

125
10

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

before

SENATE LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

To review the parking and transportation needs of the City of
Trenton, and to review the planning process of the
State and the City on this issue

December 13, 1988
Room 334
State House Annex
Trenton, New Jersey

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Senator Gerald R. Stockman, Chairman

ALSO PRESENT:

Assemblyman John S. Watson
District 15

Steven B. Frakt
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Senate Legislative
Oversight Committee

New Jersey State Library

* * * * *

Hearing Recorded and Transcribed by
Office of Legislative Services
Public Information Office
Hearing Unit
State House Annex
CN 068
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES



INTER-COMMUNICATION

CENTRAL STAFF MANAGEMENT
AND ASSIGNMENT UNIT
STATE HOUSE ANNEX

TO: David Inverso
Coordinator

FROM: Steven B. Frakt *SBF*
Committee Aide

DATE: November 16, 1988

SUBJECT: MEETING OF SENATE LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Senator Stockman has scheduled a hearing on December 13 to review the parking and transportation needs of the City of Trenton and to review the planning process of the State and the City on this issue. The hearing will be held in Room 334 of the Annex beginning at 10 a.m.

SBF:vmi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Michael B. McKitish Acting Administrator General Services Administration New Jersey Department of the Treasury	2
Mayor Arthur J. Holland Trenton, New Jersey	13
Carmen Armenti President Trenton City Council	15
John Loos International Representative Communications Workers of America	24
Laurie Pyrch Research Scientist New Jersey Department of Health	25
Elsie Glover Division of Taxation New Jersey Department of the Treasury	29
Martha Kotrba Division of Vocational Education New Jersey Department of Education	34
Robert M. Litke Executive Director Capital City Redevelopment Corporation	48
James A. Crawford Assistant Commissioner Transportation Services and Planning New Jersey Department of Transportation	51
Nancy M. Podeszwa Executive Director Greater Princeton Transportation Management Association	59
Z. Wayne Johnson Director of Community Relations New Jersey Transit Corporation	65

* * * * *

SENATOR GERALD R. STOCKMAN (Chairman): Good morning. I would like to begin this hearing before the Senate Legislative Oversight Committee this morning. I understand that Senator Zimmer hopes to be here shortly. I would like to make a brief opening statement to try to set, a little bit, the parameters of the hearing; then we can go from there.

The City of Trenton is undergoing revitalization. The State is consolidating its agencies in the Capital City and constructing or renting additional facilities. Private entrepreneurs are beginning to invest in various development projects. Older buildings are undergoing renovation. The skyline seems to change from month to month, and the City, it appears, is on the move.

But while the skyline changes, what is happening down on the ground level? Is the City also on the move where movement really counts -- in the streets, in the parking lots, and on buses and trains? Each new project brings more State employees, more business employment, hopefully, and more visitors. How will the City accommodate the increased demand on our transportation system? Will economic and civic development be held hostage to inadequate transportation accommodations? Will State workers be able to take a bus to their work site? If they must drive, will they have a place to park? Will the school buses that bring children to visit our historic and cultural sites find a traffic-free location to drop off and pick up the children?

These questions frame the background for this hearing. This Committee wants to know what is being planned, who is doing the planning, and whether there is a coordination of efforts among the City, the General Services Administration, the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, the Department of Transportation, and New Jersey Transit.

About a year and a half ago, a State official was quoted as indicating that, in fact, there was no parking plan,

despite the building boom. I trust that today's hearing will show that that statement is now out-of-date.

I am going to call first on John Loos, the representative of CWA, to briefly make a statement. Is John here? (no response) Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: I am also a CWA member, and I would be very happy to make a statement. But I cannot speak for John.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Do you know where John is, because he had asked--

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: I have been waiting for him-- (remainder of statement indiscernible; no microphone)

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Okay. Well then, I think what we will do is wait. I don't see the Mayor here -- he had asked to appear -- so I think we'll go to Mike McKitish, Acting Administrator, General Services Administration.

Assemblyman Watson is here. Maybe he will come up and join me for this hearing. John? (Assemblyman Watson joins Senator Stockman at Committee table) And why don't you come up, Mike?

M I C H A E L B. M c K I T I S H: Good morning. I am Mike McKitish, Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration. With me today is Tom Bush, Director of DBC, Chuck Strano, Assistant Director of DBC, and John Priest, who is the guy who works on parking for State employees on a daily basis. I think it is important to recognize these people as the people who have had a lot to do with the transportation issues in downtown Trenton, as they relate to State employees.

I was very pleased, Senator Stockman, to hear your opening remarks, that the issue, as you see it, is really a transportation issue in downtown Trenton, and not merely parking. We see the issue, in the General Services Administration, as access to the workplace at a reasonable

cost. Those access issues include: cars, buses, rail, and foot. We have tried to encourage mass transit and urban development in the downtown Trenton area. As you are aware, the Treasurer, the Governor, all support the concurrent policy of moving more people back in from the suburbs and supporting the Capital City of Trenton, New Jersey. The development of the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, which was sponsored by yourselves, Senator Stockman and Assemblyman Watson-- Both of you gentlemen have had a lot to do with the downtown Trenton area, and we thank you for your efforts in establishing this group.

The urban development piece of this is really being handled by the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, and I believe you will hear from Bob Litke, who is the Executive Director of that corporation, a little bit later in the testimony.

The encouragement of mass transit is being coordinated with New Jersey Transit and the New Jersey Department of Transportation. I believe both departments are represented today, and you will hear from them a little bit later.

It is important that we coordinate the bus, the rail, and the foot activities of this fine City in order to make sure that it is a City that works. In cooperation with New Jersey Transit and DOT and the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, we have engaged in a parking survey. I believe Jim Crawford will speak about that parking survey, again a little bit later.

The Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, again under the leadership of Bob Litke, has engaged Mel Lehr to conduct a circulation study in the downtown Trenton area, and again I believe Bob will have something to say about that.

We in GSA have been trying to encourage Park n' Ride and pool arrangements, because we believe that cars bring high costs, in terms of parking, traffic problems, which if we had

100% parking in the downtown area would probably be the subject of another Oversight Committee meeting, and environmental problems. I think it is important to recognize, at this point, that the expectation of 100% parking for State employees in an urban center is unrealistic.

With that in mind, what I would like to do is lay out some facts as to what the State of New Jersey, in particular the General Services Administration, in cooperation with DOT and New Jersey Transit, has been doing about the parking situation in Trenton. The first item on this list of parking goals is really a fact. It is not a goal, it is a fact. We are looking to maintain between a .55 and a .60 ratio of parking places per employee. Now that really means that for every two employees, we will provide one parking place, or a little bit better than one. This roughly equates to between 2.75 and 3 spaces per 1000 square feet of office space. And with over-subscription, which we are monitoring -- and I will speak about that a little bit later -- aggressively, we think -- and we believe the facts represent this -- that the employees in the Trenton area will be receiving between 68% and 75% coverage in terms of parking permits.

Now, as you know, there are a number of issues with State employees, which include: vacation, sick time, conferences, and on-the-road job duties. That is basically where we derive our over-subscription rate. I will caution you by saying that it is not the same in all departments. Some departments have different over-subscription rates. Tom has been monitoring on a regular basis, and John has really been out in the field reviewing these lots, to make sure that the over-subscription rate is correct, and that people are not spending their time driving around, with a permit, looking for a place to park.

The other items on this list are, in fact, goals. I had mentioned this before. We are trying to support the

concurrent policy of returning State offices, and consequently State employees, to the downtown Trenton area from the suburbs. We are trying to increase structured parking in present and future plans. This is very, very important, from our perspective. You will see a map a little bit later which will show you the layout of the downtown Trenton area and the abundance of surface parking that exists in the downtown Trenton area. We will caution you that structured parking is very expensive, and I will tell you that that is the reason I say that cars bring a high cost to parking. But we still believe that this is the proper way to address parking in the downtown area.

We will continue aggressively to investigate the feasibility and to promote the demand for remote site parking facilities. I will show you our plans, and will be available to discuss questions on our plans for our pilot project, the Perry Street Park n' Ride.

At this point, I would really like to lay out the facts of the situation we have before us. You can see from the graphic we have that the employee population in the downtown Trenton area -- and this is primarily as a result of consolidation and relocation of employees to downtown offices from the suburbs -- has grown. We expect that it will continue to grow, as we continue to move in that direction.

Before 1985, we had approximately 15,700 employees in the downtown area. Today, we have 18,134. By 1992, we expect 22,165. You can see the growth percentages listed underneath. In 1985, we had 6820 parking spaces in downtown Trenton. Today, we have 10,330, an increase of 52%. In the future, we are looking for 12,739 in our plans, and we will lay those plans out for you.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Mike, excuse me.

MR. McKITISH: Yes?

SENATOR STOCKMAN: You are going to have a copy of this statement for the Committee, aren't you -- with these figures?

MR. MCKITISH: Yes, I am.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Good, all right.

MR. MCKITISH: That will be available for the Committee.

The structured parking ratio -- and again, this goes back to our goal of increasing structured parking-- In 1985, less than 10% of our parking spaces were structured. In 1989 to '90 -- which is today -- we have 19%, in terms of structured parking, either having built or having caused to be built, through our leases, structured parking. In 1992, we hope to have 36% of our inventory in structured parking. The parking places per employee has gone from .43 to .57 today, and we hope to maintain that same ratio.

The employees with parking permits -- and this gets into the over-subscription rate I spoke about -- has grown from 54% to 71%, and we hope to maintain that in the future. The parking spaces per 1000 square feet of office space has grown from 2.15 to 2.85, and we hope to maintain that same ratio.

What we have done in this process-- I believe that before we can really institute any long-range policies or any goals, we must understand the base line information we have in terms of parking. Tom, I would ask that you just put the map up for a second, instead of the factual information. This map, generated by the General Services Administration's computer-assisted design hardware we have, shows that we have attempted to apply this parking problem in a systematic and rational way. We have broken down the Trenton area into zones. You can see the red line area and the zone numbers marked accordingly on this map. This, of course, is an aerial photograph of the downtown Trenton area, and shows on the map the seven zones we have broken this area into. Actually, we

have eight zones, but one of the zones cannot be shown on this map because it is actually a remote site within Trenton, and I am speaking of the Riverview project. Okay?

What I would ask now is if you could put up the factual -- okay, good -- side by side. Each zone has been developed in an attempt to relate the buildings and the occupants within the buildings to the spaces we have assigned. Within those zones we have areas. The areas are the ones that we monitor on a regular basis, which John goes out and takes a look at to make sure that the over-subscription rate and the number of spaces are correct, and that there is proper policing of those areas, so that the people who have permits are parking there, and the people who do not have permits are appropriately warned in the beginning, and then ultimately ticketed.

As you can see from the information that is presented here-- I will let you digest it for a little while, then you certainly will have whatever the Chair decides in terms of questions -- the opportunity to ask those questions. But, you can see how we have attempted to break this down again in a systematic and rational manner, and you can see how the numbers come up to our .43 presentation before 1985, and our .57 presentation today. This was done on actual counts in the lots. We have all of the permits and the spaces identified on our computer, and we attempt to constantly monitor this.

Now I do want to caution one thing: Parking is a dynamic process. John is constantly working on changing permits, issuing new permits, and taking away old permits. This information that is presented is a snapshot in time. It may not represent exactly those numbers today, but they are certainly within the ball park, and they do represent our best information at a point in time. That point in time is very recent, of course, as we prepared for this hearing.

What I would like to do at this point, is talk a little bit about our Park n' Ride project, which is not

included in these figures at all. The Park n' Ride is in addition to these figures that I have presented. When we were looking at the land in the downtown Trenton area that the State had designs on in terms of future office buildings, one of the sites that came to mind was, of course, the Perry Street site, a long debated site for the potential headquarters of the Division of Motor Vehicles. Once the decision was made to allow the Division of Motor Vehicles to engage their regional headquarters at the old Sears building on the corner of Stockton and -- is that Front, or Stockton and Hanover? I am not sure exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM AUDIENCE: Front Street.

MR. MCKITISH: Front Street. It was very important at that point to make sure that the Division of Motor Vehicles' headquarters be close to that regional center, for programmatic reasons. In April of this past year, we announced that the Arnold Constable site would be the site of the Division of Motor Vehicles' headquarters. We are still proceeding along those lines. The Perry Street site, at that point, became the proposed site for the Central Motor Pool, which is presently on Board Street. The Central Motor Pool we have right now is directly in the path of the new 192 road that is proposed for that area.

