). In order to make specific on the ground allocations, in consultation with planners and development officials, RPP made policy choices to allocate the growth increment as follows:

Planning Area 1	60%
Planning Area 2	35%
Planning Area 3	1%
Planning Area 4 & 4b	3%
Planning Area 5	1%.

PA5b, Pinelands, HMDC lands were not included as Mercer County does not have any of these lands. Parks were also excluded as the growth increment would not be assigned to preserved land.

Step 2 – Disaggregate Statewide Growth Increment by County

Planning Area allocations were disaggregated proportionally to counties using the ratio of county Planning Area acreage to state-wide Planning Area acreage.

Step 3 – Distribute County-wide Allocation Among Planning Areas

County-wide growth allocations were distributed within Mercer County based on RPP's interpretation of State Plan policies (informed by local planners' and developers' experience).

PA 1 & 2	Pop	Emp	PA 3, 4, 5	Pop	Emp
Cities	25%	45%	Centers	90%	95%
Centers	40%	30%	Environs	10%	5%
Transit Cores	25%	20%			
Environs	10%	5%			

Scenario 2 – B.I.G. Map-based Targets

For the second scenario which was based on the B.I.G. Map parameters, both the policy choices and the ratios developed were different.

Step 1 – Allocate Statewide Growth Increment Based on State Plan Goals

Through its B.I.G. Map proposal, DEP has indicated that its goal is to direct most of the growth increment to cities. In order to make specific on the ground allocations, RPP made policy choices to allocate the growth increment as follows:

Planning Area 1	80%
Planning Area 2	15%
Planning Area 3	1%
Planning Area 4& 4b	3%
Planning Area 5	1%.

PA5b, Pinelands, and HMDC lands were not included as Mercer County does not have any of these lands. Parks were also excluded as the growth increment would not be assigned to preserved land.

Step 2 – Disaggregate Statewide Growth Increment by County

The Planning Area allocations were disaggregated proportionally to counties using the ratio of county Planning Area acreage to state-wide Planning Area acreage. DEP has indicated that the amount of PA 2 acreage available for development would likely be reduced by half of the State Plan current designation due to the presence of environmental constraints.

Step 3 – Distribute County-wide Allocation Among Planning Areas

County-wide growth allocations within each county were distributed based on an interpretation of B.I.G. Map policies.

PA 1 & 2	Pop	Emp	PA 3, 4, 5	Pop	Emp
Cities	45%	65%	Centers	90%	95%
Centers	25%	15%	Environs	10%	5%
Transit Cores	20%	15%			
Environs	10%	5%			

2.4.3) GOZ[®] Modeling of Build-out

While most plans do not identify specific growth targets explicitly, implicit targets for growth can be identified by examining the effect of building-out the zoning. A build-out calculation tells you how much development (housing and non-residential development) could be built if the developable land included in the plan were built as zoned. RPP, therefore, used the build-out feature of its Goal Oriented Zoning[®] model to determine build-out for three scenarios for Trenton. (See Appendix 1 for details on the GOZ[®] model.)

The three scenarios analyzed by GOZ[®] were:

- Existing zoning (according to the 1989 Zoning By-law) (see figure 3),
- The 1990 Land Use Plan (which identifies redevelopment potential for Trenton) (see figure 3), and
- Vision 2050 (Smart Growth zoning developed by RPP based on State Plan goals) (see figures 4 and 5).

The first two scenarios were taken from adopted plans for Trenton. The third scenario was developed for Central Jersey using the Goal Oriented Zoning feature of GOZ[®] to identify centers and transit corridors while protecting environmentally sensitive areas. (Figure 5 is an enlargement of part of figure 4 and site specific parks and conservation zoning do not appear on it.)

2.4.4) Urban/Suburban Community Dialogue

RPP made a presentation and participated in break-out group discussions between residents of Trenton and its surrounding suburbs on the future of Trenton. This event, at the Lafayette Yard Marriott Hotel took place November 13, 2002 and was organized by Isles, Inc. and the Stoneybrook Millstone Watershed Association.

2.4.5) Urban Growth Targets Charrette

RPP led a five-hour charrette at Thomas Edison State College with City, County, State government and community development representatives to develop a population and employment growth target for Trenton. A range of targets was developed in advance of the charrette and aerial photo imagery and other maps were used to help participants envision the potential targets on the ground.

2.5) Capacity Analysis

RPP interviewed key City staff and reviewed City reports to assess the capacity of both the City's gray and green infrastructure. Sewer, water, transportation, and brownfields redevelopment data were included in the City's gray infrastructure assessment. Air quality, open space, biodiversity, and stream water quality were included in the City's green infrastructure assessment.

2.6) Regional Equity Research

RPP became a founding member of the New Jersey Regional Coalition, which hired Myron Orfield and his firm, Amerigis, to evaluate the State's racial segregation and concentration of poverty. RPP believed this research would identify the regional forces that could influence Trenton's success in meeting its desired growth targets for employment and population.

3) RESULTS

3.1) Plan Mapping© Summary

Interview Results

We began our interviews with the City. The City had two main focuses. They wanted to bring in supporting development to bolster the Hotel and other redevelopment projects' successes. In addition, they wanted supporting development to reduce the concentration of poverty at the same time as respecting stable neighborhoods and reducing the fear of displacement. They wanted jobs for City residents.

This clarity of intent, however, did not translate into specificity in the City's existing Master Plan, or its various redevelopment plans, regarding *how much* growth they wanted. Other players – Capital City Redevelopment Corporation (CCRC), Mercer County, and the Mercer County Improvement Authority (MCIA) – also had plans with no specific targets.

What did become clear, however, is that Trenton, like most cities, had more players with control over its future than most municipalities in the State. As Trenton is the State Capital, State agencies play a very big role in Trenton. They affect Trenton's future through their leasing (or not) of buildings. They set up the Capital City Renaissance Corporation, whose mission is to look after the State's interests in Trenton. The State owns a significant amount of property in the City, including surface parking lots that are potentially the most viable redevelopment sites in the City. The State also established the Joint Management Commission, which has a great deal of power to block or encourage redevelopment in the City.

Trenton is also the County seat, with the Court House, the County Administration Building, and County owned property throughout the City. With a County Executive who was born and raised in Trenton and who cares deeply about Trenton's future, the County has become an active player in Trenton's redevelopment.

The County's agent, MCIA, is another player with power and resources working to redevelop the City. It is responsible for the Arena and the Waterfront Park, and through a Memorandum of Understanding, has development control over a significant portion of the City.

In the private sector, the Trenton Downtown Association assesses a fee on property owners that is earmarked for investment in improvements to sidewalks, lighting, parking, and other amenities.

Non-profits, such as Isles, Inc., and other community development organizations, some of which are faith-based, are also active in Trenton's redevelopment.

New to the mix is the Economic Development Corporation of Trenton (EDCT), funded mostly with grants from many of the large employers in the Route 1 Corridor. The TEDC has established a short-term goal of attracting development around the new Marriott Hotel to ensure the Hotel's long-term success.

All of these players, however, were operating independently, either with little support from the others or with conflicts. Agencies that had been brought in to do things "for" Trenton were perceived to be doing things "to" Trenton. These conflicts either stalled development or ensured that if a project did move forward, it did so without the synergy that comes from a well-coordinated effort. Without this coordination, most projects, like the Arena, have had a success that is considered fragile at best.

Plan Analysis

RPP used its Plan Mapping[®] Tool to analyze over twenty State, County and local plans for the City of Trenton including:

- Assunpink Greenway Plan
- BEST Action Plan
- Canal Banks Redevelopment Area Plan
- Cass Street Redevelopment Area Plan
- CCRC Renaissance Plan
- Champale Redevelopment Area Plan
- City of Trenton Land Use Plan
- Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
- Consolidated Plan
- Cyberdistricts Plan
- John Fitch Way Redevelopment Area Plan
- Lamberton Street Redevelopment Area Plan
- New Jersey's Capital Region Transitioning Mercer County into a Regional Heritage Tourism Destination
- NJDOT Circulation Study Phase I
- NJ TRANSIT train station area planning (personal interview, August 2001)
- Pennington Avenue Redevelopment Area Plan
- Roebing Complex Redevelopment Area Plan
- Roebing Gateway Redevelopment Area Plan
- South Jersey Light Rail Capitol Extension Draft EIS
- Trenton Arts Blueprint
- Urban Land Institute Panel Report.

(See Appendix 2 for an application of the Plan Mapping[®] template.)

Personal interviews were also held with the Mercer County Improvement Authority, and Trenton Downtown Association about proposed projects.

Through a survey of economic development literature, we identified two basic types of redevelopment strategies. Strategies identified in (A) “Increasing External Demand” focus on bringing outsiders into the downtown, arena, and waterfront areas through the arts, entertainment, mixed-use development, and market-rate housing. (See figure 6, the Trenton 1999 Land Use Plan, for proposed locations of regional commercial and entertainment uses). Strategies identified in (B) “Promoting Internal Revitalization” focus on making more incremental improvements to the rest of the city through new and rehabilitated housing, retail, and recreation facilities (see figure 7). Both strategies are in play in Trenton.

The Plan Mapping[©] exercise identified a number of complementary plan proposals with only a few direct conflicts between competing proposals for the same location. These are noted under (C) “Geographic Complements and Conflicts.”

A) Plans for Increasing External Demand

Arts District and Heritage Tourism:

Four areas for artists’ studios and galleries have been proposed:

- 1) Mercer County Improvement Authority: South Broad Street near the Mill Hill neighborhood.
- 2) Trenton Downtown Association, City of Trenton Land Use Plan: Downtown storefronts and upper floors of State Street buildings.
- 3) Land Use Plan: Broad Street below the Route 1/Amtrak overpass.
- 4) Arts Blueprint & Land Use Plan: Old Trenton near the Mercer County Community College campus.

The Land Use Plan and CCRC propose Heritage Tourism opportunities for the downtown Mill Hill area, Battle Monument and State House district by the Barracks.

Entertainment: Five areas have been identified for entertainment districts, some of them without specific market niches.

- 1) Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy: The hotel district (Lafayette Street) downtown is to be an entertainment district.
- 2) Trenton Downtown Association: Movie theatres and brew pubs should be located downtown.
- 3) Mercer County Improvement Authority/Urban Land Institute study: Brew pubs and movie theatres should be located in the South Broad Street corridor north and south of the arena. The Lamberton Redevelopment Area plan also calls for entertainment facilities on South Broad Street near the arena.
- 4) The City of Trenton Land Use Plan: An entertainment district consisting of bars, clubs, and restaurants should be located downtown on State Street, as well as restaurants in the Battle Monument area.
- 5) Champale Redevelopment Area Plan: Entertainment uses are proposed for South Trenton near the waterfront below Lalor Street.

Mixed-Use Development: The Land Use Plan and three redevelopment area plans call for new mixed-use residential-retail-office development in seven areas:

- 1) Land Use Plan & CCRC plan: State-owned parking lots surrounding the Justice Complex and the Labor, Health, and Agriculture building.
- 2) Land Use Plan: East State Street between Clinton and Chestnut avenues.
- 3) Lamberton Redevelopment Plan: Ferry Street.
- 4) Land Use Plan: Train station area.
- 5) Land Use Plan: Water Works site adjacent to Pennington Avenue.
- 6) Champale Redevelopment Plan: The former Champale Brewery in the block bounded by Lamberton, Centre, Lalor, and Cliff streets.
- 7) Canal Banks Redevelopment Plan: Several areas surrounding the Battle Monument that are targeted for residential infill and rehabilitation.

Market-Rate Housing: In addition to the areas identified for mixed-use development, three sites are identified for market-rate, potentially upscale, housing:

- 1) Trenton Downtown Association & CCRC: Downtown, particularly the State Street corridor.
- 2) Mercer County Improvement Authority and the ULI study: A large residential development in the Lamberton neighborhood.
- 3) Land Use Plan, NJ TRANSIT & CCRC: Trenton Train Station area. City of Trenton: TOD at the Light Rail Station at Cass St. CCRC: Canal Rd. and W. Hanover in Old Trenton.

Passive and Active Recreation:

Passive recreation targeting visitors to downtown is proposed for the Delaware riverfront. In some proposals, major changes are envisioned; others call for less sweeping alterations to the riverfront area.

- 1) Land Use Plan & CCRC: Construct a continuous walkway downtown along the Assunpink to the Delaware River. Construct a pedestrian bridge over Route 29 to the riverfront from the Capitol Complex.
- 2) John Fitch Way Redevelopment Plan & CCRC: Reopen the Assunpink Creek and provide a greenway linking the War Memorial to Mill Hill Park. Connect the stadium to downtown via a Delaware River Walk. Upgrade D&R Canal path.
- 3) Land Use Plan & CCRC: Re-create Stacy Park along the Delaware River. Convert Route 29 into an urban boulevard.

Active recreation proposals have also been made.

- 1) The City is considering an application for an X-treme Arena (skateboarding and other forms of recreation) on a parcel in North Trenton.
- 2) CCRC: Ice skating rink in State House district.

B) Plans for Promoting Internal Rehabilitation

Housing: Many sites are targeted for infill and rehabilitation of the housing stock. In almost all of these areas, new homeownership opportunities are proposed.

- 1) Pennington Avenue Redevelopment Plan: A portion of the Pennington Avenue Redevelopment Area.

- 2) Land Use Plan: Chambersburg. Vacant housing on the edge of the neighborhood is to be rehabilitated.
- 3) Land Use Plan: Vacant housing on East State Street is to be rehabilitated.
- 4) Land Use Plan: Old Trenton for rehabilitation, but not infill.
- 5) Land Use Plan: Acquisition and rehabilitation in the Greenwood-Hamilton neighborhood.
- 6) Roebling Gateway Redevelopment Plan: Rehabilitation in Roebling Gateway and Greenwood-Hamilton.
- 7) Land Use Plan: Infill in the former Reading Railroad right-of-way at Oakland Street, and infill and rehabilitation in the West End and Stuyvesant-Prospect areas.
- 8) Land Use Plan: Rehabilitation and infill in Clinton Park and East and Upper East Trenton.
- 9) Land Use Plan: Increased homeownership opportunities in Central West (the West Hanover Street area).
- 10) Land Use Plan: Rehabilitation and infill in Humboldt-Sweets, north of the Battle Monument.
- 11) Canal Banks Redevelopment Plan: Infill and rehabilitation in Old Trenton and on Hanover and Warren streets. Infill on the northwest corner of Willow and Hanover, and along the Bel-Del Greenway corridor near the Battle Monument.

Retail: Separate from the mixed-use retail, which targets a different market, rehabilitation of neighborhood retail is a goal of many neighborhood plans.

- 1) Land Use Plan: The intersection of Hamilton and South Clinton avenues.
- 2) Land Use Plan: Develop commercial nodes on Stuyvesant Avenue.
- 3) Land Use Plan: Revitalize the Hermitage Avenue shopping center in the West End.
- 4) Pennington Avenue Redevelopment Plan: Commercial and retail development on the south side of Pennington Avenue.
- 5) Land Use Plan: Renovate the commercial corridor on Calhoun Street.
- 6) Canal Banks Redevelopment Plan: Retail development on North Broad Street below the D & R Canal.
- 7) Land use Plan: Develop Cass Street as a neighborhood commercial zone.

Parks: Many plans include proposals for new and expanded parks in the city's neighborhoods. Most proposals focus on active recreation and greenway trails.

- 1) Land Use Plan: Renovate Agibiti Park in Chambersburg.
- 2) Land Use Plan: Redevelop the former industrial properties on East State Street for recreational use.
- 3) Land Use Plan: Maintain the vacant lots at Greenwood and Clinton avenues as open space.
- 4) Land Use Plan: Develop additional open space in Old Trenton.
- 5) Land Use Plan and Assunpink Greenway Plan: Acquire a series of properties along Assunpink Creek. Develop them for recreational use.
- 6) Canal Banks Redevelopment Plan: Develop linear parks along the Bel-Del and D & R Canal greenways, as well as village greens, squares, and other mini-parks in the area.
- 7) Land Use Plan: Link the Canal Park with other public open spaces in the West End.

- 8) Land Use Plan: Improve the canal path in the Central West section (West Hanover Street area).

C) Geographic Complements and Conflicts

In some cases, plans are clearly complementary. In other cases, there are differing proposals for the same neighborhood, district, or tract. Mapping the complements and conflicts helps to draw stakeholders away from their own plan and engage in the process of making a single vision, with a single comprehensive supporting action plan (see figure 8).

Complementary plans:

Assunpink Greenway: The Land Use Plan, CCRC and Heritage Tourism plans agree on the benefits of developing a greenway along the Assunpink Creek.

Cyber/Arts District: The Land Use and Art Blueprint plans agree that a cyber and an arts district would be complementary in the North Warren St. area.

Surface Parking Lots: The Land Use and CCRC plans recommend mixed used development of this area.

Train Station: The Land Use and ULI plans agree on the need for an improved regional transportation hub at this location.

Route 29 Boulevard: The Land Use and CCRC plans agree on the need to return public access to the Delaware River waterfront.

Conflicting plans:

Barrack Street: The Land Use Plan proposes that Barrack Street in front of the War Memorial be reopened to traffic. NJDOT's access and circulation study recommends that it remain closed.

Cass St. LRT: The city is investigating the feasibility of a Transit Oriented Development for the Cass St. Light Rail Train station. The ULI study recommends commercial/entertainment development for this area.

Cass St. south: The Land Use plan calls for establishing a retail/entertainment center next to the baseball stadium, developing the Cass Street frontage for shopping and river access. The ULI study focuses on constructing a marina at the waterfront and rebuilding the Roebling mansion.

Lamberton: The Land Use Plan calls for Lamberton (the residential neighborhood opposite South Broad Street from the arena) to become an attractive, medium density residential area. The ULI study, backed by the Mercer County Improvement Authority,

suggests a major redevelopment of the entire neighborhood including new upscale housing. By contrast, the Lamberton Redevelopment Plan proposes that the neighborhood's existing stock be preserved. A Memorandum of Understanding between the county and the city states that the two should work together to revitalize the neighborhood.

Roebing: The Land Use Plan states that Building 4 in the Roebing Complex (across Hamilton Street from the arena) should be developed as an industrial heritage museum, to include a performing arts space. But the ULI study, backed by an MCIA proposal to sell the building to a developer, suggests putting a sports bar in the space. Additionally, the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy suggests that Roebing is appropriate for a "Cyberdistrict," while the ULI study suggests a more conventional office development.

3.2) Census Characterization of Trenton and Mercer County

RPP analyzed three types of Census 2000 socioeconomic data (population, housing, and employment) to develop a characterization of Trenton in contrast to Mercer County. The data revealed social problems that are serious, and in some cases, worsening. The reality and effects of the concentration of poverty in Trenton are painfully apparent.

One of these effects is the dampening of Trenton’s real estate market. Looking at census data alone, however, underplays the positive signs of a growing interest in Trenton’s market that include: the recent investment in a ballpark, arena, hotel and light rail lines, new retail projects and recent proposals for market-rate housing, etc.

A) Population

The city makes up under one-fourth of the county population. Demographically, Trenton is a very different place than the county that encompasses it. The city’s population has been declining for half a century, while the county has seen steady, if not rapid, increases during that time. Trenton has a younger population, has a far higher proportion of blacks and Hispanics (indeed, the majority of blacks and Hispanics in the county live in Trenton), and has larger households, on average, than the county as a whole.

Table 1 shows population and household breakdowns for the city as a percentage of county population in 1990 and 2000. Tables 2-5 show population changes in the city and county by sex, race, selected ethnic groups, and age between 1990 and 2000. Table 6 compares the population density of Trenton with that of other jurisdictions

Table 1: City population characteristics compared to Mercer County, 1990 and 2000

		City as % of county (1990)	City as % of county (2000)
Sex	Total	27.2%	24.3%
	Male	27.3%	24.7%
	Female	27.1%	24.0%
Race	Black	71.1%	64.0%
	White	15.3%	11.6%
	American Indian	41.8%	43.6%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5.9%	5.2%
	Other race	74.1%	61.0%
	Two or more races	--	35.8%
Ethnicity	Hispanic	63.7%	54.3%
	Puerto Rican	76.7%	64.6%
	Other Hispanic	53.4%	56.8%
	Non-Hispanic White	14.1%	9.3%
Age	Under 18	32.1%	28.0%
	18-64	25.6%	23.4%
	65+	26.7%	22.0%
Households	Total	26.3%	23.4%
	With any children under 18	29.0%	25.6%
	Led by single women with own children	57.2%	50.0%
	Married couples with children	17.6%	13.2%
	Total living alone	31.3%	27.2%
	Seniors 65 or older living alone	33.2%	28.3%
	Married couples with no children	16.6%	13.6%
	With residents 65 or older	28.4%	23.6%

in the region, while Table 7 shows household characteristics for Trenton and Mercer County in 1990 and 2000.

The population of Trenton declined by 3,272, or 3.7 percent, between 1990 and 2000, from 88,675 to 85,403 (Table 2). This loss continued a long trend of declines, starting in the 1950s, though the 1990s witnessed the smallest decline the city has yet experienced. Interestingly, the female population fell at almost four times the rate of the male population decline. At the same time, the population of Mercer County as a whole grew by 7.7 percent — almost 25,000 people — to 350,761.

Table 2: Population change by sex, 1990-2000

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total (2000)
City	Total	88,675	85,403	-3,272	-3.7%	100.0%
	Male	43,009	42,180	-829	-1.9%	49.4%
	Female	45,666	43,223	-2,443	-5.3%	50.6%
County	Total	325,824	350,761	24,937	7.7%	100.0%
	Male	157,592	170,750	13,158	8.3%	48.7%
	Female	168,232	180,011	11,779	7.0%	51.3%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Race

The black population remained the largest racial group in the city; their numbers increased slightly by 1.8% to 44,465 (Table 3). Meanwhile, the white population declined by 26% to 27,802. Other census-identified racial groups, such as Asian and Native American, made up a little over 1 percent of the population. But over 10% of residents reported their race as “other,” and 2,371 residents (3.1%) reported that they were members of two or more races (this choice was not an option in the 1990 census).

The racial composition in the county as a whole remained dramatically different from the

Table 3: Population change by race, 1990-2000

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total (2000)
City	Black	43,689	44,465	776	1.8%	52.1%
	White	37,392	27,802	-9,590	-25.6%	32.6%
	American Indian	223	300	77	34.5%	0.4%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	585	915	330	56.4%	1.1%
	Other race	6,786	9,190	2,404	35.4%	10.8%
	Two or more races	--	2,731	--	--	3.2%
County	Black	61,481	69,502	8,021	13.0%	19.8%
	White	244,656	240,206	-4,450	-1.8%	68.5%
	American Indian	533	688	155	29.1%	0.2%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	9,992	17,692	7,700	77.1%	5.0%
	Other race	9,162	15,054	5,892	64.3%	4.3%
	Two or more races	--	7,619	--	--	2.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

city, though slightly less so than in 1990. In 2000, 69,502 Mercer County residents were black (19.8% of the total), and 240,206 county residents were white (68% of the total). This means that 64% of the county's black population lived in the city — a decline from the 1990 level of 71% — though only 24% of the county's total population lived in the city. The county's Asian population rose by 76% to 17,340 (5.3% of the population), but Asians were concentrated in the outlying suburbs, with less than 1,000 in the city.

Ethnicity

The Hispanic population in the city rose by 47% (5,861), from less than 13,000 in 1990 to 18,391 (21% of the total population) in 2000 (Table 4). But if the long-established Puerto Rican population, which declined slightly, is excluded, the number of Hispanics in Trenton rose by almost 200% (6,259). Including Puerto Ricans, the county Hispanic population grew by 72% (14,233). Excluding them, it rose by 179% (10,662) — a growth rate slightly lower than that experienced by the city. In the county as a whole, 33,892 residents (10%) were Hispanic. This means that 54% of county Hispanic residents lived in the city in 2000, a decline from the 1990 level of 64%. But the city still accounted for more than half the growth in the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic population.

Table 4: Population change for selected ethnic groups, 1990-2000

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total (2000)
City	Hispanic	12,530	18,391	5,861	46.8%	21.5%
	Puerto Rican	9,350	8,952	-398	-4.3%	10.5%
	Other Hispanic	3,180	9,439	6,259	196.8%	11.1%
	Non-Hispanic White	33,247	21,022	-12,225	-36.8%	24.6%
County	Hispanic	19,665	33,898	14,233	72.4%	9.7%
	Puerto Rican	12,190	13,865	1,675	13.7%	4.0%
	Other Hispanic	5,959	16,621	10,662	178.9%	4.7%
	Non-Hispanic White	236,143	225,284	-10,859	-4.6%	64.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

The non-Hispanic white population declined in both the city and the county as a whole, though the rate of decline was nine times faster in the city (a 36.8% drop). This decline means that the city was responsible for almost the entire decline in non-Hispanic whites in the county.

Age

Children under 18 made up almost 28% of the city's population in 2000, above the county level of 24%. The number of children was approximately the same in 2000 as in 1990, even as the population declined overall. The number of elderly in the city fell 13.8% between 1990 and 2000, even as the median age edged up from 31.2 to 32.2.

The median age remained lower in the city than in the county, where it rose from 34.0 to 36.0. Overall, the city had proportionately fewer working-age residents than the county

— 60.9% in the city versus 63.4% in the county. As there were also proportionately fewer elderly in the city, this difference was due entirely to the city’s greater proportion of children.

Table 5 shows the changes in population during the 1990s for the city and the county by age.