We knew we needed the space; we knew that we needed it in the future; and we knew that we had a lot of vacant land up on Perry Street, which we all agreed should be put to a useful purpose. We thought that because we were having some problems with parking in the downtown area, and because we wanted to make sure that we encouraged pilot Park n' Ride projects, and because Park n' Ride projects, for one reason or another, really never worked for State offices, we decided to enter into a pilot project for that site; to use the vacant land to try to raise the area, to clean up the area, which had become overgrown. In some cases, we had tires and railroad ties and

other debris items up there. We decided to clean it up, to level it, and to put down a parking lot for State employees, which we would use as a remote Park n' Ride site.

We requested the assistance of New Jersey Transit and the New Jersey Department of Transportation to think through the issues with us, to try to figure out why Park n' Rides have never really worked for State employees. One of the things we came up with was the convenience factor. We felt it was very important to provide buses, and to have those buses running regularly; to make sure that the loops were short; to get the State employees out of their cars, onto the bus; to make sure it was reliable; and that it got them to their workplace quickly. That was our goal.

So, we set out with that goal in mind to develop this site. We are very happy to report that we believe this site will be operating by January of 1989. I'm sure that many of you come into this Capital City past that Perry Street site, and I think all of you can say that there is an improvement at that site right now. We have developed a community-based plan. We intend to speak to the people of the community, in particular the ISLES people, to get involved in some community gardening in that area; to plant some flowers, and perhaps some vegetables, whatever their desire. But we have allowed for land both outside the fence and inside the fence.

We have also been sensitive to the fencing issue. We didn't think it was appropriate to put the standard fencing, with barbed wire, around the entire Park n' Ride lot. We have -- and I think you will be very pleased to see -- some attractive fencing on Perry Street, and on Allen Street. We have faith in the community, and we believe we are a very important part of the community, and therefore must be sensitive to their needs and demands.

So again, the Perry Street Park n' Ride Project is a pilot project. It will be operating in January of 1989. The

capacity is approximately 700 vehicles. It will be served by New Jersey Transit. The two key State offices that will be using the Park n' Ride will be the Department of Environmental Protection and the Division of Motor Vehicles. This has been coordinated among the State Treasury Department, the Transportation Department, New Jersey Transit, and the City of Trenton. The Capital City Redevelopment Corporation has played a very important role in this process. I can't thank them enough, both publicly and privately. As Bob Litke knows, on a regular basis I seek his wisdom in many of our endeavors.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Does that mean that the flap with the Attorney General has subsided and we are beyond that struggle?

MR. MCKITISH: I believe the Attorney General is cautiously optimistic. He has seen many of these plans, and at this point is cautiously optimistic. Certainly he wants to see it before believing, but he is, in fact, excited about some of these plans. Again, I don't want to speak for the Attorney General, but he is cautiously optimistic on some of these plans.

The important thing to note about the Perry Street Park n' Ride Project is, studies of other remote sites are ongoing. We feel we have to have a comprehensive policy on Park n' Ride projects. We feel it is really the only answer to parking in the downtown Trenton area. We look forward to working with all of the people I have mentioned before, and with this group, to address those problems.

That concludes my testimony on the transportation issues in downtown Trenton. I think what you can see from the presentation is that we do have some understanding of the base line information, and we are attempting to address this transportation issue in a systematic and rational way.

I will tell you that it is not an easy thing to do. One, as a young child -- to steal a line from John Baldwin -- does not dream about being a parking guru for downtown Trenton,

when looking at professions. It is very difficult. I know you appreciate that. I know that all of the people who will testify today appreciate that. But we are working very hard on this problem, and we hope to bring it to a good conclusion.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you, Mike. Perhaps we could have some questions. John, do you have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: No, thank you.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Okay. Mike, are you going to be able to stay, or have someone here, because I know there are some questions which have been raised by some of the union representatives about problems they have, that I would like you to be aware of, and your staff? If you can't stay, I guess somebody else will be here.

MR. McKITISH: Senator, I will be happy to stay for as long as you would like me here.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Fine. Do any of the other people who are directly involved care to speak before we turn to some other officials?

MR. McKITISH: I don't believe so.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Okay. Well, I appreciate your presentation. One question that comes to my mind, which you didn't specifically touch on, but which may come up, is the question of the impact the State House renovations will have on the whole issue of parking and transportation in the City. It would seem to me that with the investment we are going to make in this Capital Complex, that what is already an attractive and inviting and rich-in-history setting could become even more so for students throughout the region and for other visitors. It could become an end point really, a site for visiting.

Has anybody started to think about, or taken into account, the impact of parking and transportation needs that that project -- which I know is a while off yet -- will have?

MR. McKITISH: We have started to think about, in only a general sense, the problems you just mentioned. Could you

put up the overall map? (speaking to his associate) The area I believe you are speaking of is right behind the State House and, of course, as you know, and as everyone in the Legislature is aware, we have a \$64 million project presently under way to renovate this series of fine buildings. Everything we are doing today does not preclude anything from happening in the future. What we are trying to do at this point is relate the parking lots to the buildings, as much as we can. Our plans do not preclude any future parking behind the State House, if that becomes desirable. As I said before, structured parking of any kind is very expensive. That would have to be looked at, along with the other needs of this fine State, and the City, as we start to develop this.

Jim Crawford just mentioned to me that we do have a program right now where visitors to the downtown Trenton area, particularly the State House, can park in the DOT parking lots, which, in fact, would be a remote site. We do have buses servicing the State House area.

But I understand your larger concern, Senator. I will say to you that the plans we have right now do not preclude that from happening in the future and, in fact, are sensitive to the needs of this institution.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I know the Governor has made a major commitment to this renovation. I know there was some difference as to whether it ought to be an even greater effort, including parking facilities. I would just hope that we are in a position whereby perhaps the next administration can take a re-look, and we won't be doing things that will lock them in. There has been talk about underground parking behind the State House to avoid too much further deterioration of what is a magnificent view of the river, which I think certainly ought to be preserved.

From your comments, I am hopeful we will be able to take a re-look at that as time goes on, as we get closer to

completing it, and maybe find some added resources to do something further. I think Assemblyman Watson feels the same way. He may have a question on it.

MR. McKITISH: Well, we are very sensitive to that. As a career State employee who has been around for over 15 years, I understand the importance of making sure that we do not preclude things from happening in the future that are good for the downtown area. I know this Governor supports that.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much, Mike, for a very interesting presentation. We will certainly look forward to a copy of your remarks and those figures. I'm sure there may be some further questions about them in time.

Next, I see the Mayor here, and I have an interest and a concern for his time. So, perhaps Mayor Holland--

M A Y O R A R T H U R J. H O L L A N D: Senator, the President of the City Council is with me. He wants to testify, so--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right; surely, fine. Mr. Carmen Armenti, President of the Trenton City Council, we will be happy to have you join us.

MAYOR HOLLAND: Senator, I'm sure you can appreciate how happy we are to know that this hearing is being held. I am thinking back to Joint Resolution No. 6, approved on March 24, 1983, creating a Trenton Parking Committee, at your initiative. The question of off-street parking has been with us for as long as I can remember. I can recall very vividly standing next to the State Treasurer at the time, John Kervick, as we broke ground for the Labor and Industry Building, and saying, "John, we've got to start building garages. We can't just asphalt this area." But as you know, for decades, that is what has been done.

There is no question in my mind that the present State administration is committed to structured parking. The City of Trenton started with a parking garage on Hanover Street about

25 years ago. We later erected a garage at Board and Front. The Trenton Parking Authority built a garage for the county government to service the Detention Center. And finally the State, in connection with the construction of the Justice Complex, provided some 500 places underground. But there is now a long-term planned approach by the State. You have heard, of course, from Mr. McKitish about that.

We have some specifics with regard to the overall circulation need of the City. We think the Barlow and Greenwood traffic circles ought to be redesigned, and this is proposed by DOT, in connection with the 129 project. Crucial is the construction of 129. The Trenton Complex began with the widening of Market Street to give a better link between 29 and 1, then 195, 295, and 129. Then finally, if needed, the widening of 29, preferably not to six, but to four lanes. But if the incinerator is to be serviced on Dock Island, then 129 is absolutely essential to that.

Also, with regard to Perry Street, we think there is a very great need for a traffic signal at Perry and the ramp to the west of Route 1. This is especially important because of the Park n' Ride facility that was just referred to.

Some years ago, I suggested as one means of assisting, especially in connection with DEP, that we have our own Trenton dinkey -- that we use the rail that runs alongside of the DEP building, and have a facility at the extremity of that near the City line. I think that ought to be looked at again.

I know there are many to be heard, and the Council President will want to add something, so let me stop here. I invite any questions anyone might have.

Of course, we have our own transportation plan for the City -- parking and traffic -- in our master plan. It was recently updated. Mel Lehr, who did a lot of work on that as a volunteer, and later on a consultant basis, is here with us, as is Tom Ogren, Director of our Department of Housing and

Development, within whose Department is budgeted parking and transportation.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much. Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: The only question I may have is-- Recently, I had a meeting with the Department of Transportation with regard to the Helene Fuld situation, and also the ramp we are talking about.

MAYOR HOLLAND: Well, the southern exit on the Freeway. That would be a tremendous boost to the redevelopment of the East Trenton industrial area.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Right, plus the fact that they are putting a little, small hotel on the corner of New York Avenue and Olden Avenue.

MAYOR HOLLAND: Yes, at New York and Olden.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: We are discussing the extention to dump off on Route 1, so I just want you to know, Mayor, that we have met recently with the Industrial Committee, and also Helene Fuld, with the Department of Transportation, to discuss that particular situation there. They are pretty well on the way to several different designs for us already with regard to that.

MAYOR HOLLAND: That's great news. I know the--

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: I think we're talking about three or four years away, that that is going to happen for us. I just wanted to--

MAYOR HOLLAND: Three or four years isn't bad.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: No, not bad at all when you know it is going to move.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Good. Mr. Armenti?

C A R M E N A R M E N T I: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Assemblyman Watson. I don't know what else I can add. I think it is obvious that the great majority of the local officials feel that structured parking has to be a major component of resolving the parking problems in the City.

My concern is that it is taking so long to set that plan. The Mayor referred to Resolution No. 6 in '83. I have a Senate Resolution No. 29, introduced in 1982, setting up the Parking and Transportation Committee. Also, a copy of a newspaper article back in '82, where Department of Transportation representatives said there was no parking plan, and the parking plan would be in force by July 1, 1982. It just hasn't gotten any better for those who visit our City and, more importantly, for the State employees, who must find suitable parking at a reasonable distance to get to their offices.

As the Mayor indicated, we, for a long time-- This came out of your office, Senator, from Jeff Laurenti, who was then the Executive Director. It just states: "Dear Carmen: At yesterday's meeting between Trenton Council and State legislators, members of the Council urged action on the parking problems downtown." That was in 1982.

What has happened, very frankly, is that the substitute for structured parking has been the demolishing of good, suitable, affordable housing. The State of New Jersey has taken practically all of Willow Street. I don't have to tell you what is happening. What was one of the great parks in the State -- Stacy Park -- is now all concrete. I commend you that this meeting focuses on what I believe to be one of the major problems facing the redevelopment of the Capital City -- parking and transportation.

The Mayor indicated that there are some specifics that the City is ready to recommend, but it goes much beyond just the parking of automobiles to come up with a suitable plan. It means possibly the recapturing of what everyone conceives to be one of our greatest assets, the major parts of the riverfront. I can see where the quality of life in this City, and the State employees-- That is all part of the total picture. The employees who come to work ought to be able to enjoy their

lunchtime, enjoy some of the wonderful amenities -- the Visual Art Center, whether it be people who are interested in art for an hour or two during lunch or after work, or having lunch at the riverfront. The only way we can recapture that open space, I believe, is a planned structured parking, especially behind the State House, and recapture part of that land on the other side of 29.

There was an interesting presentation made by the Open Space Committee just last week -- Liz Johnson -- I know, Senator, that you are involved in that program, along with Assemblyman Watson -- where students at Rutgers presented their plans. Of course, as the professor representing them said, there were no price tags put to this. But I believe that out of those dreams, out of those concepts, a viable program to recapture the open space and come up with a viable parking plan is possible.