Table 5: Population change by age, 1990-2000

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total (2000)
City	Under 18	23,577	23,646	69	0.3%	27.7%
	18-64	53,823	52,041	-1,782	-3.3%	60.9%
	65+	11,275	9,716	-1,559	-13.8%	11.4%
	Median age	31.2	32.2	1.0	3.2%	
County	Under 18	73,346	84,337	10,991	15.0%	24.0%
	18-64	210,249	222,284	12,035	5.7%	63.4%
	65+	42,229	44,140	1,911	4.5%	12.6%
	Median age	34.0	36.0	2.0	5.9%	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Density

The population density declined commensurately with the decrease in population, from 11,472 persons per square mile in 1990 to 11,049 persons per square mile in 2000. But Trenton’s density remained much higher than that of surrounding jurisdictions in Mercer County and was comparable to large cities in the region such as Newark and Philadelphia.

Table 6 compares the population density in Trenton with surrounding municipalities and with other urban centers in the region. Its density is not on the scale of Manhattan, Brooklyn, or the denser Hudson River waterfront cities. But Trenton’s population density is higher than that of any other city in the state outside the Northern New Jersey urban core. At its population peak of approximately 128,000, Trenton’s density was comparable to that of Jersey City today, at over 15,000 persons per square mile.

Table 6: Density Comparisons, 2000

Place	Persons per sq. mi.
Washington Township	502
Lawrence	1,317
Hamilton	2,208
Ewing	2,328
Princeton Borough	7,719
Camden	8,969
New Brunswick	9,188
Elizabeth	9,687
Trenton	11,049
Philadelphia	11,118
Newark	11,370
Jersey City	15,973
Paterson	17,501
Hoboken	30,011
Brooklyn	34,604
Manhattan	53,628

Source: RPP analysis of U.S. Census data

Households

In 2000 there were 29,437 households in the city (Table 7), a decline of 4.3% from the 1990 level. The county as a whole, by contrast, witnessed a 7.6% increase in the number of households, to 125,807.

The city had larger households than the county in both 1990 and 2000. During the 1990s, the city's average household size fell almost imperceptibly, from 2.76 to 2.75 persons per household. Meanwhile, the gap between city and county household size increased, as the county's household size fell from 2.65 to 2.62. Nonetheless, household size could be characterized as largely stable in both the city and county.

Other measures, however, reveal shifts in household composition. In the city in 2000, 29.7% of households consisted of one person living alone; this was true of 25.6% of county households. So while the county had smaller households overall, it also had relatively fewer single-person households. Even so, the number of such households in the county rose by 14% during the decade.

The number of married couples in the city, both with and without children, dropped 20% between 1980 and 1990. Meanwhile, the number of single women raising children rose over 11%. Single mothers raising children now outnumber married couples with children in the city — 15.7% of households versus 13.3% of households. The rate of increase in single-mother households was even faster in the county as a whole (27.3%), but married couples with children continued to outnumber single-mother households in the county by approximately 3 to 1.

Table 7: Households, 1990-2000

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total (2000)
City	Total	30,744	29,437	-1,307	-4.3%	100.0%
	Total households with any children under 18	11,701	11,659	-42	-0.4%	39.6%
	Households led by single women with own children	4,166	4,634	468	11.2%	15.7%
	Married couples with children	4,902	3,922	-980	-20.0%	13.3%
	Total living alone	8,854	8,756	-98	-1.1%	29.7%
	Seniors 65 or older living alone	3,848	3,527	-321	-8.3%	12.0%
	Married couples with no children	5,795	4,602	-1,193	-20.6%	15.6%
	Households with residents 65 or older	8,674	7,490	-1,184	-13.6%	25.4%
	Mean household size	2.76	2.75	-0.01	-0.5%	
		Total	116,941	125,807	8,866	7.6%
County	Total households with any children under 18	40,317	45,528	5,211	12.9%	36.2%
	Households led by single women with own children	7,282	9,272	1,990	27.3%	7.4%
	Married couples with children	27,816	29,799	1,983	7.1%	23.7%
	Total living alone	28,277	32,246	3,969	14.0%	25.6%
	Seniors age 65+ living alone	11,589	12,467	878	7.6%	9.9%
	Married couples with no children	34,899	33,805	-1,094	-3.1%	26.9%
	Households with residents 65 or older	30,568	31,729	1,161	3.8%	25.2%
	Mean household size	2.65	2.62	-0.03	-1.1%	

Source: U.S. Census data

The number of households with children was 11,659 (39.6%), approximately the same as in 1990 (but a proportionate increase because the total number of households fell). In the county as a whole, proportionately fewer households than in the city had children (36.2%), but their numbers increased by 12.9% from 1990 to 2000, to 45,528.

Families

As table 8 shows, Trenton had 18,695 family households in 2000, down from 20,068 in 1990 (a drop of 6.8%). Family households increased (by 4.7%) in the total county from 82,447 to 86,288.

The size of city families decreased very slightly, from 3.41 in 1990 to 3.38 in 2000, a difference of about 1%. There was no change in county family sizes, as the 3.16 statistic was maintained.

Table 8: Families, 1990-2000

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total (2000)
City	Total # of Families	20,068	18,695	-1,373	-6.8%	100%
	Mean Family Size	3.41	3.38	-0.03	-0.9%	
County	Total # of Families	82,447	86,288	3,841	4.7%	100%
	Mean Family Size	3.16	3.16	0.00	0.0%	

Source: U.S. Census Data

B) Housing

Types

Table 9 provides information on housing. Both the city and county held steady in their ratio of single-family units to multi-family units between 1990 and 2000. In Trenton, single-family housing makes up a little over sixty percent of all units, while multi-family makes up a little under forty percent of units. In the county, however, single-family housing makes up a little over seventy percent of all units, while multi-family makes up a little under thirty percent of units. Thus, Trenton has more of a mix than the county total in unit types in both 1990 and 2000.

From 1990 to 2000, Trenton lost 141 single-family units, but gained 471 multi-family units, bringing the total to 330 new units and making housing type a little more diversified. In the county however, single-family units grew by 8.5% while multi-family units grew by 6%, meaning that housing type diversity diminished.

Table 9: Single Family vs. Multi Family Units

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total county (1990)	% of total county (2000)
City	TOTAL UNITS	33,578	33,908	330	1.0%	27.2%	25.4%
	Single Family	20,924	20,783	-141	-0.7%	24.0%	22.0%
	% of City Total	62.3%	61.3%				
	Multi Family	12,654	13,125	471	3.7%	34.7%	33.9%
	% of City Total	37.7%	38.7%				
County	TOTAL UNITS	123,666	133,280	9,614	7.8%		
	Single Family	87,189	94,614	7,425	8.5%		
	% of County Total	70.5%	71.0%				
	Multi Family	36,477	38,666	2,189	6.0%		
	% of County Total	29.5%	29.0%				

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Tenure

Overall, from 1990 to 2000 Trenton lost occupied housing units, dipping 4.3% from 30,744 to 29,437. Owner occupancy plunged 14.8% to drop to below half of all occupied units (from just above half) in the city, while a lesser drop of 6.8% in renter occupancy edged it to above half from just below half of all occupied units. This drop also meant that Trenton decreased from about 26% to 23% of the county total of occupied units.

In all of Mercer County, the situation proved quite different. Occupancy rose by 7.6% (116,941 to 125,807), with owner occupancy growth (8.4%) outpacing renter occupancy growth (6%). Thus, the share of renter occupied units to the total [occupied units] went down.

Table 10: Owner Occupied vs Renter Occupied Units

		1990	2000	# change	% change	% of total county (1990)	% of total county (2000)
City	TOTAL OCCUPIED	30,744	29,437	-1,307	-4.3%	26.3%	23.4%
	Owner Occupied	15,714	13,386	-2,328	-14.8%	20.2%	15.9%
	% of City Total	51.1%	45.5%				
	Renter Occupied	15,030	16,051	1,021	6.8%	38.4%	38.7%
	% of City Total	48.9%	54.5%				
County	TOTAL OCCUPIED	116,941	125,807	8,866	7.6%		
	Owner Occupied	77,816	84,338	6,522	8.4%		
	% of County Total	66.5%	67.0%				
	Renter Occupied	39,125	41,469	2,344	6.0%		
	% of County Total	33.5%	33.0%				

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Rooms per Unit

The year 2000 saw a rise in the share of large housing units in both Trenton and Mercer County, defined here as units with 9 or more rooms. Within Trenton, large housing units increased from 4.6% in 1990 to 4.9% in 2000 (of the total housing units). There were 110 new large units built, an increase of 7%, from 1,554 units in 1990 to 1,664 units in 2000. In Mercer County, these trends were amplified, with an increase of 33% (3,926 new large housing units built) moving from 11,801 to 15,727. Thus, units with 9 or more rooms currently represent 12.5%, rather than the previous 9.5%, of total housing units.

Table 11 also shows how these changes affect the median number of rooms per unit. In both Trenton and Mercer County, a slight increase in this statistic (5.1 to 5.2 in Trenton; 5.8 to 5.9 in Mercer County) shows that large housing units are affecting the entire housing stock and markets of the area.

Table 11: Rooms per Unit

		1990	2000	Change #	Change %
City	Units with 9+ Rooms	1,554	1,664	110	7.1%
	% of City Total	4.6%	4.9%		
	Median Number of Rooms	5.1	5.2		
County	Units with 9+ Rooms	11,801	15,727	3,926	33.3%
	% of County Total	9.5%	12.5%		
	Median Number of Rooms	5.8	5.9		

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Age

New housing construction has lagged behind in Trenton, compared to Mercer County. The housing stock of the city is aged and reflects a higher percentage built before 1960. In Trenton, there are 79% of units built before 1960, while in the county, exactly half were built before 1960.

Table 12: Units Built before 1960 (percent of total units)

	2000
Trenton	79%
Mercer County	50%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Market Appreciation

From 1990 to 2000 Trenton saw a drop in the median value of owner-occupied housing units, from \$70,000 to \$65,000, which represents a decrease of 7%. However, median rent of renter-occupied units saw a 34% increase, from \$451 to \$604, which reflects a greater increase in median rent than for renter-occupied county housing units. In Mercer County, this increase was 28% (less than the increase in Trenton), but the median rent remained higher in the county, \$727 up from \$570. Median value of owner-occupied units in the county saw an 8% increase, from \$136,700 in 1990 to \$147,400 in 2000.

While the drop in median value of owner occupied housing units overall indicates a downturn for Trenton, segments of the owner occupied market showed improvement. Similarly, the dramatic increase in median rent indicates a strengthening of this market. However, in 2000 the city had a 13% residential vacancy rate compared to the county's 5.6% vacancy rate.

Table 13: Median Value and Rent of Occupied Housing Units

		1990	2000	Change #	Change %
City	Median Value (Owner Occupancy)	\$70,000	\$65,000	-\$5,000	-7.1%
	Median Rent (Renter Occupancy)	\$451	\$604	\$153	33.9%
County	Median Value (Owner Occupancy)	\$136,700	\$147,400	\$10,700	7.8%
	Median Rent (Renter Occupancy)	\$570	\$727	\$157	27.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Municipal Finance

Of all Mercer County municipalities, Trenton has the highest municipal tax rate (2.001), yet the city ranked near the bottom for school tax rate (1.191).

In both average residential property value and average property taxes, Trenton ranks the bottom of the list, \$61,756 and \$2,318, respectively.

C) Employment

Jobs

Table 15 shows the total number of private-sector jobs in Trenton and Mercer County in 1990 and 1999. In 1999, there were 24,166 private-sector jobs in Trenton, an increase of 3% (911 jobs) from the 1990 level of 23,255. In addition to these jobs, there are approximately 5,000 local government jobs and 20,000 state government jobs in the city, as well as 15,000 local jobs and 15,000 state jobs in the remainder of the county. Meanwhile, jobs in Mercer County as a whole rose by 11,939, or 9%. Approximately half of the total labor force of the city was made up of private sector jobs, whereas four fifths of the labor force in the county was made up of private sector jobs.

Table 14: Trenton Municipal Finance Data

TRENTON MUNICIPAL FINANCE DATA		
GENERAL	Population	85,403
	Net Taxable Valuation	\$1,859,287,046.00
	Valuation per Capita	\$21,770.75
RATES	Municipal Tax Rate	2.001
	School Tax Rate	1.191
	County Tax Rate	0.562
REVENUES	Average Residential Property Value	\$61,756.00
	Average Property Taxes	\$2,318.00
	Average S.A.V.E.R. Rebate	\$171.00
	Net Average Taxes	\$2,148.00

Source: NJ Dept of Community Affairs

Table 15: Private-Sector Jobs in Mercer County and Trenton, 1990-1999

	1990	1999	# change	% change	% of county total (1999)
City	23,255	24,166	911	3.9%	16.7%
County	133,135	145,074	11,939	9.0%	100.0%

Source: NJ Department of Labor

Of the 145,074 private-sector jobs in Mercer County in 1999, 16.7% were in Trenton. For comparison, 24.3% of the population lives in Trenton (2000 figure). If public-sector jobs are included (Table 17), Trenton has a greater share of the total employment in the county—26%—than it has of county population.

Table 16: Private sector and government jobs in Trenton and Mercer County, 1999

The county has more jobs per 1,000 residents than the city (638.6 compared to 464.4). The

	Private sector	Government	Total	Total as % of county
City	24,166	26,860	51,026	26.0%
County	145,074	51,541	196,615	100.0%

Source: NJ Department of Labor

county also has a greater variety of private sector jobs, and more jobs in higher-paying sectors, than the city. Table 16 shows the type and amount of private-sector jobs in the city compared to those in the county.