This meeting today is absolutely very apropos. As you know, the Mayor and I were in somewhat of a controversy a few months back about parking for the Motor Vehicle Regional Center. That came about because the Mayor and I felt that that was not the right program. It did nothing to solve the parking problem for State employees. It was the same old hodgepodge of parking planning. Out of that came -- thanks to Bob Litke and the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, an agency that you put into place -- action to look immediately into all of those problems.

So, while we are having this meeting, which is very apropos, the wheels are in motion to come up with a plan through the efforts of the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation.

I know that I haven't spoken about anything specific, but that is the feeling of the Council. The feedback I get from many of the State employees that I talk to, who, I have to admit, complain to me, is, "What are you going to do about the parking, Carmen?" I relate that to you for your

consideration. I don't think we can wait any longer. I think that once we come back-- Once Bob Litke and the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation comes back with a plan, somehow we must fund it, and we must get it off the ground.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you.

MAYOR HOLLAND: I have a couple more specific suggestions. New Jersey Transit has worked out an arrangement with employers in the northern part of the State, what is called a voucher system, whereby an employer, on a tax deductible basis -- that is for the employer -- gives money to the employees so that they can use mass transit. I wrote to the State Treasurer back in October, suggesting that that approach ought to be considered for State employees. The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission is looking at it.

Also, there has been a lot of talk recently about a monorail on U.S. 1. About 15 years ago, the City of Trenton, with an UMTA grant, looked at the possibility -- the feasibility of a monorail for the City of Trenton. It would have originated at the railroad station, gone down Clinton to State, down State Street to the State House, then to the Courthouse, and back. The feasibility was not found, but I think the day may well come when we will find feasibility for that. I would suggest that the Committee keep that in mind.

We are very fortunate, finally, in having -- thanks primarily to you two gentlemen -- the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation. It is the ideal forum and agency, I believe, to consider matters like this.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Senator, I would like to ask Mike a question with regard to the statement that was just made by the Mayor, about the subsidy of being able to use the rail revenue parking, or whatever transportation we might have.

Mike, could you tell me about the private parking we have for the State? What is the cost per parking space for us, per month?

MR. McKITISH: (speaking from audience) .Okay. In a structured lot--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Do you want to come on up, Mike, so we can catch it on the record? I think that would be helpful. If Tom wants to come up with you, fine.

MR. McKITISH: (complies) In a structured lot, the cost of a parking place is about \$10,000 per space. In a surface lot, I believe it is between \$3000 and \$4000.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: All right. My question, Mike, is, what are we paying for parking per State employee, say in a parking garage such as Sussman's? What are we paying per month, per employee?

MR. McKITISH: Market rate? The market rate of the Sussman garage, I believe, is \$90 or \$100 a month.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: A hundred dollars a month?

MR. McKITISH: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: I can recall, Mike, I think, in our Appropriations Committee, asking that question, and I think it was about \$106 at that time per parking space per employee. This was two years ago.

MR. McKITISH: The arrangement we have entered into with Mr. Sussman specifically, is in the neighborhood of from \$90 to \$100 a month. We can confirm that for the Committee.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Would you say that is the average, what we are paying today?

MR. McKITISH: Well, it depends upon the market you are in. Now, certainly in the Trenton area, the market rate right now for a structured parking lot is in that neighborhood. That is the market rate.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: That is the market rate for Trenton?

MR. McKITISH: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Thank you, Mike.

MR. ARMENTI: Just for your information, Senator, the City Council is faced with, and will be discussing this afternoon, the prospects of having to make repairs on the Broad and Front Street garage that is operated by the Trenton Parking Utility. The repairs are estimated at \$1,200,000. We have solicited requests for proposals, and there has only been one response. The idea was whether the City should go to privatization of the garage, or whether we should continue to operate it as a parking utility.

The Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, along with the central Trenton business community, has urged us not to go private; to retain control. After discussion today, I believe that is what may happen. We only had one interested party, in wanting to go private.

But the point I want to make is, where the private garages are receiving somewhere in the area of \$90 to \$100 per space, the City of Trenton, at Broad and Front, is only receiving \$35 per space. Now, it ought to be said for the record, that we can no longer provide and subsidize, and then continue to make the maintenance repairs, with those types of rentals. So, if we do continue to operate it as a public facility, the people who are now using it can expect an increase in the rent for those spaces.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Through you, Mr. Chairman, Carmen, did you say \$100,000 to \$200,000? In my reading, it was about \$1,200,000.

MR. ARMENTI: About \$1,200,000 for repairs.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: All right; okay.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: A couple of things on that score, but first let me thank you for your remarks, Mr. Armenti. We have two longtime leaders in Trenton government sitting here, who care very deeply about the City. I think your points were

very well taken, and I hope listened to. It has taken a long time. I remember, and Assemblyman Watson was very much involved with me in getting legislation through to create a commission to deal with parking. It is pretty evident from hindsight that that commission never really got off the ground. I don't think we ought to dwell on that fact, or beat anyone up over it. But I think it is evident that the administration has perhaps been preoccupied with other issues, and only recently -- it is my impression -- started to seriously try to come to grips with some of the problems that you care very deeply about, from the point of view of the City.

I want to make clear, speaking for myself, that I am pleased to see some momentum. We are going to hear from some organized labor people, and I think there are some problems that are going to have to be dealt with, notwithstanding. But I do see -- and I think both of you gentlemen seem to suggest it, too -- that we are starting to move in a better direction. Frankly, I think it is unquestionably up to the next administration to determine whether that momentum is illusory and of negligible significance, or whether it is carried to some real meaningful completion.

The jury, in my mind, is still out on a lot of aspects of the future of the City of Trenton as a great community. A lot of things have happened. But, in this parking area, as in others, it seems to me that we have started to do some things, if we can follow through. I think very frankly it is evident that it is going to be up to the next Governor to follow through, and I think it is critical that we all keep that in mind -- of both parties, whatever persuasion -- and try to be sure that whoever would seek that office, or get it, is aware that we in Trenton have some special interests -- parochial interests maybe, but they are unique in that they are Capital City interests -- which ought to be of concern to the whole State. I think we are touching on some of those right here

today. I think Mr. McKitish has indicated that we are starting to move. Some past administrations really did not listen carefully enough, I don't think, to the concerns of people like yourselves, about the impact of what the State was doing in the City.

I think we are seeing and hearing evidence that that is changing some, but I think more can be done, and I think we are going to hear more about that. So I want to thank both of you for your comments, and I am sure Assemblyman Watson joins me.

MR. ARMENTI: Thank you very much.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I want to hear now from some organized labor representatives. I promised to let one of them, at least, speak early, and that is John Loos. John, are you here? (affirmative response from audience) John, before you get started, there are a couple of other things.

Mayor, I hope your suggestions will be taken up by Jim Crawford, and by Mike as well, in terms of this voucher. I think the question of a monorail is something that certainly ought to be kept in mind. I think there are a lot of imaginative ideas that may well start to germinate, and we may well be able to take advantage of in time.

One other thing, Carmen. On the building -- on the renovations -- there is litigation, I gather, ongoing potentially to help recoup some of that money.

MR. ARMENTI: (speaking from audience) Yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: It might be that the State, because of its peculiar interest, might be interested in helping this City in some way, either in that litigation or in a loan to finance these added repair costs, at a time which is so difficult for the City in its present economic situation. I would like to join with Assemblyman Watson in maybe approaching the Treasurer's office, to see whether arguably we could get legislation to do something along those lines on some basis,

and whether the administration -- the Department of the Treasury and the administration generally -- might be sympathetic. I think that is something we could explore after this hearing today.

MAYOR HOLLAND: The parking space you save may be your own. (laughter)

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. I think that is one reason we may have a legitimate interest in it.

One other thing I want to say, and it was Mr. Armenti's comment. We apparently did lose some housing stock in the course of the direction we have taken. I think we ought to be very careful. I would like to ask the Treasurer to advise us of any plans they have which will jeopardize any housing in the City. I think that is a critical issue. If there is one thing we don't want to do, in our enthusiasm for an attractive City from the point of view of a better riverfront landscape, from the point of view of more attractive structured parking, as opposed to a sea of blacktop, and a lot of other things, it is to negatively impact on the neighborhoods in the community in terms of housing. And I am sure Assemblyman Watson is every bit as anxious as I am to see that not happen.

I would like the Treasury to advise this Committee of what, if any, plans they have that will impact negatively on any housing, and what relocation and/or new housing development, through perhaps help from the Department of Community Affairs, would be available, so that we can honestly say that we have not taken one step forward in terms of transportation and parking for the region, and two steps backward from the point of view of the interests and concerns of the residents of the City of Trenton. I would ask you to do that.

Now, we will have a representative from the CWA. Mr. Loos, will you please identify yourself?

J O H N L O O S: Yes. I am John Loos. I am an international representative with the Communications Workers of America. We represent 39,000 State employees, with in excess of over 15,000, located here in the City of Trenton.

Senator, let me begin by thanking you for your leadership in this area; for calling this public hearing and trying to get the various actors who are involved in the planning process for the future of this City together in the same room, to begin to talk about the issues.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Let me stop you for a minute, John. That is an interesting statistic, because if we have 18,000 State employees in the City-- It is your understanding that 15,000 of them are CWA workers?

MR. LOOS: Well, I think it is--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I don't want to put you on too much of a spot, but you made that comment, and I am wondering where AFSCME--

MR. LOOS: Well, Darlene is here. Darlene (speaking to an associate seated in the audience), how many do you have in your local? (colloquy between Mr. Loos and Darlene indiscernible; Darlene has no microphone)

MR. LOOS: That's 12,000 in two locals, and there are several other locals we represent. So I would say we are very close to 15,000 working in the City here.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Obviously a large number, whatever it is.

MR. LOOS: We also represent people in the judiciary. I don't know whether or not they are included over there. They may well be.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. LOOS: Okay. Senator, before I give you my remarks, we thought it would be worthwhile to have you hear from three State workers for just a minute or two, to give some, almost anecdotes, or personal hassles, if you will,

because I think it is important that we see the statistics that Mike put up there, and that is one way. Whenever we engage in any kind of planning, we have to look at raw numbers, and that. But I think we also have to realize that there are real human beings behind the numbers.

I would like to first introduce Laurie Pynch, who works at the Department of Health as a research scientist, and ask her to talk for just a moment or two.

L A U R I E P Y R C H: Thank you. I would like to discuss some of the issues as I see them as a State employee. Given the fact that any solution to this particular problem will be a long-term solution, I think it is really important that prospective employees are told of the situation before they are hired, so they can make an informed decision as to whether or not they really want to work for the State in Trenton.

There have been many instances I know of where people have been hired, myself included, but were not informed. They were totally ignorant of the situation until the first day they arrived. My suggestion is that this information should be provided during an interview, or prior to any offer of employment.

If individuals are so inclined, they might -- as I did -- try to pay for a space in one of the many municipal lots in the area, and there are no available spaces in those lots either. So a person can't even pay out of her own pocket for a space in Trenton.

Given those facts, many of us are forced to park illegally in the State lots, on the streets, in remote areas, in parking lots, etc. In my view, this presents a very severe security problem. There may be someone here who will address that a little later. I think the people here need to address this particular problem. In my opinion, there is a great potential for security risks out there.

As an occasional observer where I work, it is apparent to me that there are a lot of spaces available out there. I don't know for what reason, but the feeling of the State employee is that there are spaces available, and not enough is being done to equitably distribute those spaces, or to actually keep track of how many spaces are being used.

Along those same lines, I know of a few cases of employees with the same starting dates of employment, who have gotten stickers before others. So there is, in my opinion, a very severe inequity issue out there. People are receiving stickers before others. There is no clear policy. When union reps have asked to see some sort of a parking distribution policy from the State, they have run up against severe obstacles in attaining anything concrete along those lines. If a policy does exist for distribution, it is not accessible to the people who should be allowed to see it.

Thank you.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you. Assemblyman Watson has a question for you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Ms. Pyrch, you said that before becoming an employee of the State, these kinds of things, especially the parking problem, should be addressed -- during the interview, I guess, before employment.

MS. PYRCH: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: This should be made a condition?