Almost two-thirds of the city’s private-sector jobs are in the relatively low-paying services sector; this is true of less than half of the county’s private sector jobs. Even given the high concentration of service jobs in the city, there were still more service jobs available per 1,000 residents in the county as in the city.

The high-paying Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate sector makes up 7.8% of county jobs, but fewer than one-tenth of those jobs are in the city. Approximately one-tenth of jobs in both the city and county are in the manufacturing sector, but that still leaves the city with fewer manufacturing jobs per resident than the county as a whole (50.1 jobs/1,000 residents compared to 64.4 jobs/1,000 residents).

Table 17: Private Jobs by Sector, 1999

		significant private sector jobs, #	significant private sector jobs, %	Jobs per 1,000 residents	City as % of county
City	Total	24,166	100.0%	464.4	17.0%
	Agriculture	35	0.1%	0.7	2.6%
	Construction	1,178	4.9%	22.6	24.3%
	Manufacturing	2,609	10.8%	50.1	18.2%
	Transportation, Communications, Utilities	659	2.7%	12.7	9.9%
	Wholesale Trade	1,237	5.1%	23.8	21.2%
	Retail Trade	2,510	10.4%	48.2	9.1%
	Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	879	3.6%	16.9	7.9%
	Services	15,059	62.3%	289.4	21.5%
County	Total	141,944	100.0%	638.6	
	Agriculture	1,330	0.9%	6.0	
	Construction	4,839	3.4%	21.8	
	Manufacturing	14,325	10.1%	64.4	
	Transportation, Communications, Utilities	6,637	4.7%	29.9	
	Wholesale Trade	5,848	4.1%	26.3	
	Retail Trade	27,717	19.5%	124.7	
	Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	11,133	7.8%	50.1	
	Services	70,115	49.4%	315.4	

Source: NJ Department of Labor

Jobs-to-Housing Balance

In 2000, Trenton had a higher jobs-to-housing ratio than did Mercer County as a whole (Table 18). The City had 1.5 jobs per housing unit, while Mercer County had 1.48 jobs per housing unit. In addition, the City had a 13 percent residential vacancy rate, compared with a 5.6 percent vacancy rate in the county as a whole. The disparity in vacancy rates drives the number of jobs per household in the city much higher than in the county. However, since an above-average share of total employment in Trenton is in the public sector (with employees who live outside of Trenton), a jobs-to-housing ratio considering only private covered employment in the city (0.71) is not only far below the county jobs-to-housing ratio (1.09), but shows that there is more housing stock available than [private covered] jobs.

Table 18: Jobs-to-Housing Ratio and Vacancy Rate

	City	County
Employment	51,026	196,615
Housing Units	33,908	133,280
Jobs-to-housing ratio	1.50	1.48
Vacancy Rate	13%	5.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, NJ Department of Labor

Unemployment

Trenton has had a consistently higher unemployment rate than the surrounding county, as Table 19 shows. However, the gap narrowed slightly between 1990 and 2000. In the county as a whole, unemployment fell from 4.4% to 3.0% between 1990 and 2000. At the same time, unemployment in the city fell from 9.4% to 6.6%.

Table 19: Unemployment in Trenton and Mercer County, 1990-2000

	1990	2000	Change
Mercer County	4.4%	3.0%	-1.4%
Trenton	9.4%	6.6%	-2.8%

Source: NJ Department of Labor

Income

In 1999, the most recent year for which data are available, family income was 42% of county family income (\$36,681 for city residents and \$88,017 for the county). The per capita income for city residents in 1999 was \$14,621, compared to \$11,018 in 1989 (representing a 33% increase). County per capita income increased by 48% over the same period. In 1999, city per capita income was 52% of county per capita income – a decline of 6% from 1989.

Average income for households in Trenton in 1999 was \$31,074—55% of the county average household income of \$56,612. (The higher percentage for household income reflects the city’s higher average household size.)

Available jobs in Trenton continue to pay lower wages than in the surrounding county, but the wage gap was much smaller than the income gap, suggesting that many of the higher-paying jobs were likely held by commuters living outside the city or county workers have higher-paying jobs outside the county e.g., NYC. The average annual wage for a Trenton job in 1989 was 80% of the average wage for a job in the county as a whole—approximately \$22,000, compared with \$27,000 for a job in the county. By 1999, the average city job paid 82% of the wages of the average job in the county. The average annual wage was \$33,500 in the city and \$41,000 in the county.

Table 20: Income and Wages in Trenton and Mercer County, 1989-1999

		Mercer County	Trenton	Percent of County
Family Income (1999)		\$88,017	\$36,681	41.7%
Per Capita Income	1989	\$18,936	\$11,018	58.2%
	1999	\$27,910	\$14,621	52.4%
	% increase	47.4%	32.7%	
Household Income	1989	\$41,227	\$25,719	62.4%
	1999	\$56,612	\$31,074	54.9%
	% increase	37.3%	20.8%	
Annual Wage	1989	\$27,063	\$21,760	80.4%
	1999	\$40,903	\$33,378	81.6%
	% increase	51.1%	53.4%	

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, NJ Dept. of Labor

Labor Force

Table 21 shows the average annual labor force in Trenton and Mercer County in 1990 and 2000. In 2000, there was a total of 40,890 residents of working age in Trenton, an increase of 173 from the 1990 level of 40,717, at a very slow growth rate of 0.4%. The labor force in Mercer County as a whole also rose; by 3,576, or 2.1%. Predictably, the labor force percentage of Trenton compared to the entire county almost evenly matched the percentage of the total population, which was 23.5%.

Table 21: Labor Force in Mercer County and Trenton, 1990-2000

	1990	2000	# change	% change	% of county total (2000)
City	40,717	40,890	173	0.4%	23.5%
County	170,758	174,334	3,576	2.1%	100.0%

Source: NJ Department of Labor

Table 22 depicts two indicators of employed residents (labor force): industry and occupation. By industry, city residents lead in the less-skilled industries such as construction and transportation, while county residents lead in higher-paying industries such as professional, administration & scientific and finance, insurance & real estate. Trenton also leads in public administration, which in this table does not include state government due to the statistical inability to report state government employment and labor force.

Occupation shows a more varied picture between city and county. 43% of the county labor force is in the management/professional occupation group, while only 22% of the city labor force is. As a corollary, 14% of the county labor force is in the service occupations, while 26% of the city's labor force works in service occupations.

Table 22: Labor Force by Industry and Occupation

	BY INDUSTRY			BY OCCUPATION		
		employed private sector labor force, #	employed private sector labor force, %		employed private sector labor force, #	employed private sector labor force, %
City	TOTAL	32,470	100.0%	TOTAL	32,470	100.0%
	Agriculture	99	0.3%			
	Construction	1,929	5.9%	Management/Professional	6,980	21.5%
	Manufacturing	2,993	9.2%	Service	8,390	25.8%
	Trade	3,894	12.0%	Sales and Office	8,973	27.6%
	Transportation & Related	1,774	5.5%	Farming and Forestry	99	0.3%
	Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	1,436	4.4%	Construction, Extraction, and Maintenance	2,731	8.4%
	Professional, Information, Scientific, Admin, etc.	4,300	13.2%	Production, Material Moving & Transportation	5,297	16.3%
	Services	11,682	36.0%			
	Public Administration	4,363	13.4%			
County	TOTAL	166,647	100.0%	TOTAL	166,647	100.0%
	Agriculture	462	0.3%			
	Construction	7,693	4.6%	Management/Professional	72,043	43.2%
	Manufacturing	15,990	9.6%	Service	23,887	14.3%
	Trade	20,063	12.0%	Sales and Office	44,165	26.5%
	Transportation & Related	6,414	3.8%	Farming and Forestry	266	0.2%
	Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	13,272	8.0%	Construction, Extraction, and Maintenance	10,118	6.1%
	Professional, Information, Scientific, Admin, etc.	28,447	17.1%	Production, Material Moving & Transportation	16,168	9.7%
	Services	56,977	34.2%			
	Public Administration	17,329	10.4%			

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

3.3) Economic Revitalization Alternatives

RPP undertook a literature search focusing on urban revitalization within a regional context. We found some examples of this regional approach although most of the revitalization described was centered on small-scale developments (e.g., baseball stadiums, new high rise apartments, etc.) By recognizing the regional economic engines of a metropolitan area, applying economic modeling, and developing strategies it is possible to redirect some growth into struggling cities. This approach requires a combination of the right large and small-scale projects as well as a regional mindset in problem solving.

In urban development, localized strategies on a regional scale can be placed in two categories: infrastructure and fiscal. While infrastructure development focuses on changing the character of a particular urban location using regional financial resources, fiscal development seeks to change the entire economic relationship between a city and its ex-urban environs. While urban revitalization projects have been completed throughout the United States, only a handful have been successful as either a component of or inspiration for a larger economic plan.

Infrastructure: Waterfront Redevelopment

Most waterfront revitalization strategies are isolated in their scope. They are completed with the single purpose of changing the potentially most valuable space of the city. On the other hand, some waterfront projects are mindful of the regional economic scene and allow for a greater "spurring-off" effect in economic investment. While it is widely understood that waterfront property can be both aesthetically pleasing and profitable, few cities have used this type of development to attract a regional market. Most waterfront cities, like Camden, Baltimore or Boston, have attempted to create a tourist destination with varying degrees of success. Yet, not all urban areas are suited for the "entertainment destination" label.

A large part of Jersey City's revitalization efforts can be attributed to Newport, a 400-acre inner-city commercial zone along the waterfront that is poised for expansion. The desirability of this office space is due to the aesthetics of a waterfront along the Hudson River with the skyline of Manhattan in view. Several financial companies, like PaineWebber and Charles Schwab, have invested large sums of capital through new waterfront office towers. The waterfront area has been almost the sole location of Jersey City redevelopment with more than 6.6 million square feet of modern corporate office space added since the mid-1980s. Presently, Sam and Richard LeFrak, Newport's original developers, are seeking to add 2 million square feet of office space to the area. The success of the Jersey City waterfront can be attributed to an understanding of the local market: big-name financial conglomerations. By capitalizing on Manhattan's office space shortage, the struggling city can attract more firms from this market.

The city of Wilmington has also capitalized on its riverfront location with beautification and economically rewarding strategies. The opening of Riverfront Park and the First USA Riverfront Arts Center in 1998 have rejuvenated waterfront activity for both leisure and work. The city was the first in the state of Delaware to take advantage of the Financial Center Development Act, passed in 1981. The law encourages national banking and financial service companies to put their headquarters in the state with looser banking restrictions on items such as closed end credit and loans. At the same time, small banks in the area are protected by preventing out-of-state holding companies from buying more than 5 percent of voting shareholding stock in local Delaware banks.¹ Between 1992 and 1997, the new employers in Wilmington were depository & non-depository institutions and business services, creating over 14,000 jobs.² The new Christina River business zone has encouraged these new finance firms to mix with pre-existing cultural and entertainment attractions. Mixing land uses on waterfront property has created an economically viable atmosphere in Wilmington.

Infrastructure: Historic Preservation

Similar to waterfront strategies, historical preservation is often limited to one neighborhood in its economic effects. However, cities like Durham and Alexandria have used preservation principles to create new and attractive areas of regional commerce. Utilization of a city's urban appeal can help in drawing specific businesses and firms of the "new economy," especially young, high--tech companies. Thus, historic preservation has proven especially effective in today's high-growth regions.

Once known as the "City of Tobacco," holding more than twenty-five percent of the cigarette market during WWII, Durham, NC has been able to transform some of its former tobacco plants into modern office space. Since Durham County is in the advantageous position of holding 85 percent of the Research Triangle Park property, there has been a movement to remodel its symbols of the old industry. Today, Durham has re-nicknamed itself the "City of MERIT (Medicine, Education, Research, Industry and Technology) to highlight its economic strengths as the home to Duke University.³ The Brightleaf Square project symbolizes Durham's successful economic changeover. Two adjoining tobacco warehouses dating to the turn of the century were recently converted for mixed-use development.⁴ In addition to offering numerous retail and dining outlets, the square houses a number of professional firms including law offices and small design companies.⁵ The American Tobacco Historic District project, currently in progress, has also been successful in luring regional economic powerhouses like Duke University into a renovated tobacco warehouse.⁶ This project is slightly more ambitious in its intention to create a large-scale center city development. In Durham, historic preservation has served as a means towards a regional end.

¹ "The Financial Center Development Act." Passed by Delaware State Legislature, 1981.

² *Strategies for Success*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. January 2001. 97-101.

³ "Bullish on Durham." North Carolina Citizens for Business and Industry. 1998-2001.

⁴ "Cities of the Triangle."

⁵ Brightleaf Square website. www.brightleafsq.citysearch.com

⁶ "Bullish on Durham."