MS. PYRCH: Yes, that is my suggestion.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Do you see any drawbacks with that? Do you see that if, in fact, after being interviewed, and knowing that you probably wouldn't have proper parking, but somewhere down the road you may have proper parking, you may sign off anyway, and say, "Well, okay, I will accept the position anyway"? The drawback there is the fact that you have already agreed that you would take the job without being provided any kind of consideration for parking. So, you know,

you would probably be one of the lowest on the totem pole to get a parking spot, because of the fact that you have been interviewed and have stated your position with regard to accepting the position. So I can see some drawback there, in making this a condition of employment. What do you think, Senator?

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I think you raise an interesting point. You would have to be careful that it was flexible, and that you didn't sign your life away and then really be barred from any consideration because of that understanding at the outset.

MR. LOOS: Senator, I think Ms. Pyrch is suggesting that if prospective employees were told of the parking situation in Trenton, that, in fact, would be all they would become. They wouldn't become employees of the State of New Jersey.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I certainly think that it shouldn't be misrepresented to them what the reality -- what the situation is. What building are you in? Where is your building located?

MS. PYRCH: The Health and Agriculture Building.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: That's the round building over near the Justice Complex?

MS. PYRCH: The square building attached to the round building -- the Health part of it.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. For instance, did you attempt to get parking at the Broad and Front Street facility?

MS. PYRCH: Well, at the time-- I am new to the area, and I don't know the facilities by name. But I did, by foot, go to any parking lot I could find within walking distance.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: And you found that there were just no spaces?

MS. PYRCH: You put your name on a waiting list. How many are on this waiting list? A hundred plus.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: The security risk problem you are talking about is what, vandalism to your car or personal problems of assault -- that sort of thing?

MS. PYRCH: Yes, anything. I am thinking about any possible act of crime that might occur in the lots, or wherever.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Are you working on an ad hoc basis, day to day, in terms of finding a location now?

MS. PYRCH: Yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: And you are not untypical? Are you suggesting that there are a number of people in your Department who have this same problem?

MS. PYRCH: Yes, many.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: How do you feel about the idea of a pool; for instance, a facility nearby with a 10- or 12-minute bus ride? Is that something you might be receptive to, if you were sure your car would be secure and well cared for?

MS. PYRCH: Absolutely. I think the security of the lot itself would be utmost in my mind, but if there were some kind of a busing situation in from those lots, I see that as part of the solution.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Sure. How long have you been with the State?

MS. PYRCH: For six months.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Okay. Well, I would hope that maybe people will put their heads together. You have been kind enough to come here and share that information with us. If nothing else out of this Committee, hopefully maybe you will get a little personal relief, although I cannot guarantee that.

Thank you very much.

MS. PYRCH: You're welcome.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: John?

MR. LOOS: Next, I would like to ask Elsie Glover, from the Division of Taxation, Mill Hill, to come and talk for such a moment or two. Elsie?

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Good morning, Ms. Glover.

ELSIE GLOVER: Good morning.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Good morning.

MS. GLOVER: I am Elsie Glover. I am an employee of the Department of the Treasury, Division of Taxation, Mill Hill. Being a Chief Shop Steward for CWA, I have had the opportunity to speak with many of the employees in reference to the parking situation. In the area where we work, there is a City-owned lot which I am estimating holds approximately 200 cars. We have stickers--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Which lot is that, Ms. Glover, if I may ask? Do you know?

MS. GLOVER: It is across from the Capitol State Bank.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. It's surface parking you're talking about?

MS. GLOVER: Yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. I think we are both familiar with it.

MS. GLOVER: Okay. I would say it holds approximately 200 cars, but yet stickers are given out to approximately 400 employees. So, we are talking about a first-come, first-served basis. We have mothers and fathers who cannot come to work until their children have left for school. It is almost impossible for them to leave for work approximately an hour earlier, just to get a parking spot. This is what they would have to do.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: What time is that lot usually full? I guess you start your regular work about eight or--

MS. GLOVER: By 8:15, 8:30 people are scrambling for a parking spot.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Most people, what, start at nine?

MS. GLOVER: No, eight.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: At eight. Well, if they are getting there at 8:15, 8:30, I am not sure how sympathetic we ought to be.

MS. GLOVER: Okay. Also, I would like to state -- not cutting you off -- we share the lot with four other agencies. We have Motor Vehicle; we have Human Services.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Does this include the 400 altogether?

MS. GLOVER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: It includes Motor Vehicle, Treasury, and others?

MS. GLOVER: Yes, correct. The stickers were given out to approximately 400 people, but there are only spaces for about 200 cars. Not only that, they took away 40 spots from us last year, when the new bank opened up on the corner of Broad and Market, to accommodate the employees there. We have other structures going up on Broad Street. I don't know what type of a deal has been made in that respect.

However, the employees are very angry and frustrated at not being able to find a parking spot. I don't like to speak on a personal basis, but I have a sticker. It does not guarantee me a spot. I have been an employee for 29 years. I may or may not get a spot. Something must be done.

I was listening earlier to the fact that a spot, or an area is being cleared on Perry Street. I also thought I heard that we were not getting too concerned about the barbed wire; we are concerned about the beauty of it. I might be mistaken. However, we are concerned about security also. We have employees who have been mugged. It is a horrible, horrible feeling to leave your home in the morning, not knowing whether or not you are going to arrive on your job safely, or arrive back home safely, because of leaving your job and being mugged, because of where you have to park.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Ms. Glover, let me ask you this: On a given day, do you have any information, with specificity, as to how many of your co-workers who have stickers for that lot, are actually unable to park in that lot? What kind of numbers are we talking about -- on a daily basis?

MS. GLOVER: I don't have definite figures, but I know there are quite a few. There are many who have been given stickers because in the building where I work, Senator, you are not allowed to go out and feed the meters. So you end up with a ticket every day.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: But, are you talking about 10, 20, 30, 40? Do you have any records, to give us some sense of how bad the problem is? See, on the one hand -- and we ought to ask this-- I don't know whether, Mike, your people can give us any information as to the number of spaces in that lot. You are probably familiar with it, Tom.

MR. McKITISH: (speaking from audience) Three hundred and thirty-three.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Three hundred and thirty-three? Are you able, off the top of your head, to tell us how many permits have been issued for those 333 spots?

MR. McKITISH: About 400.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: So, you're talking about 333 spaces and 400 permits. I guess your argument would be that the 67 difference is on the basis of sick leave, vacation, away-from-the-location work, etc. -- things of that sort.

MR. McKITISH: Work time starting also. That building has a number of employees who have different work times during the heavy processing of taxes season. I will tell you that there are some difficulties getting a parking place after a certain time in the morning in the downtown Trenton area, as more people come in and park. After three o'clock in the afternoon, I will really challenge anyone in this room. They can park just about anywhere in Trenton after three o'clock in the afternoon. So, we are sensitive to those work load terms.

We are also, Senator-- I must, just for a second, talk about security.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Why don't you come on up, Mike, so we can capture what you are saying?

MR. McKITISH: (complies) We have placed "strategic security-- First of all, at the Park n' Ride on Perry Street, we have positions approved for four guards -- two guardhouses at this location.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Mike, before you start--

MR. McKITISH: Yes?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Could you give us the overall positions that were approved in last year's Appropriations Act? I think it was about 27 more we had given you, to beef up your security force. Do you recall the--

MR. McKITISH: I cannot do that with any specificity because that showed up in the Law and Public Safety budget under the State Police. However, I know the number was substantial. I really don't know--

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: I know we were concerned about the problem brought forth here this morning by Ms. Glover, and others, on security, and we did -- and you did -- put additional moneys into the Appropriations Act, and also provided for the positions necessary to beef up their force.

MR. McKITISH: Let me say that we have, with your help certainly, provided those positions for guards. We have guards strategically located here at the corner of Bank and Willow Street, and up here at the corner of Area 31 (using map to demonstrate). These guards, under their job duties, are on patrol outside of the building. I am not going to tell you that they are outside of their little kiosks every day, but we are constantly on them to make sure that they do get out there. I personally, when I leave from the State House, drive up this way. I drive around to all of the blocks -- it is not unusual for someone to find me doing that -- to make sure that people are, in fact, doing their jobs.

Up at the Perry Street Park n' Ride lot, we have, again, four positions approved. We intend to provide some traffic relief to address some of the concerns that the Mayor

presented earlier. We are very, very sensitive to security issues. In the Justice Complex area, we have put on additional guards to monitor the parking lot. I am not going to say that there are not going to be transgressions, either against someone's property or against someone's person. That does happen. I think it would be foolish for me to say that I could totally eliminate that.

However, we look forward to the day -- we really look forward to the day -- when we do not have to have guards in these locations; that the real security will be provided by the people as a result of the circulation that we provide for this great City. That is what we are pointing to. We understand that there is a short-term concern. We understand that this has to be addressed and we have, in fact, addressed it.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Mike, I wonder if you would have someone from your staff talk further with Ms. Glover about this particular problem, to see what the figures are, and maybe work with her in terms of the number of people who, I think, do not get in to park there, who arrive within the regular working hours and have permits. I mean, if it happens on a rare occasion to one or two or three people, that's one thing. If it is happening more regularly, I think you would agree that we ought to do something about it.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Senator, if I may, I would like to go a little bit further with that. It seems as though the parking lot that Ms. Glover is talking about holds 200, and you've got 400 stickers.

MR. McKITISH: We say it holds 330.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Well, I guess I have to take Mike's figure, because he is closer to it. Do you have a formula that you use, like 20% more parking permits are given? Say it is 330, 20% would give you about 400 or so.

MR. McKITISH: On average, in all of the lots, the difference between these two numbers would be 21%.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Twenty-one percent.

MR. McKITISH: However, as I said before, each area is monitored specifically. We do have concerns at that location. I am not going to suggest that we don't. We try to make sure that they do their rounds in that area. Let me just find that building if I can, for a second, on this map. It is right in here. We are very sensitive to that.

I do want to say for the record, as you all know, I wear two hats in the Treasury Department, and I have a very busy schedule. I feel it is necessary that I stay here to hear the concerns of organized labor in this forum, so that we can address some of those concerns. I am not here to say that we are always right. We need to listen. We hear, and we address these issues as we go along.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Good, all right. Let's hear from another State employee. Thank you, Ms. Glover. I appreciate your coming.

MR. LOOS: We have one last State employee, and that's Martha Kotrba, from the Department of Education.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Could you please spell your name for us?

M A R T H A K O T R B A: It's K-O-T-R-B-A.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much.

MS. KOTRBA: I am employed in the Division of Vocational Education, and my office is located in the Capitol Plaza refurbished project.

Five days ago, Thursday evening at 4:45, I became a victim of the parking crisis that I see befall State employees working in the City. I was attacked, robbed, and mugged. I was, needless to say, scared to death. There was not a soul around. I chased my attacker, and I almost caught him, too, but-- I chased him up the steps by the Planetarium and across and behind, and I watched his movements, screaming, and there wasn't anyone around -- 4:45. I mean, it's not really all that dark out yet either.

I found some of my belongings. Fortunately, I have had a personal protection course. I think it ought to be mandatory for all State employees. I think it is something that needs to-- In fact, any employee working in the City ought to have a personal protection course. They are excellent. It really saved me. It allowed me to know that on payday you keep your check in your briefcase; you keep your car keys in your coat pocket; and you keep your hands on your pocketbook. There are some safety factors that were important in that course that I really believe helped me.

However, I got into my car and reported this to the police. They were excellent. They retraced my steps with me. I found some of my belongings. The next morning, we found even more. I came away with a few bruises and a few bumps and bangs, but I think so did the perpetrator.

However, the point is, I am now scared, and I have not been scared since I was a little kid. I travel 70 miles to work. I live in Hunterdon County, and I commute down here. I monitor between 80 and 100 programs and health occupations throughout the State of New Jersey, and I need to have a car. I need to travel. I cannot car pool easily because of the responsibilities I have on the job. I have worked here two years, and I am nowhere near even beginning to get a parking permit for the lot that would be assigned to me.

I was very surprised when-- I agree with the first person who spoke, in that if I, as a State employee -- or a future State employee -- had been told during my interview process that parking was a problem, and that safety was a problem, I could have made an intelligent decision, and possibly I would not have had to be a victim. But I was, and I therefore ultimately feel that the State is responsible for providing me, as an employee, safety on my job; safety to and from my automobile, and safety to and from meetings that I have to attend in the State.

Some suggestions for that would be: The institution of an immediate personal protection course, which I think is paramount. Get the word out to State employees that safety is a problem in the City, and that women especially should not leave after dark without being attended by someone. A fellow co-worker of mine left exactly five minutes before me, traveled the same steps I did, but was walked to her car by a male employee. I came along five minutes later totally alone, and I was accosted. I know it was because I was alone.

I also feel there ought to be some type of an escort service or a bus service for people who tend to work late, which I was doing in order to finish a project that was due the next day. Instead of leaving at 4:15, I left at a quarter to five. So, for being a conscientious employee, you become abused. I feel, again, that if our employer wants us to do the job we were hired to do, they need to provide safety, and an escort service on a regular half-hour basis, where we, as employees, would know someone would be there for us -- someone who could walk with us, or drive us to our cars -- would be appropriate. I think that needs to be done immediately.

I listened to these people talking about statistics and parking spaces per employees, etc. But it was my body that was abused the other night, and I really take offense at that. Statistics can say anything. There are hundreds of State employees who do not have safe parking in this City. They work here; they travel here from all over. I was very amused after I started working here that they presented a pewter bowl to a fellow co-worker of mine because she had served 10 years in the Department of Education. They had a big party. She said she would have preferred being given a parking sticker, as opposed to a pewter bowl. So, I don't know how long someone has to work here to finally get to the top of the list for parking, but I know that 10 years seems to be-- She just got one, as a matter of fact, this past summer, so that made it 11 years for

her. I have only been here for two years, so I have a long way to go before I can be assured of a safe parking place.

That is really where I am coming from.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much, Ms. Kotrba. That was rather extraordinary testimony, and an extraordinary effort on your behalf. I know I can speak for Assemblyman Watson in saying, obviously we are sorry that this experience befell you. We are appreciative of your taking the time out to be here with the Committee to share your views. I think they are very important views, and I am happy that Mr. McKitish is here, and his staff, to hear them.

Obviously, there may be very rare occasional experiences of State employees going through what you went through, whatever we do. But I would hope--

MS. KOTRBA: Senator, I just want to interrupt. I am the third person in my division in the last six months who has been attacked. That is just my division on the tenth and eleventh floors of Capitol Plaza, and that's just Education.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Let me go back to the incident itself. As I understand it, it happened in Capitol Plaza?

MS. KOTRBA: No, it happened by the Planetarium.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Where do you park?

MS. KOTRBA: I was parked in Lot 6, which is behind the museum, to the left of the Planetarium.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: And you work in Capitol Plaza.

MS. KOTRBA: That is correct.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: So you crossed State Street, you went up alongside of the Education building, and--

MS. KOTRBA: No, I walked up State Street to the museum and went straight back--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: --turned right, went back past the museum, and were going down the steps by the Planetarium, when you were attacked--

MS. KOTRBA: At the bottom of the steps.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Was it a young person involved?

MS. KOTRBA: Between 19 and 23.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. A male?

MS. KOTRBA: Yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: And he got away?

MS. KOTRBA: Yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: And the time was 4:45 in the afternoon, on a--

MS. KOTRBA: On a Thursday -- a payday; a State payday.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: On a Thursday, a payday. And you then began to scream, and he ran down the steps?

MS. KOTRBA: He ran back up the steps. I chased him, he ran behind the Planetarium -- you know, the dome -- and then started to go down the other set of steps. I chased him that far, and then realized I could never catch up with him. He scaled a chainlink fence by the parking lot, ran across both directions of north and southbound 29, and almost got hit by cars. They had to stop, scream on their brakes and blow their horns, to let him get through, and then he bounded over and went into the woods and down by the river.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right. How long before you saw any policemen?

MS. KOTRBA: I didn't see any policemen until I got in my car and drove to the guard booth, and he couldn't even get the window open to ask me what had happened. I rolled down my car window, and I was so upset, and he couldn't even get his window open. He had to come out. However, the State Police were superb. Once they were notified, they really took over.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: And three employees in your Division in the last six months have suffered similar assaults or attacks?

MS. KOTRBA: Yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: In that area?

MS. KOTRBA: No, on State Street.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right.

MS. KOTRBA: Between Capitol Plaza and 225 West State.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I certainly think your personal injury protection course-- I am not necessarily enthused about the idea of making it mandatory, but I think it ought to be something available to any State employee, if they elect to take it.

I think the escort service question is also an excellent idea. I don't know whether the State, by department, has any policy, but there probably ought to be a policy with regard to accompanying employees after regular work hours. Perhaps that should be put in, in writing of some sort or form.

I also think -- and then, Mike, I would like you to comment on this -- that particularly on paydays, because I guess that is a peculiar-- If we studied the statistics, I would suspect maybe there are more incidences of this sort on paydays. It would seem to me on those days, that the guards ought to be extra vigilant, that employees ought to be alerted to be extra cautious, and that escort services ought to be extra available. Maybe this combination will reduce, a little bit further, this kind of a happening.

Mike, do you have any comment on that? I know you can't stop every incident, but are there any policies with regard to escorts? Are there any policies with regard to a personal protection course? Or are there any special precautions taken on paydays?

MR. McKITISH: (speaking from audience) Senator, certainly a personal protection course is something that, if the employee wishes to engage-- Any employee in any urban center might consider a protection course of some kind. But I also suggest to you that the problem is not just in urban centers. I periodically read reports in the newspaper of people accosted at malls, especially during this time of the year. Crime is not something that is just found in urban centers. It is all over the place, unfortunately.

We have talked to the State Police, and understand that the State Police, the Capitol Police, and the guards are all really one and the same. Certainly the troopers endure much greater training -- it is my understanding -- than the Capitol Police, and the guards have lesser duties in terms of what their responsibilities are.

I am very sorry to hear what happened to this lady, or to any State employee, because, again, I am very sensitive to that. I will go back, and just recount the fact that I am a career employee who had to struggle with parking in my early years in State government; parking up in the Bank and Willow Street area before guards were, so to speak, fashionable, or even thought of by State government as a duty.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Well, I am concerned. My instinct reaction is that I am concerned that at 4:45 at night -- which is a peak time, just a little beyond regular working hours -- a woman employee coming out of that building could experience the kind of incident that we just heard here, and not have any Capitol Police, State Police, or whatever-- You know, whether they caught the person is one thing, but to not even be around until she got to her car and drove over, raises in my mind the question of whether, at those hours, Mike, between twilight and, let's say, 5:30, when most State employees are long since gone, we ought to have a policy of those police being out and on foot and around and very visible.

MR. McKITISH: Senator, there is a guard booth located between Area 2L and Area 6 -- right at this location. These guard booths all have windows in them. The guards -- according to their duties, their specs -- are supposed to be out of the guard booths and in that general vicinity.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Moving around.

MR. McKITISH: They are all equipped with radios. They are not equipped with firearms. This is part of their job responsibility.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Well, why don't you, for this Committee, do me a favor? The date is fresh and recent. The hour is on the record. I would appreciate it if you would communicate with the police authorities, find out who was on duty at that time, and what the State Police or the Capitol Police's explanation is for why, at that time and place, with the kind of screaming that took place over at least a couple of minutes time, no policeman was in the area to hear it, and let us know. I promise the witness that if we get that information from you, which I hope we will, she will get it from us.

MR. McKITISH: I will ask the State Police for a full incident report on the matter, and try to get the answer for you.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: This is another interesting question: Is there, Mike, to your knowledge, a record kept of these incidents? It would seem to me that is something that someone ought to be monitoring, to keep an eye on it. To your knowledge, do the State Police--

MR. McKITISH: This is really in the area of the State Police, and I don't purport to tell them how to do their business, understandably. But, it is my understanding that they do keep incident records for their own security purposes. I am not, at this point, privy to any--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Don't you think that it ought to be the obligation, as a practical matter of the State Police and Capitol Police, to keep some sort of record of incidents involving either property damage or personal injury of public employees, and share that information with you, or someone on your staff? Don't you think that makes sense? I mean, we get some testimony here -- and I know you are sensitive to it -- about, you know, what the magnitude of some of these problems is. I really can't tell. This young woman, of course, had a peculiar and upsetting experience, and she has strong feelings of her own.

But I think it would be helpful to you, and to us, if we could maybe get a little better handle on this. If you need this Committee's help, or even if you need legislative action-- I can't help but think that Assemblyman Watson would be supportive as well, to see that that is done.

MR. McKITISH: Senator, I would really defer to the State Police for that information. I really cannot, and I wouldn't even pretend to tell them how to do their job. I'm sure, though, that they are aware--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I don't mean to be grandstanding, but obviously the Legislature could do that. I recognize your sensitivity. The Division of State Police is a unique organization; they have very strong views about their work, and so on. But certainly in an area of this sort, I see no reason why-- Somehow, we ought to be able to get those statistics. We will go to work on trying to help you with that.

MR. McKITISH: We are very pleased with the State Police's activities. They have been very helpful to us in providing increased security in the parking lots. I think that a good discussion with the State Police might be helpful, and certainly, again, the reason I am here is to listen to all the concerns and make sure that we take whatever action you deem necessary.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Good. I didn't mean to criticize the State Police. I think they do an excellent job, but I think we can help on this, and we will.

MS. KOTRBA: I would just like to make a comment: The night that I was in the State Police station going through this whole thing, I asked them how many other people -- State employees -- they have been involved with lately had gone through similar circumstances, or something where they had to go out and investigate, and how we could get that information. Frankly, I really feel that I would like to do something to protect all the people who have not gone through this. They

told me that they had never been asked for that information. They do reports on all of it, so I know it is there.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: All right, we will get into that. Thank you very much.

Do you have anything further, John?

MR. LOOS: Yes. What I would like to talk about is the vision for the City that the CWA has. I don't think we can talk about parking and transportation, without really thinking about what it is we want in this City. We have this vision of this City as a thriving metropolitan center. It is going to be a City someday, we think -- if the proper planning is done -- where there are going to be stores for all income levels to shop in. There are going to be restaurants for all income levels to eat in. The ethnic flavor of this City's full-time residents and part-time workers and visitors is going to be reflected in the diverse cultural life of this City.

But our vision of Trenton also, obviously, given the number of people we represent here, includes thousands upon thousands of State workers coming to work everyday, and not having to spend an unknown quantity of time looking around for parking. People should be able to plan their lives and know that within some reasonable amount of time they can get to work and park. They should not have to be circling the City looking for an empty parking meter, where they really shouldn't be parking in the first place, because there are ordinances on meter feeding.

And, obviously, our vision includes people not having to worry about their personal security. Yes, as Mike says, there is crime every place in the State, but muggings, I think, if we look statistically, are-- The incidence of muggings is higher in urban centers. There are more people concentrated in the area; more people walking the streets. So, it is an issue that has unique concern in the City.

I am sure this vision that I just laid out is one that is shared, probably, by everyone here in this room. The question we raise today is: Who is planning for the future? Who is going to take charge? Who is going to commit resources ultimately, so that this vision can be turned into reality? We are here today because we are committed to working in the planning process with the various entities. This union has a real vested interest in the planning process being done in a rational and progressive fashion.

We are also here today because we believe that State government, and its various entities -- both the executive branch and the legislative branch -- have a unique role in the planning process. This is really a company town. State government is the primary industry in town. So, State government has a special obligation to help to incarnate the dream; incarnate the vision. There has to be a new partnership not based upon strict legal obligations, but rather on long-term commitments to turning dreams into deeds.

This Legislature has to eventually begin to appropriate funds for the fair demands of the State employment force, for either adequate parking or for affordable public transportation. But the Legislature obviously needs leadership from the executive branch. The Governor and key Cabinet officers must take bold steps in the planning process, which is still in the embryo. The Treasurer and the Commissioners of the major departments must commit staff time to the planning process that is going to be going on under the auspices of Capital City.

But, they must go beyond that, more than just giving staff time. Each staff must be given Cabinet-level approval to participate in the planning process, not in a conservative way, but as progressive leaders. They must be able to dream dreams and have visions about what this City should be like.

What would this mean? It would mean a policy decision from the top, from the Governor on down, that State government was going to lead the way in Trenton's redevelopment. It would mean that the staff that participated might dream wild dreams of a better City, and know that the Cabinet officer was going to include building part of that dream into the next year's budget. It would mean courageous legislative leadership, because the legislative branch of government is really also a major -- not a department, but effectively it has a lot of employees and a lot of people who participate in the life of this City, as a result of coming into these various committee meetings, etc.