In pursuing a larger share of the Washington-area economy, the city of Alexandria's unique historic atmosphere lends itself well. Alexandria is a rare example of a small and aging eastern city that has experienced steady growth over the past two decades. Since 1980, the city has grown by nearly 25 percent to reach a 2000 population level of 128,000.⁷ In the past twelve years the city has nearly doubled its number of jobs to 82,000 and more than tripled its amount of occupied commercial office space to 15 million square feet.⁸ This is an unusual pattern for an old city in a metropolitan area that is rapidly expanding, both residentially and economically, on its semi-rural edges in Virginia and Maryland. The new logo for the Alexandria Economic Development Partnership is a picture of George Washington winking, supposedly because his actual presidential offices were in the port city.⁹ This attitude is highlighted by the historic waterfront neighborhood of Old Town, which has been enjoying an economic rebirth and luring Washington-based firms for more than two decades.

Unlike the nearby high-rise districts of Rosslyn and Crystal City, the Old Town neighborhood uses its unique features to attract regional businesses. Both historical (red brick sidewalks, strict building height & design guidelines) and modern-day (good subway, highway and airport access) features have made the area desirable for both residents and businesses. The city successfully used federal urban renewal money in the 1960s to preserve and accentuate its historical integrity.¹⁰ As a result, Old Town has recently been able to lure firms from both traditional service industries and the "New Economy," providing Alexandria with one of the highest concentrations of high-tech firms in the already hot Northern Virginia market.¹¹

Infrastructure: Niche Districting

The notion of niche districting is an economic strategy that tries to place firms or businesses of similar types into one designated, geographic region. In the downtown city this method works on a small scale. Some organizations and economic development groups have taken the extra step to apply this focused strategy with consideration given to the popular economic engines of the city or region. If certain industries are strategically placed in certain parts of the region, they can be beneficial to all area residents.

Only recently has the city of Columbus been able to effectively use regional economic tools for its own benefit. With growing service and high-tech sectors, the capital city continues to rely heavily on the manufacturing industry. The Honda automobile corporation is the area's largest employer with over 13,000 employees, most working at the auto plant in suburban Marysville.¹² The taxing system of the state of

⁷ U.S. Census Bureau.

⁸ Alexandria Economic Development Partnership.

⁹ Alexandria Economic Development Partnership.

¹⁰ Bates, Steve. "The Patriarch of Planning." *The Washington Post*. 13 May 1993. p V1.

¹¹ Alexandria Economic Development Partnership.

¹² "Business Guide: Manufacturing." Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce. [Online] Available. <http://www.columbus.org/business/manufacturing.html>. 12 June 2001.

Ohio has encouraged a greater necessity for regional co-operation between Columbus and surrounding Franklin County. Personal income taxes are paid to the municipality where one works and property taxes directly fund the local schools.¹³ Thus, the tax revenues brought in by commercial, job-oriented projects make that development more desirable than residential or public ventures for a local government.

Both the nearby centers of suburban Dublin and downtown Columbus have capitalized on a driving regional economy. Without a major university or research facility, Dublin has developed into a commercial center with a daytime working population of 65,000 (compared to its 35,000 residents). By actively maintaining a 50-50 balance of residential and commercial development, the city has been able to raise more than \$40 million in annual tax revenue. Dublin has benefited from highway access and recognition of its image.¹⁴ On the other end of the regional spectrum, the city of Columbus has been successful in attracting and retaining regional industries. Through downtown revitalization, tax abatement and venture capital strategies, Columbus has re-made itself a desirable capital city for business.¹⁵

The city of Columbus and various local organizations have utilized the notion of the "niche district" in order to attract certain types of economic development to different areas. For example, through a neighborhood economic development group, the Downtown South area of the city has reinvented its image as an attractive center for small high-tech and design firms.¹⁶ Regional firms like DesignGroup and JII Sales Promotion Associates have been influenced to move all or some of their office operation to this relatively new business district. Businesses are attracted to innovative historic rehabilitation projects and the chance to be located next to firms in similar types of work. A model development is The Schmidt Complex, a former auto dealership that is being converted to office space wired for direct internet access.¹⁷ In addition to Downtown South, Columbus has a number of commercial-oriented neighborhoods that have thrived through "niche" marketing such as the Brewery District (restaurants and retail) and the Arena District (a mixed-use entertainment center). Through these areas, the city of Columbus is able to entice businesses of different types that would otherwise locate in the suburbs.

The distressed city of Detroit has discovered a unique industry to match with certain neighborhood locations: gambling. In 1996, Proposal E was passed, legalizing casino gambling in the city of Detroit. Proposal E was approved to allow for temporary casinos in order to bring much needed capital to Detroit. The casinos have or will be brought to only two specific neighborhoods of the city: Corktown (where two exist already) and the waterfront. The city felt that it was already losing its citizens' spending to the nearby

¹³ Stevens, Mike. Economic Development Director, City of Dublin, Ohio. [Personal Interview] 31 May 2001.

¹⁴ Stevens, Mike.

¹⁵ Rittner, Toby. Economic Development Coordinator, Franklin County, Ohio. [Personal Interview] 30 May 2001.

¹⁶ Schmidt, Dan. Director, Downtown South, Inc. (Columbus) [Personal Interview] 4 June 2001.

¹⁷ Wright, Steve. "Columbus' Innovation District for the 21st Century." Downtown South. [Online] Available. 19 January 2001.

casinos of Windsor, Canada. The law explicitly states that casino tax revenue is to be used to fund specific city services including the police force, public safety initiatives and youth development programs. Detroit has chosen to focus the funds on improving city schools with the tax revenues adding to the per pupil expenditure.¹⁸ While little spin-off activity has occurred in the neighborhoods' bars, restaurants and other facilities, the casino presence has created much-needed jobs for local residents. Since the casinos have been open for less than two years, more time is needed to demonstrate if this niche market has made a significant difference.

Fiscal: Marketing Campaigns

Oftentimes, non-profit development groups spring up in urban centers to emphasize the economic strengths of their city or region. Through several channels, these business promotion groups seek to both attract and retain business to their area. This process can be especially difficult in distressed urban centers where businesses have incentives to relocate to the suburbs or another metropolitan area. Consolidated marketing campaigns draw businesses into the city through innovative and consistent promotion. Usually, they serve best as a stepping stone towards long-term revitalization strategies.

Recognizing its geographic centrality in the United States, economic promoters of the Kansas City region took a different approach in marketing. In 1998, the International Alliance convened a "Going Global" conference in the city among existing coalitions such as the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, Mid-America Regional Council, local government representatives, business groups, trade associations, higher learning institutions and federal agencies. The expressed purpose of this summit was to create a unified economic direction for the Kansas City area that emphasized participation in the global economy.¹⁹ This goal would be realized through a local-to-global economic approach involving the tourism and international trade industries. The Kansas City Economic Advisory Board was formed as a cross-company regional group to monitor and provide advice concerning the area economy.²⁰ In addition, the board has used the REMI economic modeling program (see below) to predict the future sectors of economic growth. Finding high forecasted growth in services, specifically the medical and recreation sectors, the Kansas City region understands how to market its present and future economic resources.²¹

The Wilmington Renaissance Corporation (WRC) has been hailed as a successful public-private partnership in promoting downtown and neighborhood economic development. Led by a board of directors consisting of interested Wilmington leaders, the WRC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that partners with both political and business figures.²² Instead of spearheading new tourism projects like a sports stadium or

¹⁸ Puls, Mark and Judy DeHaven. "Detroiters Still Waiting for Casino Jackpot." *The Detroit News*. 23 July 2000.

¹⁹ *Reflections on Regionalism*. Brookings Institution. 2001.

²⁰ Walker, W. Earl. Chair, Kansas City Economic Advisory Board. [Letter] April 2001.

²¹ Walker, W. Earl.

²² Wilmington Renaissance Corporation.

arena, the WRC has instead led a project to expand the existing Grand Opera House. The \$3.8 million addition will provide new entertainment and office space as well as an art gallery. The corporation also realizes the importance of luring Wilmington's most popular companies: financial institutions.²³ Understanding the desirability of the waterfront area and Wilmington's recognition as a financial capital, the WRC has helped to bring two new financial institutions, Wilmington Trust and MBNA, to the city's downtown.

Fiscal: Using the Regional Market

Regional markets focusing on specific industries have produced highly successful results in many suburban communities throughout the United States. Suburban communities have easily been able to lure businesses with proximity to urban centers and available land. As a result, cities have found it difficult to attract area business. Yet, some urban centers have used unique techniques, such as public-private partnerships and economic development groups, to help redirect or foster the regional market.

On a large regional scale, the city of Richmond, Virginia has tapped into an existing area market, utilizing its advantageous position between the Washington, D.C. and Research Park economic powerhouses. The distressed capital city had not been able to benefit from the concentration of software firms and defense contractors in the nearby regions. Then in 1998, Richmond was able to persuade Virginia Tech, in the western Virginia town of Blacksburg, to open a new engineering school through Richmond's own Virginia Commonwealth University. The telecommunications company Motorola-Siemans assisted in funding the project with the intention of opening a product development facility in Richmond.²⁴ The Virginia Biotechnology Research Park, opened in 1996 by the Commonwealth of Virginia accompanied the university project. With nearly 100 percent occupancy of its existing buildings, the complex will eventually provide 1.5 to 1.9 million square feet of research, laboratory and office space with more than 3,000 working professionals.²⁵ This professional infrastructure is intended to complement Washington's federal agencies and Research Triangle Park's R&D facilities.

The city of Alexandria, VA has taken advantage of two regional markets of the Washington, D.C. area. In addition to one of the highest concentrations of high-tech firms, Alexandria is the fourth largest center for trade and professional organization in the U.S. Only the larger cities of Washington, New York and Chicago rank higher.²⁶ This status can be credited not only to the city's proximity to the nation's capital, but also to the activities of interested parties. The highly effective Alexandria Economic Development Partnership has been luring many organizations to Alexandria with lower rent costs and a historical urban character. It is home to over 300 trade and professional

²³ *Strategies for Success.*

²⁴ Cohen, Natalie. *Business Location Decision-Making and the Cities: Bringing Companies Back.* Brookings Institution. April 2000. 17.

²⁵ Virginia Biotechnology Research Park website. <http://www.vabiotech.com>

²⁶ Alexandria Economic Development Partnership.

organizations, including the National Society of Professional Engineers, the National Business Travel Association and the American Society for Training and Development.²⁷ Thus, organizations and firms that require proximity to the nation's capital can utilize the economic advantages of having their offices in nearby Alexandria.

With the development of Windsor, Canada and Detroit, MI, as two nearby cities with legalized gambling, the area is starting to create a regional gaming market. While the gambling industry has usually been oriented around one city or specific destination, in the Detroit-Windsor area it is a \$2 billion regional market (surpassing the \$1.2 billion initial estimation). Detroit's first two casinos, MGM Grand and MotorCity Casino, and Windsor's gambling network, including a \$350-million permanent establishment, have created an entertainment center.²⁸ Similar to popular gambling destinations such as Atlantic City and Las Vegas, the addition of more casinos creates a greater sense of a tourist destination.

In 2000, the Hartford-Springfield Economic Partnership (HSEP) was formed to establish a forum for interstate cooperation in marketing and public policy between the nearby cities of Hartford, CT and Springfield, MA. These two small urban centers have fallen victim to urban decay and population loss over the past few decades. The HSEP has created a region out of the two cities called "New England's Knowledge Corridor: Gateway to Innovation." The approach is to build on an existing market of research & development and high-tech companies by capitalizing on regional strengths: over 20 universities and colleges with a metropolitan population of 1.6 million.²⁹ Its central location between the Boston and New York metro areas is also a highlight. This particular partnership is unique in its willingness to cross state lines to promote a regional economy. The results of this particular regional economic co-operative have yet to be seen.

In order to create a more economically viable urban center, the Jacksonville, Florida metropolitan area has taken a geographically targeted incentive approach. The city, and adjoining Duval County, serve as the center of a six-county metropolitan region. The mayor of Jacksonville has declared that no development incentives will be given in areas that are already thriving economically.³⁰ The Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce has set up a list of "target industries" that are suited to the region and have the potential for expansion. The six identified economic sectors are aviation/aerospace, pharmaceuticals/biotechnology, information technology, microelectronics and automotive parts.³¹ To attract these industries, the Qualified Targeted Industries Tax Refund (QTI) was set up by the state to provide a maximum \$3,000 refund per new job to "target businesses" that have relocated to certain distressed areas of the region. The City of Jacksonville/Duval

²⁷ Alexandria Economic Development Partnership.

²⁸ Puls, Mark and Judy DeHaven.

²⁹ Hartford-Springfield Economic Partnership.

³⁰ Raleigh, Decklan. Director of Business Development. Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce. [Personal Interview] 14 June 2001.

³¹ Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce.

has set up a series of its own fiscal incentives including tax increment grants to projects within an "economic development target area."³²

Fiscal: Attracting Corporate Headquarters

In the new service-oriented economy, a corporate headquarters is one of the most desirable economic acquisitions for a distressed urban center in a growing region. Regional economic modeling reveals that major employment centers, such as headquarters, can spur activity in additional economic sectors. Corporate headquarters can also contribute to positive name recognition and the creation of a regional market by establishing a safer fiscal market. In terms of the city-suburb relationship, the relocation of a headquarters to an urban center helps to create a market from the inside out.