I would challenge the legislative branch to think about committing some of its staff -- perhaps the majority leadership of both houses -- that they should be involved in the planning process, so that eventually when the departments and the Governor come before the Appropriations Committee, and say: "This is the dream we have, and this is the way we want to build it in 1990, or 1991," the legislative branch and the majority leadership would have been part of formulating that dream.

What do we want -- CWA? What does our membership tell us we want? Well, our people want to do good jobs for the State, but they want to spend less time getting to them. They want parking, but it does not have to be next-door. You have heard that we are open to experiments. We really commend the Treasurer's office on this experiment with the Park n' Ride lot. We hope it works, because our dream of the City isn't a city full of parking lots that surround buildings. That is a heck of a way to build a city; buildings with just parking lots surrounding them. We need to experiment with new ways of moving people in and out of large office buildings.

We would like to see some experiments for lots even further out, perhaps strategically located upon major arteries

coming into this City; perhaps out on Route 1 someplace; perhaps coming in from the south someplace on Route 206. If people use this Park n' Ride lot, we think there should be other experiments to see if we can bring even fewer cars into the City.

We want affordable public transportation into the City. No city can survive in the 21st century as a thriving metropolis with just cars streaming into it. We've got to confront tough, tough questions in the public transportation area.

Those are costly decisions in the short run, but in the long term, as we hear about ozone and all of the other problems associated, we have to have leadership that is going to look beyond one year's budget, or two years' budget, and say, "We have to plan for the survival, really, of the citizens of this State. We have to do what is environmentally sound."

The statistics up here look good, but too many of those spots are surface parking lots, and it does tear down affordable housing for people when we do surface lots. It is bad environmentally. You build 100 spots in five locations, and you are taking up land that could be parkland, that could be open land, that could be affordable housing, that could be shops for people to shop in. Build it up, or build it down. That is the way we have to go. We cannot have surface parking all over the City.

The last thing I want to emphasize is: We want our members to be protected as they move about this City. We are worth more than a piece of equipment; we're human beings. I don't say that in a preachy sort of way. It is something we all know, and that we all believe. But we wouldn't allow an expensive robot the State owned to move along that corridor unattended. We wouldn't do it. You know, it might be worth a quarter of a million dollars; a piece of equipment we could program, but we would never allow it to move unattended like

that. We are human beings, and we've got to say that no cost is too great when we are talking about the security of our members. We have had too many tragedies in this City in the area of security. I don't mean to suggest that the State has looked the other way. I think that Mike McKitish's office has done a lot to move in the right direction, but we are not there yet. We shouldn't give up. These ideas that colleagues of mine expressed a few moments ago need to be looked at; the idea of offering personal protection courses; the idea of doing it on State time, so that, on a voluntary basis, people can go to learn how to be secure.

Parking, yeah, we want it. We know it is not easy, but we are prepared to be part of this planning process. I think Bob Litke, from the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation, is going to testify, but just before he testifies, I want to publicly state that I think he is doing a good job initially. He has reached out, I think, to the various constituent groups in this City, including organized labor, and we appreciate his openness in the planning process.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Loos. Your remarks are very encouraging, and were very well said. You know, public employees are a rich resource for the Capital City. While we talk about transportation problems, parking problems, etc., as you point out, we are really-- The bottom line, ultimately, is people.

The City of Trenton can be made a richer, better City by the public employees who are spending a tremendous part of their day here -- day in and day out. I think your comments about your willingness to work with the administration, to work with the Legislature, and to work with Bob Litke are well-sounded. I am delighted to hear that, and I look forward to it. I think you and your members can contribute in a lot of ways to the future of the City of Trenton, not only on the issues which are immediately before this Committee, but in many

other ways, to help to make the City of Trenton a really great -- the greatest Capital City of any capital in the United States. We will look forward to that, and I know you do, too. Thank you very much.

Mr. Litke -- Bob Litke -- from the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation.

R O B E R T M. L I T K E: A little drama.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: Are you going to drag that around with you every day? (referring to large picture Mr. Litke is carrying)

MR. LITKE: Only to special places.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert Litke. I am the Executive Director of the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation. I appreciate the opportunity to come here to speak before you. Although I do not have answers, you know I am charged, soon, with coming up with some proposals.

The Capital City Redevelopment Corporation has begun the process of developing a master plan for the capital district, which plan should be completed and adopted by the corporation early next summer.

As part of the planning process, we have placed under contract the transportation planning firm of M. R. Lehr and Associates and the urban planning and design firm of the Liebman Melting Partnership, in joint venture with Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk Architects, Inc.

Land use planning and urban design are inseparable from transportation planning, although they are separate disciplines. At this stage in our planning process, we are collecting and analyzing data and identifying issues and problems. If you look at downtown Trenton from the air -- and that is why I brought this glorious picture -- you can't help but be overwhelmed by the extent to which vast areas of the downtown are devoted to surface parking. This is not a sign of health in a downtown economy. It is an indication of the lack

of demand of land to build on. We have the land, and nobody wants to use it for productive purposes -- is what I'm saying.

But that also gives us great opportunities for the future, because this land is a resource which, over time, can be put to more productive use. As downtown Trenton becomes a more thriving place, all that land area now devoted to surface parking will gradually be devoted to other uses -- offices, retail, housing, and perhaps a civic center. Parking, instead of being spread out on the ground, will be in structures, and that is expensive. But that is a different kind of a problem, brought on by a burgeoning economy. When we build parking structures, it is because we are out of well-located vacant land. That means that downtown is alive and well.

In approaching the redevelopment planning for the capital district, we have to appreciate the fact that parking is an issue in transportation planning, and that is what we are trying to address, in conjunction with the State, with the City, and with the people in Trenton. What we have to do is effectively move large numbers of people at peak periods, so they can get about their daily business most efficiently. People can move on foot, via mass transit, or in their own private cars, and there are many ramifications for each alternative.

To the extent that we can make downtown a more viable place to live, we will relieve the transportation burden, since those who live downtown are more prone to walk to work. To the extent that we can improve the functioning, price, and image of mass transit, we will relieve the congestion on our streets and the pressure for parking spaces brought on by the need to store private cars. To the extent that we can wean people away from one car per person, we will relieve the pressure for parking spaces. I think there are lots of alternatives, but there are no panaceas.

On Wednesday -- tomorrow -- we are beginning a public planning process that we have been moving towards as a key element in our planning for the capital district -- for downtown Trenton. We are engaging in a series of work sessions -- public work sessions -- with people representing a very, very broad cross section of the community. We have invited people from what we call the cultural, educational, and recreational segments of the community. We have invited developers; we have invited merchants and businesspeople from downtown; we have invited government planning agencies and related lay people involved in planning boards, economic development, and so forth, to participate. We have invited residents, people representing a variety of community organizations, churches, and housing-based organizations. We are asking people to come in to meet with our planning people, and to give us their agendas. We are not sitting there telling anyone how we are going to solve the problems; we are listening. We are trying to elicit visions and responses and solutions to problems. No matter how wild or off-the-wall they may be, lots of crazy ideas have germs in them that can produce long-term, as well as short-term solutions.

We are beginning that process tomorrow at eight o'clock in the morning, and we hope to wrap it up Thursday at ten o'clock in the evening. I trust that the mail has been efficient enough so that both you and Assemblyman Watson have received invitations and have a picture of the whole process, and I trust that you will find the time to drop in and participate, as you see fit and as you have the time to do so.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Excuse me, Bob. May I interrupt you? Has John Loos been invited to that?

MR. LITKE: John Loos has been invited, yes.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Because I would think that when you talk about representatives of a broad cross section, the leadership or the representatives of 16,000 to 18,000 public

employees who regularly, every day, come and go, would be an extremely important voice to be heard from. I hope he can make it.

MR. LITKE: Not only has John been invited to represent the union as an institution, but we have also set up a luncheon for "the worker." We have asked John to identify several people. We have asked Rick Porth to get us some City workers; we have asked the State to do the same, and Mercer County.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Good.

MR. LITKE: So, we will get together with about 10 or 12 people who have to survive every day and work in town, and they will talk to us, too. We're trying to cover -- I guess you could say, cover the universe, in Trenton, so we can begin to fashion the real serious agenda to begin to solve the problems.

The upshot of what I have to say, is that we are absorbing; we are collecting data; we are looking at the problems; we are talking to everybody who has the patience to talk to me. We will start to come out with things that the public can respond to, and I hope we will get answers.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Very good. Thank you very much. I'm sure anyone who is here who is interested would be welcome to attend that session to express themselves. Thank you very much, Bob.

I don't know whether Jim Crawford is still around, but--

A S S T. C O M M. J A M E S A. C R A W F O R D: Right here.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Oh, I didn't see you. Didn't you get up and disappear for a while? (no response) I know you have a busy schedule. You have been extremely patient. As sort of the number two person in that huge Department of Transportation, we will be delighted to hear from you. I know the Committee will.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER CRAWFORD: Senator, I guess I am going to take a slightly different tact than perhaps some of the others today, because while finding parking places for the numbers of employees who work here is indeed an element in the overall program that needs to be addressed, I daresay that it is not a solution in and of itself, and that, in fact, there is no such thing as free parking in Trenton, and that even if free parking were provided to every State employee, there is a tremendous cost to the State in having that many more people driving into the City. What we need to do is face a comprehensive strategy for providing for the transportation of the State employees, not just for their parking.

We not only have to reduce the unavailability of parking, but we also have to recognize that there are traffic congestion problems both within the City and in the arteries feeding into the City, and that faced with this fact, we also have to recognize that for many State employees, car pooling is not a realistic arrangement, and that there are many for whom reliance on public transportation is not a solution.

What we have to do is address this as little bits in an overall mosaic. No one element solves our problem, but if we begin to nibble away with a few more people on public transportation, increasing the per passenger ridership even by a tenth or two-tenths of a person on the average, we will begin to accomplish an overall pattern that will provide for those who are driving, better parking and less congestion, and for those who are traveling by bus, more availability, and for those who are able to share a ride, that potential.

To do this, though, we have to recognize that it isn't simply a matter of wishing it to be so. We cannot sit back and say, "Gee, wouldn't it be nice if more people would car pool? Wouldn't it be nice if somehow people would find a way to use the public transportation that is available within the City, and in some of the suburbs feeding into the City?"

I would like to offer then several points on issues which I think need to be addressed, talk a little bit about some of the things we are doing in conjunction with the Department of the Treasury, and finally, end up by talking about some of the potential obstacles which I think need to be recognized as we go forward. I will try to keep this brief, because I know there are a number of other people who have waited patiently.

First, I think we have to establish a hierarchy of preferential parking at State lots for all participants of ridesharing in whatever form, from car pools up through bus service. It is unrealistic to say, "Well, one particular parking lot provides for preferential parking, and another--" Yeah, we have a preferential lot. It is a third of the way out in the lot. There is a space for van pooling. That is not preferential parking, and indeed, preferential parking is one of the things that are necessary. Without it, there is, in fact, little incentive to get out of your own car to make the trip.

The other issue that goes along with this, is the fact that we need to recognize that when people share a ride, they need to have the ability during those rare but occasional situations where a true family crisis or other type of crisis arises, to get home. Unfortunately, in addressing this, all too often we are faced with a situation where we can bring people in, but their constant comment to us as we go about dealing with them is, "What do I do if I get a call that my child is sick at school?" Or, "What do I do if I get word that a parent or someone else who is dependent upon me, needs my help in a hurry?" I would suggest that there would be an advantage to the State looking at a system, especially in conjunction with the remote Park n' Ride lots -- and I know we are doing this from our discussions with Treasury -- to ensure that people can, if not immediately, at least within a half an

hour, get to the parking place where their vehicle is, so they can continue to make the rest of the trip home.

Satellite parking facilities clearly have to be part of the answer. I am hopeful that the past experience of 10 years ago, when remote parking lots were established and failed miserably, will be reversed as the City of Trenton continues its revitalization. The experience at the Perry Street lot should be a basis for many such lots throughout the State, and in particular throughout the Mercer County area, where people coming into the City can park, board a vehicle, and it will take them to their job site. They would know that: a) they would be able to get to their job site in a reasonable amount of time, and b), be able to get back to their vehicle if there is a need to during the day.