In the early 1970s, Johnson & Johnson built a new world headquarters on the corner of Albany and George Streets in the rapidly deteriorating city of New Brunswick. This development resulted in additional city investment and a development corporation (New Brunswick Development Corporation). An Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) was secured for the amount of \$6 million to construct New Brunswick's first hotel and conference center, the Hyatt Regency. Since that time, the city of New Brunswick has seen a number of high-profile projects including Civic Square, New Jersey's first privately funded municipal complex, and several mixed-use projects like Kilmer Square and Liberty Plaza.³³ All of this economic re-investment has been attributed to Johnson & Johnson's significant interest and activity in building an economically viable environment.

Since 1993, the city of Rochester, MN, with a population of around 110,000, has landed on Money Magazine's list of "Best Places to Live" no less than five times among the nation's mid-size cities.³⁴ Analysts point to Rochester's ability over the last two decades to attract economic growth through downtown revitalization efforts and a working tax increment financing policy (TIF). All new development in the area is funded or assisted by property tax revenue from recently constructed projects. Much of the economic boom has been attributed to housing one of the few national headquarters for the world-renowned Mayo Clinic, the nation's largest non-profit medical center. The Mayo Foundation has expressed interest in making Rochester an economically feasible center through funding projects such as a recent courthouse renovation and the continued expansion of its campus. Retail projects like the Barnes & Noble occupancy of the historic Chateau Theater and a planned, mixed-use "Times Square" project have made shopping in the city as popular as at the suburban malls.³⁵ In short, it has been the Mayo Clinic's commitment to Rochester that makes this city consistently "livable."

The city of Easton, Pennsylvania was once a manufacturing and industry center connected by canal boat to the Philadelphia and New York ports. Industrial relocation

³² Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce.

³³ New Brunswick Development Corporation.

³⁴ Fried, Carla. "Best Places to Live in America, Number 3: Rochester, Minn." *Money*. July 1996. 75.

³⁵ Schonsberg, Tamara. "Downtown Construction Expected to Continue..." *Post-Bulletin*. 6 July 1993.

out of American urban centers brought difficult times for the small city in the 1970s and 1980s. Currently, Easton has been able to stabilize its population near 26,000 and expand the number of local businesses.³⁶ This is largely attributed to Easton's retention of Binney & Smith's world headquarters, the manufacturers of Crayola crayons. In 1996, the company opened The Crayola Factory, an interactive "discovery" museum at the Two Rivers Landing cultural center, that also includes the National Canal Museum and National Heritage Corridor Visitor Center. Together, these attractions draw over 300,000 visitors a year to a downtown that would otherwise be neglected.³⁷ Easton is not limited to tourist attractions. The Crayola Factory center has attracted a number of other businesses to locate downtown including restaurants and art galleries. The city serves as a model of a former industrial center cut off from its region that has creatively revitalized through business retention and expansion of its most-prized financial resource.

Regional Economic Modeling

Identifying regional economic engines and sources of growth can be a difficult task. As a result, economists often use an economic model to understand the specifics of a region's economy. These models are differentiated by the results they produce, the methods used, the geographic size of the location and the scope of the economic profile. Modern economists have frequently adapted theoretical economic models into applicable computer software.

Economic-base analysis serves as the most primary theoretical model for understanding the regional economy. First, all regional industries must be separated into two categories. Basic industries are those that export out of the region; non-basic industries produce or distribute for regional consumption. The model values basic industries higher because they bring capital into the regional economy and are responsible for the most "spurring-off" in economic activity. Multipliers are used to show how one particular employer affects the basic and non-basic sectors with indirect increases in jobs, income and other indicators.³⁸ While the economic-base model is successful in industry classification and identification, it lacks the geographic capacity to describe intra-regional economics. Questions about the economic difference between cities and suburbs remain unanswered by it.

Mix-and-share analysis is a useful economic model in relating the regional and national economies. This model uses employment as the main identifier between these two economies. Regional changes in employment over time can be determined as the sum of three effects: the national growth effect, industry mix and regional share of national employment in each economic sector. The national growth effect describes the change in employment at that level. Industry mix is the distribution of employment in "faster" and "slower" growing economic sectors of the region.³⁹ Mix-and-share analysis

³⁶ U.S. Census.

³⁷ Binney & Smith.

³⁸ Kaiser, Edward J., David R. Godschalk and F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. *Urban Land Use Planning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995. 4th Edition. 150-151.

³⁹ Bendavid-Val, Avrom. *Regional & Local Economic Analysis for Practitioners*. New York: Praeger

also proves to have intra-regional limitations, but it is useful when comparing a region to the national state of the economy.

The simplistic efficiency of input-output modeling has made it the most desirable method for computer software and modern economic analysis. When adapted correctly, the model can be very data-compatible and user-friendly. The basic principle of the input-output approach is that invested, distributed or produced capital of one industrial sector affects more than one additional sector of the region. Whereas the economic-base model uses only two general categories for specific companies, input-output modeling can classify dozens of industrial sectors.⁴⁰ It is widely applied for specific projects and their economic impact on the region, such as sports stadiums or military bases. At the most primary level, the input-output model is a series of capital transaction tables between the identified industrial sectors.⁴¹ Usually, the sectors are adapted to an existing classification system with data, such as the information published by federal and state labor departments. This circumstance has allowed the input-output model to be easily translated into numerous computer-modeling programs.

Economists at Rutgers University have developed two computerized input-output models to service different economic inquiries. The first, a version of the privately copyrighted REMI (Regional Economic Modeling, Inc.) model, uses aggregated economic sectors that classify several companies into one large group. While the data and results of this model tend not to be very detailed, the REMI model is useful in making economic predictions for large geographic regions. Using a national data baseline for income, jobs and other factors, Rutgers' REMI model can predict regional trends for up to 35 years in the future.⁴² In addition, Rutgers has developed another input-output model called R/Econ which includes over 500 detailed sectors of the economy. The most desirable geographic size is a county and the model has mostly been used to show the effects of individual projects. R/Econ is useful in determining how important an individual industry or specific development is to the region of concern.⁴³ It closely follows the "ripple effect" as an individual addition, loss or retention in the region affects each sector of the economy.

The federal government has produced one of the more widely used input-output models with RIMS2 (Regional Input-Output Modeling System). Originally created in the 1970's by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), the RIMS model has been modified and re-evaluated several times. Because the federal government uses it, a wealth of data on both the national and regional levels is available. As one of the least expensive economic models available on the market, RIMS2 is also workable at the county level. Using various multipliers, such as employment and

Publishers, 1991. 67-68.

⁴⁰ Maki, Wilbur R. and Richard W. Lichty. *Urban Regional Economics*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 2000. 238-239.

⁴¹ Maki, Wilbur R. and Richard W. Lichty. 239.

⁴² Greenberg, Michael. Professor of Urban Studies. Rutgers University. [Personal Interview] 6 June 2001.

⁴³ Lahr, Michael. Assistant Professor, Center for Urban Policy and Research. Rutgers University. [Personal Interview] 6 June 2001.

earnings, it produces similar numerical results to Rutgers' models.⁴⁴ The major distinguishing feature of the RIMS2 model is its universality.

Additional computer applications of the input-output model can be found in various economic research agencies throughout the country. The Minnesota IMPLAN Group's IMPLANPro is a variation on the popular REMI model that is marketed to the firms and agencies in their particular state.⁴⁵ Research organizations such as the Upjohn Institute in Kalamazoo, Michigan use modeling as part of their economic research. Cities or regions in the area may contract out research work to the institute to produce model-based reports.⁴⁶ These different adaptations of input-output modeling help to keep more regions interested in promoting and predicting their economic futures.

⁴⁴ *Regional Multipliers*. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. March 1997. 1-2.

⁴⁵ Minnesota IMPLAN Group, Inc.

⁴⁶ Upjohn Institute.

3.4) Range of Potential Growth Targets

RPP prepared a range of potential growth targets for the Urban Growth Targets Charrette. The potential targets were developed from:

- **historical data** from Mercer County Planning Department (on the historical peak population for Trenton),
- **current population and employment** information from the Census 2000 and Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) respectively,
- **trend projections** from the Department of Transportation (DOT) and DVRPC,
- **various development plans projections** including - Trenton's 1990 Land Use Plan (when built-out as calculated by RPP's GOZ[®] model – see section 2.4.3 for methodology), and the State Plan as calculated by the Center for Urban Policy Research,
- **Trend Shift[©] projections** developed by RPP based on two scenarios – one where trend is shifted according to State Plan planning area goals and the second where the assumptions of the B.I.G. map are used to modify State Plan planning area goals (see section 2.4.2 for methodology and Appendix 3 for calculations).

Other relevant information such as vacancy rates and availability of parks was also provided. Where possible, information on Trenton was compared to similar data for Mercer County. The range of urban growth targets and other data are shown in Table 23.

Table 23		POTENTIAL URBAN GROWTH TARGETS		
	TRENTON		MERCER COUNTY	
	Population	Employment	Population	Employment
HISTORICAL (1950)	128,009 (peak)		229,781 (2/3 current)	
CURRENT (Census 2000), DVRPC	85,403	62,700	360,761	236,650
TREND				
DOT (2025)	81,850	60,000	390,800	269,900
DVRPC (2020)	91,883	66,483	388,454	277,247
DEVELOPMENT PLANS (INCREMENT)				
Trenton 1999 Land Use Plan (30% redevelopment mixed use, industrial)	14,501	49,172	n/a	n/a
CUPR (2020)	14,844	23,051		
Trend Shift [©] SDRP (2020)	13,125	23,624		
Trend Shift [©] BIG Map (2020)	23,010	26,250		

VACANCY RATES	TRENTON	MERCER COUNTY
Housing (Census 2000)	13.10%	5.60%
Office (2002 SITAR)	unavailable	11.80%
PARK @ 8 acres/ 1000 residents	401 acre shortfall have 279 acres	have twice the OSP standard 5,644 acres

3.5) Trenton's Capacity for Growth

For the most part there is plenty of growth capacity in Trenton's physical infrastructure, including good access to fiber optic cable. In addition, with the South Jersey Light Rail Line due to open next year, active discussions are taking place about expanding transit services in the City. Although there are a few specific areas of the City that experience flooding or need new pipes, and there are some circulation problems from closed sections of the street grid, Trenton's "gray" infrastructure is more than adequate for even ambitious growth targets.

Trenton's "green" infrastructure capacity (air and water quality, open space, street trees, etc.), however, presents a more complex picture. We know from RPP's Green Links Project that Trenton has an active street tree program and is making progress creating the Assunpink Greenway. But air quality in the City and water quality on the Assunpink Creek do not meet federal standards, and although Trenton has an award-winning brownfields clean up program, it appears that no coalition has been formed to solve its water and air pollution problems. Water quality in Trenton can be significantly improved by local action, whereas air quality is a regional problem.

An important finding of the Urban Growth Targets Project is that there is a need to create opportunities to improve water quality, reduce flooding and increase transportation choice (auto travel, transit, biking, walking) as redevelopment in Trenton moves ahead.

In transportation, there are two Transit Oriented Design projects proposed for the City: one around the Northeast Corridor Train Station and one around the South Jersey Light Rail stop that is under construction. In addition, the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation is planning a comprehensive jitney study, to help people access transit services. The City has also hired transportation consultants, Nelson Nygaard Inc., to update the Transportation Master Plan.

On water issues, NJDEP's regulations do require developers to undertake certain prescribed actions to protect water quality and offer flood protections. But our study of Trenton indicates that these are currently insufficient to protect water quality in cities. As for more effective or more innovative strategies to pursue water resource protection, the City has received funding from EPA Region 2 to work on identifying redevelopment techniques that would improve water quality (e.g., rain gardens or roof gardens, relatively inexpensive techniques used rarely in this country but extensively in German cities and elsewhere to capture rain water and recharge it.)

In our interviews with officials who were trying to attract development to Trenton, we found that they feel so disadvantaged, that they welcomed almost any development they could get. If we suggested adding a goal to these projects, such as improving water quality as they were built, the officials felt that they could not add more costs to what were already risky ventures.

Interestingly, developers we interviewed took a more pragmatic view. They felt that it was because building in cities was so expensive, that they could consider such goals – adding a rain garden would be such a small portion of the overall project cost.

Details on the City’s gray and green infrastructure capacity are provided below.

A) Gray Infrastructure

Sanitary sewers

Trenton’s sewer utility has more capacity than do those of most of its suburbs. Moreover, the utility has far more capacity per square mile in its service area than any of the suburban systems, and far more capacity per undeveloped square mile. This is true even if developed and environmentally constrained suburban land is taken out.

Table 24 shows the capacities of sewer treatment plants in Mercer County. Note that this table shows only the capacity of the treatment plants, not the capacity of sewer pipes. An interview with Trenton Sewer Utility officials suggested that, while insufficient pipe capacity for redevelopment exists in localized areas, the system is not in need of substantial repairs or upgrades and has generally been well-maintained.