We have to also recognize that this is not something that happens for free. I caution the Legislature, and the Treasury Department, too, from time to time, that just because the transit service is provided by a State agency, we cannot work on the assumption that therefore the State agency will set up and operate that service within their existing budget, no matter what the additional cost is. So, as we take these on, we ought to consider ourselves as employers. Just as the Department is out advocating subscription bus service for various employers along Route 1 and in other areas, we need, as employers within State government, to recognize that this is a cost of doing business.

That brings me to a third issue which has already been discussed by the Mayor, the question of providing assistance to those for whom public transportation is a viable option. The Mayor talked about the \$15-a-month allowance. There are a number of ways that that can be done. The New Jersey Transit system -- which I am sure you will hear more about in a little while -- has available the option of buying bus cards, for those who ride the system on a regular basis. The State could

make an arrangement, as we are doing with employers in other parts of the State, where the employer makes the bus passes available at a discount to its employees, and picks up that cost as part of their overall price of doing business; certainly no more unrealistic than the amount that has to be paid where structured parking is provided in order to provide that.

But, we ought not to view that as something for everybody. It ought to only be for those who really will use that service, not for those who say, "Well, you know, I may come in two days a week, but the other three days I will need to have a space. Make sure I am on that list for a parking space."

The options we are talking about, though, require uniform and universal policies in all departments of the State, to ensure that the most liberal interpretation of flex time or staggered working hours be accomplished within the realistic constraints of that work force. I realize from my own situation, where we have some units we would like to put on flex time, that because of the conditions we have, we have to limit it to a staggered work hour, and not add the ability to offer complete flex time. This is something that needs to be worked out on a systematic basis throughout State government.

Finally, we need to address the fact that this is an ongoing process that does not stop simply because at one point in time we may reach a plateau where there seems to be some level of satisfaction. The Treasury Department has made significant progress in the last several years. I can say that from personal experience, having a wife who waited nine years to get her parking sticker for downtown, and hearing about the problems every Monday and Thursday when the Legislature is in session -- the lack of parking on those days. But I think the fact is, there needs to be a universal system.

As part of that, the Department is beginning, in conjunction with New Jersey Transit and on behalf of the Treasury Department, to look at a survey of State employees to find out exactly how many of them have the option available of other forms of ride sharing, make them aware as to what those options are, provide the pooling process that would then be necessary, and finally, to put together a series of coordinators. To do that, we are looking at printing several brochures that would be available, which would be focused on the Trenton car pooler, or the Trenton ride sharer. We are also looking at the availability of bulletin boards for employees in State offices. In the surveys we are going to do, we are not only going to be sending them out; we are actually going to be setting up work stations in the various lobbies and cafeterias of State buildings, to make our people's presence known and to assist in helping people. We are also going to expand the ridesharing information signs that have begun to come up -- we now have 21 of them in the State -- and those signs are not only for people going to Route 1. That same service is provided to the employees coming to the State.

What we cannot do, and what it should not be assumed that we can do, is find a way to make someone share a ride. We can offer a service. We can make it as attractive as possible. We can market it in conjunction with the other agencies of State government. But, when it comes right down to it, we, as a people -- and that includes union help; it includes management efforts -- have to accept the fact that the only way we are going to solve our transportation problems, is to recognize that we are part of the cause of those problems, and that a solution requires our participation, not just the other person's.

I would like to just take a few minutes to talk about some of the obstacles here. I have not gone, Senator, into the various projects. If you want to get into those, I will, but I

think we have been over those before. Some of the obstacles we must recognize are: Although the ridesharing is aimed at the actual user, it is fundamentally true that none of the policy changes suggested, and few of the marketing issues, can be accomplished in a meaningful way without the highest level of commitment from State government, county government, City government, and business within the Capital City. In order for that commitment to become a reality, there must be, at these same high levels, an acknowledgement that congestion in the Trenton area is, indeed, a serious problem, and a genuine desire to solve this problem must be held by all.

Frequently, there appears to be support for traffic and parking congestion mitigation efforts, but that seems to evaporate when the realities of some conflicting considerations, especially budget constraints, come into focus. For example, it has been suggested that New Jersey Transit has demonstrated in the past a sensitivity to anything that could be construed as competition, even toward self-supporting third-party vans. I suggest that that, in fact, is not the case, and that we have tried to establish a number of vans throughout the capital, and have been somewhat limitedly successful.

Additionally, we must recognize that preferential parking and flex time can encounter difficulties when we have to face the administrative issues that need to be addressed, and they also create problems when we have to address the question of overtime, especially irregular overtime work conditions.

I think we also need to recognize -- as I think has been suggested by several of the City representatives -- that the long-term solution involves not only the development of better transportation modes, but, in fact, a total commitment to rebuilding the Capital City so that residential services are available to some of the people who work here. Even a small

increase in the number of people living in proximity to their jobs and able to walk or take a normal City bus, would provide a substantial increase in the overall benefit to the entire downtown area.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much for your very thoughtful presentation to the Committee.

Incidentally, does anyone here have any handle, even a crude estimate, on how many of those 16,000 to 18,000 public employees in the City either car pool or van pool or use public transportation? I gather you are moving toward trying to develop--

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER CRAWFORD: That is why we are going to do the survey.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: At this point, I guess the answer is that no one really knows, so you can't even monitor whether we are making any progress or are going backwards. I think that is a very--

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER CRAWFORD: Well, we know we are going backwards in the number of car pools. Stickers have decreased over the last several years, so it appears as though we are going backwards. That is not uncommon throughout the State. Even those private industries which have heavy commitments to ridesharing, have experienced that as the overall price of transportation has appeared to decrease and people have found it less onerous to make the trip.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: One other observation I can make with regard to your statement today is the fact that one of the reasons for employees wanting to use their own vehicles, is the fear of an emergency at home. You know, that situation can be easily overcome. All departments have runners, like a taxi service. If something should happen, they would be ready to take whoever the person is wherever he or she has to go. I don't see any major problem with an employee being able to go home or go to a school or to go wherever that emergency is,

because of the fact that they don't have their own vehicle. There are many in each department who would be able to provide that kind of a service.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER CRAWFORD: Assemblyman, may I quote you when we are out marketing? I don't disagree that that, in theory, is true. The problem is, you then need to get a commitment that that, in fact, will occur, and you need a commitment that it will not be abused.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: I don't think it takes any legislation to do that. That would be by department; the person running the department could do that.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: An executive order, too, perhaps, from the Governor. We are touching on areas where in time that might well be thought about, because you made the point that we have to do something to make things more uniform -- universal policies across departments and so on. But I think you raised some very interesting issues.

One of the things in the back of my mind is the cost problem. I guess we would have to look at whether there ought to be somehow even a premium, perhaps, in the way of compensation for people who exercise this alternate mode of transportation -- car pooling or public transportation. Of course, if you are subsidizing public transportation, in a way that is a premium itself. Maybe arguably a premium to public employees who accept, and utilize faithfully, car pooling is something that could be thought about, or talked about. I don't know. But, we have to do something further, right? Everybody here seems to be heading in that direction.

Thank you very much, Jim. We will now have Nancy Podeszwa. (speaker pronounces her name here) I worked on getting your name right, and then I lost it.

NANCY M. PODESZWA: I know it is me when someone says "Nancy," and then hesitates.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Would you please, Ms. Podeszwa, identify yourself for the record? We will be happy to hear from you.

MS. PODESZWA: Sure. My name is Nancy Podeszwa. I am the Executive Director of the Greater Princeton Transportation Management Association. Please just give me a minute to tell you a little bit about TMA, which will put my remarks in focus.

TMA is a private, nonprofit, membership organization, aimed at optimizing transportation mobility for employees, residents, and the general public, while minimizing traffic congestion. Our area of focus is central New Jersey. TMA's members include major employers and developers, representing over 24,000 employees and more than 18.5 million square feet of development.

Although primarily TMA's focus has been in the area of suburban mobility -- primarily on the Route 1 Corridor -- access to and circulation within our urban centers is likewise of great interest to us. As a result, I thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important topic -- the parking and transportation needs of the City of Trenton.

Because our members are employers, our emphasis is on employee mobility. In the City of Trenton, one of the primary issues affecting the work force seems to be an overabundance of vehicles, causing congestion, increased air pollution, and, as a direct result, highly stressed, discontent employees, as can be seen by some of the testimony this morning.

Recognizing this as a major issue, steps need to be taken in several areas to accommodate those vehicles, many of which we have heard talked about this morning. But at the same time, as Mr. Crawford stated, I think we need to acknowledge our inability to accommodate all of those vehicles. We must focus on steps that discourage this overabundance of vehicles. But in order to discourage the vehicles, we need to take positive steps to deter drivers. It is this part of the

equation which we feel has been lacking in some of the actions for employees in Trenton.

Luring individuals out of their singly-occupied vehicles, or as it is lovingly referred to by those of us in the business, "the blasted SOV," requires two things: 1) Information -- intensive educational campaigns about alternatives to the SOV. It was very frightening to me when I listened to the people testify this morning -- although only one mentioned it, and mentioned it as something that was not available to her -- that there seems to be no consideration at all for something other than driving: "We need parking." They are not saying they need some way to get to work; they're saying they need parking. They are not even aware of the alternatives, to consider them.

Then secondly, once you have made them aware of those alternatives, incentives -- bonuses, freebies, lures, if you will -- to tempt people to try an alternative.

First, in the area of information, what are the alternatives to driving my car? A simple question, but one for which many people do not have an answer. Individuals need to be made aware of the existing alternatives. Some specific examples in Trenton:

Transit: Trenton has a very effective network of existing transit service, both rail and bus. Employees need to know about that. Rail and bus schedules should be available in all office lobbies and information centers throughout the City. Signage, on vehicles, and at rail stations and bus stops should be improved, and fare data and customer service information should be readily available to potential system users. Transit operators -- and in this case in the City of Trenton we are dealing solely with New Jersey Transit -- should hold information sessions at job sites, where individual employees can find out about their transit options between home and work. I am well-aware that New Jersey Transit has done

this in certain instances and there have been very, very positive results.

Ridesharing: So many people I come in contact with have not considered it, simply because they are not aware of it. Again, information sessions with organizations like TMA, with NJDOT's Office of Ridesharing, or with a professional rideshare company, none of which cost anything, can easily provide answers to questions like:

- What is ridesharing?
- Could it save me money?
- Who could I rideshare with?
- What does a van look like?

and all of those other questions that employees have; certainly not an exhaustive list of educational programs to make people aware, but some examples of options people should know about and some ways of communicating the message.

Incentives: Information is something, but certainly not enough. I used the phrase, "lure people from their cars," which may have sounded overly dramatic, yet enticement is precisely what it takes. There are many actions an employer can take to make transportation alternatives more attractive to employees. I would like to take a moment to call to your attention that so many employers I speak to, when asked the question, "What do you pay for your employees' transportation," say, "Nothing." They don't pay anything for their employees' transportation. They figure it is the employees' problem to get to and from work.

Well, first of all, that is wrong. All of those parking spaces cost money -- lots of money. I have heard figures up to \$35,000 quoted for four spaces. They do cost money, and that is actually an unfair advantage to people to drive their car. We need to balance that equation, and maybe even put it a little the other way, so that people can consider alternatives to driving their cars. Again, I cannot provide an exhaustive list, but some examples to serve as food for thought:

Transit: Look to including in the design of these new facilities in Trenton, elements to facilitate transit use. Don't have all the walkways access the parking lots; have them access the streets. Install shelters; curbside access; pull-offs. Allow flexible work schedules to accommodate transit users, so that if you have to leave a meeting five minutes early to go and catch your bus, that does not mean you won't get the next promotion. If parking is free, consider comparable subsidization for transit users, or higher subsidization. Provide short-term free ride tickets, so employees can try transit and experience it and see that it might work for them.