Table 24: Mercer County Sewer Utility Capacities, 1999
(millions of gallons per day)

Sewer Utility	Permit capacity (mgd)	Available capacity (mgd)	Total sq mi in service area	Capacity per sq mi (mgd)	Undeveloped sq mi in service area	Capacity per undeveloped sq mi (mgd)
East Windsor Municipal Utilities Authority	3.35	0.85	9.25	0.09	3.35	0.25
Ewing-Lawrence Sewerage Authority	16.00	5.37	43.55	0.12	10.90	0.49
Hamilton Twp. Water Pollution Control Division	16.00	6.50	37.02	0.18	9.05	0.72
Hightstown Borough Wastewater Treatment Plant	1.00	0.30	1.58	0.19	0.14	2.12
SBRSA - Aunt Molly Road Plant	0.30	0.10	0.70	0.14	0.10	1.01
SBRSA - Pennington Plant	0.30	0.01	0.98	0.01	9.05	0.00
SBRSA - River Road Plant	11.70	2.04	29.54	0.07	5.79	0.35
Trenton Sewer Utility	20.00	7.00	7.63	0.92	0.46	15.17

Source: Sewer Utilities

Storm sewers

In an interview, Trenton Sewer Utility officials asserted that the city faces little threat from combined sewer overflow (CSO) events. While most storm sewers were separated from the sanitary sewer system in the 1960s and 1970s, a 500-acre area of combined sewers remains, mainly in Chambersburg and South Trenton. To handle a combined sewer overflow, the Sewer Utility constructed a 20-million-gallon detention basin above its discharge point into the Delaware River. With the basin in use, the city experiences less than one CSO discharge into the river each year.

Parts of the city experience flooding on a regular basis, particularly along the Assunpink Creek near Mulberry Street. The city is undertaking the Assunpink Creek Greenway project in conjunction with the county and US Army Corps of Engineers to

mitigate this flooding problem by converting impervious surface near the creek into parkland.

In other areas, storm sewers overflow from time to time. An engineering analysis would be needed to determine the cost of correcting the problems leading to these overflows.

In older, highly urban areas, redevelopment can offer opportunities for improving stormwater management. Replacing existing impervious surfaces with porous surfaces and the use of green roofs and walls are recommended Best Management Practices for reducing stormwater in urban redevelopment situations. (Source: Best Management Practices for Control of Nonpoint Source Pollution from Stormwater 5th Draft, NJ Department of Environmental Protection). Trenton already contains one structure with a green roof—a parking garage located near the State House—and a park is being proposed by the NJ Department of Transportation for the roof of the Route 29 tunnel.

Water supply

In 1999, the Trenton Water Utility served 22,000 city customers, in addition to nearly 50,000 customers in surrounding townships. The filtration plant, located on the Delaware River, has the ability to serve 30,000 additional customers, meaning that the city's ability to supply clean water to additional development is "essentially unlimited". (Source: City of Trenton Land Use Plan, 1999).

Streets, highways, and transit

Unlike most of the rest of Mercer County, the City of Trenton has a block street network, which gives it the ability to adapt readily to changes in land use as well as to accommodate many small uses in close proximity to one another. As with many cities, deferred maintenance has resulted in familiar problems such as potholes.

Also, the city has only a few broad thoroughfares capable of moving large amounts of vehicular traffic within an urban framework. Instead, narrower streets such as State, Warren, Calhoun, Lamberton, and others must fulfill this task in much of the city. Nevertheless, the resulting streetscapes give the city an urban feel that does not exist elsewhere in Mercer County or in many surrounding counties.

The city experiences a lack of connectivity at key points. For example, the Amtrak rail line is a barrier between the downtown and eastern and southern neighborhoods, including the arena area. Aside from Broad Street, there are no major thoroughfares connecting the city's key points (such as downtown, Cadwalader Park, the Roebling Complex, and the baseball stadium), or connecting the south side to the west side.

The city's three major highways are generally free of heavy congestion, though their capacity and potential for expansion are limited. In any case, it is not clear that the surface streets could withstand a substantial increase in traffic that could result from a major highway expansion. Route 29 acts as a barrier between the city and its Delaware

River waterfront, especially between the downtown area and the river. Acting as a major thoroughfare, it cuts its way along the entire city parallel to the river, making it hard for pedestrian access to go to and from the area with its many existing and planned attractions.

A number of traffic circulation studies are underway for the downtown section of Trenton. The studies seek to improve flow and provide data necessary for determining if Route 29 could be modified to a boulevard, thus providing greater access to the Delaware River waterfront. The city recognizes circulation within the city is complicated by one way streets and that gateways to the city need to be identified more clearly. However, no major areas of congestion currently exist within the city.

Trenton is served by Amtrak and NJ TRANSIT, which provide frequent service to a station on the edge of the downtown area. The train station is close to the Chambersburg, Greenwood-Hamilton, and Roebling Gateway areas, but lacks connections to these neighborhoods. In addition, SEPTA (SE Pennsylvania Transit Authority) connects the Trenton station to Philadelphia and local points south.

A light rail line will soon connect this station to points on the south side of the city and beyond to Bordentown, Burlington, and Camden. The line may be extended west to the Capital Complex, and potentially through the west side of Trenton to the airport. If the proposed extension is fully constructed, the light rail line will form a major axis connecting many currently isolated points within the city.

Bus lines converge on downtown from many points throughout the city and suburbs. NJ Transit lines 601 through 609 currently serve the city and connect it to the region.

Other alternatives to single occupant vehicle traffic include the “tow path” beside the Delaware and Raritan Canal which is used by pedestrians and bicyclists to commute to work. The city is also in the process of adding bike lanes to selected streets.

Brownfields Redevelopment

The City of Trenton has an aggressive, internationally recognized Brownfields Redevelopment program. The program was initiated in 1995 with four target sites. In six years the number of targeted sites has grown to nearly 100 with environmental remediation work begun or completed on 67 sites and 28 properties totaling 125 acres redeveloped or being redeveloped. Trenton is the only city in New Jersey to be designated a Brownfield Showcase Community by the EPA.

All of the 7.5 miles of the City of Trenton are included in the city’s Brownfield program. The city’s recognition of the importance of uncontaminated ground as a basic infrastructure requirement provides a strong basis for the success of its future redevelopment efforts.

B) Green Infrastructure

Air Quality

New Jersey is divided into four air quality regions under the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) program. Mercer County is included under the Northeast region. All of New Jersey is currently out of compliance with NAAQS requirements for ozone levels. The exceedance of NAAQS requirements is attributed to mobile sources, i.e., vehicle traffic, rather than manufacturing sources.

Data are available for Mercer County for two additional NAAQS parameters—nitrogen oxide and particulate matter. The data showed no exceedances for these standards in the previous five years. (Source: EPA Air Data Monitor Trends Report, 2002).

While the NAAQS requirement for ozone has been exceeded it does not follow that no further development should occur in Mercer County or Trenton. Rather, new development should be designed to promote transportation alternatives to the single occupant vehicle. Redevelopment opportunities in Trenton exist that could improve air quality by providing housing near train or transit stations, reducing the need for car use.

Open Space

Trenton currently contains 279 acres of parks and open space. (Source: Trenton Department of Parks and Recreation personal interview.) The largest city park is the eighty acre Cadwalader Park in the West Ward. In contrast, Mercer County contains 5,644 acres of parks and open space (Source: NJDEP GIS layer 2001). The largest county park is Mercer County Park at 2,482 acres. A comparison of open space acreage per 100 residents reveals Trenton to have 0.3 acres of open space per 100 residents while Mercer County has 1.6 acres of open space per 100 residents. Mercer county has twice the minimum amount of park/residents OSP recommends (8 acres/1,000 residents) while Trenton does not meet the minimum.

Trenton has the potential to capitalize on three waterways within its borders: the Delaware River, Delaware and Raritan Canal, and Assunpink Creek. The City is currently negotiating the remediation of lands along the Assunpink Creek to add an additional 90 acre linear park to its open space holdings. Daylighting (removing the concrete cover) part of the Assunpink Creek in downtown Trenton is also being explored by the City.

The Delaware and Raritan Canal provides public access along its banks, however, within the city (unlike within the county) the path is disconnected in places. Transportation Improvement Plan funding has been allocated to improve pedestrian connections along the Canal before 2005.

Biodiversity

Trenton contains three small wetlands—the largest of these is located on a series of islands in the Delaware River. The two other areas total less than two acres with one area located in a city park near Mulberry Avenue and one located at the city's southernmost

border with Hamilton Township. These wetlands are the only areas of significance identified for Trenton by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection's (NJDEP) Landscape Project. (The Landscape Project identifies priority landscapes based on the presence of threatened or endangered species.)

Mercer County contains over 3,000 acres of wetlands. NJDEP's Landscape Project identifies areas of significance for wetlands, forests and grasslands within the county.

However, Trenton recognizes that through redevelopment efforts it can restore biodiversity in the city by reintroducing lost wetlands and other ecotones. Reintroduction of wetlands is part of the NJ Department of Transportation mitigation package related to the construction of the Route 29 tunnel. The city also currently implements a street tree planting program to provide natural habitat within the city and Isles Inc. operates a community garden program throughout the city with ten gardens currently maintained.

Stream Water Quality

According to the EPA's 303d list and NJDEP's Impaired Streams Categories, the Assunpink Creek in Trenton currently exceeds allowable standards for phosphorus, fecal coliform, arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead and mercury.

Trenton and most of Mercer County are included in NJDEP's Watershed Management Area 11 (WMA 11). While other streams in Mercer County in WMA 11 exceed allowable standards for fecal coliform, no streams outside of Trenton have exceedances for metals pollution. NJDEP is proposing to develop maximum load levels for fecal coliform for the Assunpink Creek and other affected streams in Mercer County by July 2003. Maximum load levels for other pollutants in the Assunpink Creek will be set by NJDEP by 2007. Once maximum load levels are set, NJDEP is to convene public stakeholder meetings on how to achieve the levels.

Better stormwater management through redevelopment will provide Trenton with opportunities to improve its stream water quality.

3.6) Trenton's Urban Growth Target

State, Mercer County and local government representatives as well as community development representatives were invited to participate in a five hour charrette led by RPP March 29, 2003 at Thomas Edison State College.

Participants included:

Andrew Carten	City of Trenton, Director of Planning
Elgin Clemons	Trenton Economic Development Commission, Director
Tim Cunningham	Mercer County Improvement Authority
Gina Galli	NJ Economic Development Authority
James Gee	Office of the Governor
Dennis Gonzalez	City of Trenton, Director of Economic Development & Housing
Marty Johnson	Isles, Inc.
Donna Lewis	Mercer County, Director of Planning
Paul Truban	NJ Department of Transportation
Leo Vasquez	Camiros, Inc.
Bill Watson	Trent Towne Group, LLC

Participants heard presentations from RPP staff on potential growth targets and Trenton's growth capacity and discussed the implications of the different targets. At the end of the charrette they had proposed a population target of an additional 20,000 residents and 49,000 jobs by 2020.

This selection of targets represents the most ambitious of the targets proposed but is well within Trenton's gray infrastructure capacity for growth. The feeling among the group of participants was that the targets *should* be ambitious to stimulate a fresh look at addressing Trenton's redevelopment needs.

3.7 Regional Equity Context

The New Jersey Regional Coalition, which RPP helped to found in 2002, was formed to develop and implement regional strategies to combat urban decline, racial segregation and fiscal disparities in New Jersey. The Coalition hired Myron Orfield's company Ameregis to examine the statewide data on racial and economic segregation in New Jersey. The final report, *New Jersey Metropatterns*, was released in April 2003. It provides a context for comparing Trenton's socioeconomic challenges and strengths with conditions statewide.

The report reconfigures the long-held notion that New Jersey is made up of troubled cities and well-off suburbs surrounded by rural areas. Instead, through cluster analysis, it identifies eight types of communities in New Jersey: large cities; distressed; at-risk, developed; at-risk, rural; bedroom developing; affluent; constrained; and resort communities. More than half the population of New Jersey (65%) lives in communities that show signs of fiscal distress.

"The classification system shows that a growing number of New Jersey suburbs are struggling with stresses typically associated with large cities," the report notes.

"There is a group of suburbs in the state with significant and growing poverty in their schools and weak tax bases. There is another group of slow-growing places with few social needs, but whose property tax bases are below the state average and falling further behind. And a large group of fast-growing, middle-class suburbs is struggling to provide the schools and infrastructure it needs with just average resources. Just a small share of the population lives in affluent suburbs with expensive housing and plentiful commercial development."

In addition, the study determined that "among New Jersey's most troubling challenges is the segregation of its residents by income and race. In particular, its cities and a growing number of its suburbs are experiencing expanding areas of concentrated poverty."

These findings have significance for Trenton's strategies to achieve its population and growth targets. First, the findings point to the need for systemic reform – of the State's property tax system, affordable housing policies and regional planning function. Second, they identify a political constituency that aligns cities with inner ring suburbs and the rural poor whose numbers should have the weight to focus legislators' attention on these systemic problems.