Ridesharing: Provide on-site matching services and/or preferred parking. I can only echo what Mr. Crawford already said about preferred parking for car and van poolers. When he was talking about that midday mobility-- That is an element which, in our experience, is so important. In Trenton, it is actually a much easier thing to do, in terms of giving people that midday access to some shopping and eating facilities so they can run errands. Maybe have some shuttle service around, or have -- as Jim was talking about -- something which we have had some experience with. In Seattle, Washington, they have a similar program. It is called "a guaranteed ride home." The employer agrees to provide to people who participate in transit programs or ridesharing programs a guarantee of up to 40 miles a month in free taxi service. They have the security that if their child is sick, if they have an emergency and they need to get home, they can still participate in a rideshare program, but nevertheless have that security. In fact, the statistics -- although it hasn't been a very long-term program -- show that more people are ridesharing because they have the security and the actual payout is minimal, because the actual experience of those emergencies has not been that broad.

All of these are relatively low-cost ideas aimed at informing people about transportation options and encouraging their use.

A short note: I have heard people talk about remote parking areas -- the Perry Street example is one -- and I am even looking to further remote areas. That is a wonderful idea. The key to the success of remote lots in other areas where they have been used, has been good access between the lot and the building site. When you are talking about Route 129, which is going to be built, think of high occupancy vehicle lanes on it -- maybe not all day long, but during peak periods -- so that once I get to that parking lot, I know access to my building is swift, and therefore I have an advantage over the person who needs to drive his or her car. Let's turn the tables so that it is not, "How soon before I get my parking permit?" but, "I don't care about the parking permit, because I have another way to get to work."

The key to the solution, as we see it, lies in three things: 1) clear identification of the issues involved -- hopefully something that is being facilitated by this hearing; 2) involvement of the affected parties, which means the developers and the employers who have to live with this situation, both in the public sector and the private sector, in working toward resolution; and 3) providing to those parties the necessary technical assistance to implement those recommendations. It is in this third area where I think we can offer the technical resources of TMA to be helpful.

We have found that employers are always willing to take steps that will help them to retain good employees. But a lot of times, if presented with the idea of flex time or ridesharing, they are willing to do it, but they do not know where to go. We can provide the technical assistance.

In summary, may I say that we applaud the Committee's efforts in focusing on this important issue, and we appreciate

the opportunity to voice our views. Again, I would just like to offer TMA's resources in any way that might be effective.

I have a copy of these remarks and some material on TMA to leave with you.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: John, any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: No, thank you.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Thank you very much for your interesting remarks. I think somebody has to be doing research on where some of these ideas have taken hold, and where in the country we are seeing better results in these areas. It sounds as if your organization, as well as perhaps some of Mr. McKitish's staff, and others, could be doing that, too. Thank you very much.

We will now have our final witness for today, Wayne Johnson. Wayne has been very patiently sitting there all morning. He is from the New Jersey Transit Corporation, and is a Trenton resident. At least he was a Trenton resident. It's nice to see you. I'm sorry we are so late in getting to you.

Z. W A Y N E J O H N S O N: No problem. Thank you very much, Senator, and Assemblyman Watson. I appreciate the opportunity for Transit to speak. Being last on the agenda always kind of means that either everyone has taken everything you have said and you have relegated to cleanup, or you are trying to go back through and highlight. I think I will try to mix the two here a little bit.

I think that what has been clear through the testimony today is that State government, as a totality, has not been dispensing blind justice; that there is an effort well under way in which we are trying to coordinate between all of the State offices, pulling in the transportation expertise of New Jersey Transit and the New Jersey Department of Transportation, towards focusing on what is a problem -- a transportation problem, much more so than a parking problem within the City of Trenton -- and one that is long overdue for addressment, but I believe that significant steps have been taken.

If I cannot go through all of the details, I will highlight again the importance of generating the necessary background information so we can all identify, as succinctly as possible, exactly what the problem is -- where people are situated, where they are coming from, where they are going -- and thereby tailor your solutions to that, as opposed to shotgunning around or giving out knee-jerk reactions, and translating those into real dollar projects that do not address the need.

The survey that was talked about of all State employees will really give us that tool for perhaps the first time, in one succinct document. You will be able to say who in the Department of Higher Education works there, comes from where, what is the route, and what will it take to make them use public transportation, which is really going to be one of the keys, as well. You have to break the American mind-set of portal-to-portal service -- "I can only drive in my one vehicle" -- and an overall sense of total, total dependence.

Assemblyman, as you indicated, if we go to remote parking facilities and provide transit services to get people to their offices, there is no reason in the world why we can't provide mechanisms where, in emergency situations or other needs, people can leave their work locations and get where they are going within a reasonable time period.

The other key that we in New Jersey Transit have dedicated ourselves to over the course of the next year in our marketing effort, not only as it addresses this particular problem, but our urban areas overall, is, how do you get the message out much more effectively than we have ever done heretofore? It is a challenge to us that we have taken on, and we are putting it to our marketing people and our marketing consultants. We are going to be translating that information as we develop it, in with the efforts of the GSA and the Capital City Redevelopment Corporation as well.

We think that when you start looking at the urban markets, they are unique within themselves. You don't talk to the urban market the exact same way that you would talk to a suburban market or a Trans-Hudson market. There are some uniquenesses there. We need to recognize those, and we need to be innovative in the ways by which we address those.

Trenton itself is unique, inasmuch as not only is it an urban market, but it is also the Capital City. Therefore, we have various publics within Trenton alone that you will not find in other areas. While we need to talk to the urban market with its ethnic diversity, we also have the uniqueness of a major State employee market, which has somewhat different, but at the same time parallel needs as well.

I think we are well under way in being able to come up with mechanisms and services to address all of these succinct needs. As Assistant Commissioner Crawford said, New Jersey Transit most definitely has a role in this, and we are more than happy to take it on. Indeed, we are already operating one State employee shuttle for the Department of Higher Education. We are in discussions now with the Treasurer's office and other State offices, and we hope to be able to launch even additional services as we complete these surveys and as we continue to hone the policy-related issues and the transportation needs. I believe you will see those things unfolding over the course of the next several months. They will not be a panacea for everything. Parking is but one issue in trying to deal with the overall transportation system within the City of Trenton, but it is an important element, and we are going to take it on.

As I know you have heard from Hazel Gluck and from Jerry Premo before, and from Assistant Commissioner Crawford today, it is not sufficient to look to New Jersey Transit, or any other one singular State agency, to be the one to fund the entire bill. However, through the partnership that has been formed, and which will continue to be formed, between the

various State agencies, the private sector, the county and local governments, I see no reason why there cannot be a total addressment of the issue here within the Capital City.

Indeed, as we continue to move out -- and I am going to wrap up shortly -- on the creation of a Perry Street lot and other satellite facilities within the City of Trenton, it will actually enhance the ability for public transportation providers such as New Jersey Transit to provide services to those people. For the first time, it will give you, in essence, four, five, six succinct locations with high volumes of people you know you can pick up. You can go directly there, and set up quick bus routes. We are looking at things, again, on a 10- to 12-minute running time, so there is not a long period of time which would serve as a disincentive. But if you have four to six heavily used locations for State workers to congregate in, it will be much easier, much quicker, and much more efficient for public transportation services to get there and move them to where they want to be, where currently we are running around in probably some 2000 different locations, you know, to try to collect all of these people.

Finally, as Nancy Podeszwa has mentioned, and as Jim Crawford has mentioned from DOT, and the like -- and Bob Litke -- we have to start to look toward the future. The future is not continued expansion of surface parking, particularly in the urban centers, but really the future bodes that we must go to structured parking. I am happy to say that New Jersey Transit is sort of a man beyond its time, inasmuch as we are right now concluding negotiations for the construction of a parking garage at the Trenton train station, on the site of the current Maiden Lane parking on Maple Avenue. We are very near to completing that deal. We will be approaching our Board of Directors with it as soon as we conclude those negotiations. I daresay it will be something that will be a public matter in a matter of months.

As we have indicated in the press before, we are looking at a 2400-car garage at that location, which when you take into consideration that there is some parking on the site already which will be built over, it will mean approximately 1450 additional parking spaces, which will free up much needed on-street parking in that greater Trenton train station area, and alleviate some of the concerns, if you will, or objections -- the just objections, being a Trenton resident myself -- where you see commuters, as well as State workers and others, taking up necessary residential spaces as well. So, that is one increment toward solving the problem that we are very happy to take on.

Just to give you a very quick snapshot in terms of the services that are available within NJT Mercer, which is our facility for Mercer County, we currently have in the bus fleet 66 buses -- in the fleet down here. We have 11 routes which serve Trenton -- 11 individual routes. Our annual ridership in the Mercer County area is approximately 4.3 million people. On a daily basis, that equates to about 18,000 individual riders on a daily basis. If I look back over the the GSA charts and see 18,000 State workers in the greater Trenton area, and if you can presuppose that maybe 4000 of them are on buses now, if we could get another 14,000 on our buses, it sure would help us to decrease some of our operating deficits and create some money, for a change, on it.

I would be more than happy to answer any succinct questions you may have about various New Jersey Transit projects, or just the philosophy of public transportation. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATSON: The only thing I might add to what Wayne has just said, is the fact that if we are to do anything as far as State employees, we may be looking to New Jersey Transit for a subsidy.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Tell me this, Mr. Johnson: Has any thought been given as to whether State employees using public transit-- Of course, they would be coming in-- That parking lot would be for people using the train to go out of Trenton for transportation purposes, as opposed to coming in. My question really doesn't make sense in that--

MR. JOHNSON: I understand the question you are leading to. Negotiations have not been completed. We are using the land that is owned by New Jersey Transit to, in essence, lease lever, you know, the private sector development of a parking garage down there. While there will be 2400 spaces available in that garage, not all of that is going to be for New Jersey Transit commuter use only. There will be an element in there which will be open on a first come, first served general basis.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Will there be any preference given to public employees for parking spaces in other facilities of yours; for instance, for employees who work in the City of Trenton, to give them that little added incentive to park and ride?

MR. JOHNSON: Not at the current time.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: I would think that is a small, but an interesting idea which has just grown out of the exchanges here; that is, in a New Brunswick facility, or if there is a newly built facility in Hamilton Township, or Princeton Junction, or other places, whether or not there ought to be a preference given by New Jersey Transit, to the extent that it has control over any parking facilities, to public employees who are going to use that parking in order to take public transportation in to their work, particularly if it is in to an urban area like the Capital City.

MR. JOHNSON: It is something we could think about. Part of our problem, Senator, is that over the course of about the last four years, ridership on the rail lines, for instance,

has grown in excess of 40%. We are at a parking deficit ourselves. Through various studies and initiatives, we are looking at bus feeders, rail stations, and the like as well. That is something that can be taken into consideration.

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. This hearing had to end by one o'clock, and it looks like we'll make it. Is there anyone else in the audience who has not signed up who would like to add anything? (no response)

I would like to thank Assemblyman Watson publicly for being able to join me in this hearing. Yes?

MR. LOOS: (speaking from audience) Senator, may I just say one thing?

SENATOR STOCKMAN: Do you want to come up to the mike for just a minute, so we can capture your testimony?

MR. LOOS: There have been several speakers today who have spoken in terms of doing surveys of State employees. I just want to use this forum to offer the union as a participant in those surveys, I think at the design level before the surveys go out, because State workers talk to us. They talk to our stewards; they talk to our chief stewards; they talk to our elected officials. We would like to participate in the design level, but also I think we can enhance the number of people who respond to a survey. We have a whole lot of folks out there in the workplaces to form a--

SENATOR STOCKMAN: That is an excellent idea. Unfortunately, Jim Crawford is not here, but Mr. McKitish is. Would you please pass that offer on? I think it makes a lot of sense to have some input by organized labor representatives of these employees, in terms of perhaps increasing their participation, as well as in helping to improve the design of the surveys. I appreciate that offer, and I hope the Department of Transportation and/or Treasury will take you up on that.

I think that will end the hearing for today. Before formally adjourning, I want to thank again Mike McKitish, who has a major role in State government, wearing several hats as a matter of fact. I think it is a reflection of his sincerity and seriousness about this issue that he not only came and testified personally, but that he sat through the whole hearing to listen, as he suggested he would, to comments, observations, and suggestions by other people. I think that bodes well for this idea that at the highest places in State government we have to come to a clear recognition of the stake the Capital City has in these issues, and the need for a statewide policy that hopefully will be concurred in and accepted by the branches of government at the county level and at the municipal level and would fall into place so we can take some better direction than perhaps we have historically in the Capital City in these matters.

I want to thank everyone who showed up for the hearing today. Thank you very much.

(HEARING CONCLUDED)