4) NEXT STEPS

RPP's next steps to follow up on the Urban Growth Targets project will be focused locally within Trenton and regionally within Mercer County. RPP believes the Urban Growth Targets methods also have statewide value and will pursue discussions with the Department of Community Affairs on statewide application.

4.1) Smart Growth Neighborhood Targets for Trenton

At the local level, RPP has been asked by the City of Trenton to take the population and employment targets agreed at the charrette and to use its GOZ[®] model to develop a Smart Growth scenario for distributing the projected growth within the City.

4.2) Regional Economic Linkages and Regional Equity

At the regional level, as part of our work on the Mercer Master Plan, RPP will compare the Urban Growth Target proposed for Trenton to projected growth for Mercer County and work with all the municipalities to determine what strategies they can use to facilitate this growth.

With the New Jersey Regional Coalition, RPP organized a statewide conference June 15, 2003 to develop organizing strategies to respond to the findings of the *New Jersey Metropatterns* report. Following the conference we will continue to work with the Coalition to organize for regional equity in Central Jersey.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 GOZ[®] MODEL DESCRIPTION

What is GOZ[®]?

GOZ[®] is a computer model that calculates how much development – housing and non-residential development – could be built if the developable land in a town or region were built as zoned. The model estimates a number of impacts from that development, including impacts on natural resources, infrastructure and public costs. GOZ[®] calculations can be used in other models or as material for more detailed studies, analyses or plans.

GOZ[®] allows the user to create alternative zoning scenarios that can be designed and compared using either a traditional zoning framework or a framework based on Smart Growth principles. This alternative zoning framework is called Goal-Oriented Zoning, for which GOZ[®] was named.

GOZ[®] is an application developed by The Regional Planning Partnership (RPP) using the Geographic Information System (GIS) software ArcView[®]. RPP offers this tool to planners in order to inform decisions by providing an affordable, accessible, and easy-to-use method for developing capacity-based plans and zoning ordinances.

Why was GOZ[®] created?

Municipal master plans typically include many good goals. They state, for example, that the municipality intends to manage infrastructure efficiently, protect natural resources and preserve community character. The actual outcomes of the land development process, however, often fall short of these goals. RPP's experience in land development and conservation issues since 1968, demonstrated to us that the problem is usually with the community's zoning ordinance, not its master plan.

For example, although polls show that most people do not like the problems associated with dispersed low-density, single-use development patterns, or "sprawl," most zoning ordinances require this pattern of development. Because most municipalities have never calculated the build-out of their zoning ordinances, most local officials do not know how many housing units or square footage of non-residential development would result if their developable land were built-out as zoned. Without that information, they cannot know the impacts that would be expected from that amount of development. They cannot, therefore, avoid or minimize these impacts by making different decisions.

The GOZ[®] MODEL

To solve this problem, RPP designed GOZ[®] to calculate the theoretical zoning yield, and estimate the impacts from that yield, of alternative zoning scenarios. Besides being able to create their own scenarios based on altering existing zoning, users can apply a completely different zoning framework, called Goal-Oriented Zoning, which is what

GOZ[®] stands for. Goal-Oriented Zoning is based on the Smart Growth concepts of centers, environs and planning areas described in New Jersey's State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

Once the zoning information is put into GOZ[®], it is ready to make its calculations. GOZ[®] comes packaged with information available in New Jersey on land cover, preserved and environmentally sensitive land, as well as with commonly used impact formulae. The data can be updated and the assumptions about the zoning yield or the impacts can be changed to reflect the user's experience and any unique characteristics of the locality. RPP made GOZ[®] to be as transparent to the user as possible.

Step 1: Data inputs and mapping

GOZ[®] begins with land use / land cover mapping. The model classifies land into the following categories:

- Developed land — land with structures on it
- Undeveloped land — land that is not developed
- Constrained land — land that cannot be developed due to environmental factors. The model considers permanently preserved land (farmland, parks, and open space), wetlands, water bodies and land with slopes of 12% or more as constrained land. The model is packaged with a Data Store of these data layers available statewide. The user can choose to use these and/or other constrained layers.

The model also requires a layer of the existing zoning for the study area, along with a database containing the density of housing units allowed in residential districts and the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of building space allowed in each non-residential district.

Step 2: Calculating developable land and the amount of additional development

GOZ[®] uses the data from Step 1 to figure the amount of "developable" land in each zoning zone. Unless a redevelopment factor is applied at the user's discretion, only land that is neither developed nor constrained is considered developable.

Based upon the amount of developable land and the applicable zoning provisions, GOZ[®] then calculates the total number of housing units or the square footage of non-residential space that could theoretically be built on the developable land. In this manner, GOZ[®] calculates the theoretical "build-out" for each zone.

Step 3: Calculating impacts from the additional development

Based on the amount and type of new development calculated in Step 2, GOZ[®] then calculates impacts upon infrastructure, natural resources, and public costs. The model performs these calculations using multipliers derived from published research and industry standards. The impact indicators include the following:

- Vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled
- Public water and sewer demand
- Water and air pollution
- Capital costs of schools, water/sewer facilities, and roads

Users can modify the various assumptions and factors used by the model in its impact calculations.

Step 4: Reporting the results

GOZ[®] produces reports on the model's output for the new development occurring under build-out from Step 2 and the impacts from Step 3. Users can generate these reports by municipality, county, watershed, or for the selected study area. The user can display the reports on screen and print them, and export the data to a spreadsheet program. Users can also print maps showing the borders of zoning districts.

Step 5: Evaluating different scenarios

GOZ[®] allows the user to create alternative zoning scenarios that can be designed and compared using either a traditional zoning framework or a framework based on Smart Growth principles, called Goal-Oriented Zoning.

Using the traditional zoning framework, users can modify their zoning to test alternative scenarios. Using the Goal-Oriented Zoning framework, users can design their own smart growth centers on a backdrop of zoning zones based on the policies governing the State Plan Planning Areas' Environs. Users can see impacts from build-out under either framework or make comparisons between them.

The information provided by GOZ[®] can be used in other studies, models, plans or analyses.

The model provides the ability to quickly modify, calculate, and compare the impacts of alternative zoning scenarios. The user can change zoning classifications, impact multipliers, or zoning district boundaries with relative ease, and the model will calculate the impacts of the new scenario. The user can also assign a redevelopment factor to consider more of the developed land as developable.

The Regional Planning Partnership views GOZ[®] as an informational / educational tool particularly useful for local planners and stakeholders engaged in master planning, watershed planning, and the State Plan endorsement process.

APPENDIX 2 PLAN MAPPING EXAMPLE

Plan name

Canal Banks Redevelopment Plan

Plan date

March 1994, Amended 1996 and 1998

Agency name

City of Trenton

Contact information

Andrew Carten

Geographic Area

Canal Banks Redevelopment Area boundaries as delimited in the ordinance. Generally the area extending 3-4 blocks on either side of the D & R Canal, from Route 1 to Calhoun Street. Includes Old Trenton and the Battle Monument.

Plan Contents

An ordinance declaring the Canal Banks area a redevelopment area and delimiting its boundaries. Sets forth a land use plan and specifies requirements that developers must meet. All development projects are subject to review by the Department of Housing and Development.

This plan is a consolidation of the Old Trenton, West Hanover, and North 25 redevelopment areas.

Vision, Goals and Objectives

Vision

Goals

Redevelop the Canal Banks Redevelopment Area in accordance with the recommendations put forth in the Canal Banks Community Planning Study, dated October 1993 and the City of Trenton Homeownership Zone Application.

Targets (Objectives)

1. Create a linear park along the D & R Canal. Vacant land adjacent to the canal should be developed with appropriate uses for a park setting. In addition, continue to develop a linear park along the former Bel-Del rail line as well as village greens, squares, and mini-parks in conjunction with new residential development.

2. Promote new housing opportunities throughout the Redevelopment Area. Rehabilitate suitable housing stock in the area, especially the 100 and 200 blocks of West Hanover Street and the 200 block of North Warren Street, and in the Hanover-Academy Historic District.
3. Develop new infill housing on various sites: the state-owned parking lot on the northwest corner of Willow and Hanover; along North Willow Street; north of the canal, along the Belvidere Greenway (just west of Willow Street) and in the Old Trenton neighborhood on the state-owned parking lot and vacant land next to Rte. 1.
4. Promote homeownership opportunities through the rehabilitation of existing homes and construction of new homes for owner occupancy.
5. Preserve the existing stock of occupied housing through preservation programs for property owners.
6. Foster the redevelopment of North Broad Street south of the canal as a neighborhood retail center, including a commercial anchor between Allen Street and the canal.
7. Redevelop land adjacent to the Battle Monument Park with uses that complement the park setting. New uses in the area may include new residential development, new commercial development, and/or new educational/institutional/commercial development.
8. Redevelop the 200 block of East Hanover Street through the rehabilitation and/or selective demolition of deteriorated buildings.
9. Reduce the number of surface parking lots in the district, especially along the canal. New surface lots shall only be permitted where there is a defined community need or alternative uses appear unfeasible. Parking lot designs shall include appropriate landscaping, wrought-iron fencing, or a combination brick and decorative facing to mitigate their impacts on surrounding properties.

Data collected

Tables, charts, graphs

Narrative data

Base condition maps

Strategies (tools)

Specific strategies

Districts:

1. Canal Zone (CZ): Create a linear park along the D & R Canal. Develop vacant land along the canal with recreational/cultural/educational or community uses that complement the park setting.
2. Residential (R): The mixed-use zoning classification shall apply for new or rehabbed housing in R districts.
3. Residential/Commercial (C): The mixed-use zoning classification shall apply. As-of-right commercial development shall consist of anything in the B (Business) zoning classification, except convenience stores and grocery stores are also allowed.
4. Open Space (OS): Vacant land in the OS district should be redeveloped as public open space.
5. Public Facility (PF): Public Facilities or parking for public facilities shall be allowed. A new Central Fire Headquarters shall be developed on Perry Street. A new major health care facility shall be developed on North Warren Street.

Requirements:

1. New infill housing shall be architecturally compatible with the existing streetscape.
2. Developers shall agree to controls set by the Department of Housing and Development, which has the right to review and approve all plans for 30 years.
3. Any rehabilitation or new construction within the Academy-Hanover Historic District shall be reviewed by the Trenton Landmarks Commission.
4. Developers must adhere to a specific set of design standards in the Battle Monument Special Design Zone.

Recommendations to other bodies

Partnerships

- D & R Canal Commission: Create a multipurpose path along the Canal extending into Trenton from the Ewing Township boundary. The path will terminate at Warren Street. The City intends to extend the park improvements to Rte. 1 and redevelop the North 25 Park, bounded by Ringold Street, Titus Avenue, and North Warren Street.

Plan condition maps

Redevelopment Zone Boundary Map, as amended, is attached.

Assessment of progress

Personal interviews

Field observations

Isles Inc. is developing new multifamily housing surrounding the Battle Monument and along the Canal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Capital City Redevelopment Corporation. 1989. *Capital City Renaissance Plan*. Trenton, NJ: CCRC.
- City of Trenton. 2002. Assunpink Greenway Plan. Map.
- City of Trenton Department of Housing and Development. 2001. *City of Trenton 2001 One Year Consolidated Action Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton Division of Economic Development. 2001. *Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 2001. *Brownfield Environmental Solutions for Trenton (BEST) Action Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1998. *Lamberton St. Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1998. *Pennington Ave. Redevelopment Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1997. *Champale Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1997. *John Fitch Way Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1997. *Roebbling Gateway Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1993. *American Bridge Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1992. *Cass St. Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1986. *Greenwood Ave. Redevelopment Area Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- City of Trenton. 1999. *Land Use Plan*. Trenton, NJ: City of Trenton.
- Cornell University Center for the Environment. 2001. *Trenton Eco-Industrial Complex: Baseline Analysis*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- D&R Canal Commission. 2002. *Draft Development Plan for the Canal State Park*. Stockton, NJ: D&R Canal Commission.

HTC Group. 2001. *New Jersey's Capital Region Transitioning Mercer County into a Regional Heritage Tourism Destination.*

Mercer County Improvement Authority. 2001. Personal Interview.

NJ Department of Transportation. *Transportation Choices 2025 New Jersey Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan.*

NJ State Planning Commission. 2001. *The NJ State Development and Redevelopment Plan.* Trenton, NJ: NJSPC.

NJ TRANSIT. 2001. Personal Interview.

NJ TRANSIT. 2001. *Southern New Jersey Light Rail Transit System Draft Supplemental Environment Impact Statement Capitol Extension.*

Rutgers Advanced Landscape Architect Studio. 2002. *Trenton – Reinventing the Capitol District.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Solomon, Ruth. Memo to Herb Simmons re: New Jersey Cities' Capacities to Handle Future Growth.

Trenton Arts Connection. 2001. *Trenton Arts Blueprint.*

Trenton Downtown Association, Inc. 1997. *Approved Work Plan.*

Trenton Downtown Association, Inc. 2001. Personal Interview.

Trenton Roebling Community Development Corporation. 1989. *The Roebling Project.*

US Census. 1990, 2000. Summary Files 1 & 3.