Memo Regarding "Mt. Laurel II" Fair Share Computations by Chadwick III, Coppola, and Moskowitz

pgs: 12

Note: Expert Report (Carla L. Lerman)

CA 0022 70D

CARLA L. LERMAN
413 W. ENGLEWOOD AVENUE
TEANECK, NEW JERSEY 07666

To:  All participants in Urban League of Greater New Brunswick v.
     Carteret et al.

Date:  February 3, 1984    ∧ℓ₍'∅ 2/⁷

Re:  Chadwick-Coppola-Moskowitz Memo of 1/30/84

A memo regarding "Mt. Laurel II" Fair Share Computations by John
Chadwick III, Richard T. Coppola and Harvey S. Moskowitz (1/30/84)
has been circulated to all planners involved in the Urban League of
Greater New Brunswick v. Carteret, and closely retated cases.

Following the considerable effort of these three planners (experts in
the AMG Realty and Timber Properties v. Township of Warren consolidated
cases) to reach a consensus on certain basic Mt. Laurel issues, Judge
Serpentelli requested that the conclusions reached in that case be
applied to the Middlesex County case, Urban League of Greater New
Brunswick v. Carteret et al.

This memorandum does not offer an evaluation of the recommendations
in the Warren Township case, but merely attempts to apply the dual
regional definition for present need and prospective need determina-
tion and allocation. For purposes of comparison, the same factors
for measuring Present Need which were used in the Lerman Fair Share
Report were used in this analysis.

PRESENT NEED

Lerman's Fair Share report for the Court in this case used an ex-
panded metropolitan region of the thirteen counties to determine the
overall level of present need. This large region was then broken
down into two sub-regions resembling housing markets. The excess
need in the Core Area (Hudson County and the City of Newark) was
reallocated to the north and south sub-regions in proportion to
their economic growth and vacant land Growth Areas (SDGP). A new
level of present need was then calculated for the sub-regions which
included the reallocated excess. This new present need percentage
was then applied to all municipalities in the case. Their own in-
digenous need was increased by the number required to bring their
present need rate to that of the sub-region.

In the Warren Township case the metropolitan region used consisted of
nine counties--the eight metropolitan counties comprising Region 11
in the State Development Guide Plan, plus Hunterdon County.  This
nine-county region will be compared to the expanded metropolitan region
described above and the overall present need percentage and resulting
allocation compared.

|  | Based on "13 County" Present Need (subregion incl. reallocation) | Based on "9 County" Present Need |
|---|---|---|
| Cranbury | 41 | 44 |
| East Brunswick | 638 | 694 |
| Monroe | 329 | 357 |
| Piscataway | 701 | 763 |
| Plainsboro | 174 | 190 |
| South Brunswick | 310 | 337 |
| South Plainfield | 355 | 386 |

The increase in the number of units for each municipality from the 13-
county region to the 9-county region is the result of the same high
deficiency rates in the Core Area being reallocated to fewer counties
in a smaller region.

The allocations above do not include any reallocation from Non-
Growth Areas within the region.  Although Mount Laurel II refers to
the need for Growth Areas to absorb more than their own indigenous
need from areas of high rates of need, implying that the Non-Growth
Areas are responsible only for their own indigenous need,  the Court
also said that areas that permitted and/or encouraged growth would
have that limited responsibility altered.  Since the SDGP was pre-
pared and Growth and Non-Growth Areas were delineated, in 1977,
considerable development has taken place.  For example, between
1970 and 1980, the three outlying counties of Hunterdon, Warren and
Sussex, which consist almost entirely of Non-Growth Areas, increased
their occupied housing units by 35%, 26% and 63% respectively.
Since 1980 approximately 3,000 building permits have been authorized
in the three counties.  It would seem reasonable that the status of
some of the Non-Growth Areas in these counties are ready for re-
evaluation.  Therefore, their responsibility for some of the excess
need in the remainder of the region through 1990 should also be re-
evaluated before their share is reallocated.

|                                                        | 13 County Region | 9 County Region |
|--------------------------------------------------------|:----------------:|:---------------:|
| Total Occupied Households                              | 1,906,624        | 1,564,417       |
| Number lacking adequate plumbing, excl. overcrowded   | 30,365           | 26,982          |
| Number overcrowded                                    | 72,390           | 64,220          |
| Number additional units needed for vacancies          | 5,093            | 5,546           |
| TOTAL                                                 | 107,848          | 96,748          |
| % deficient units                                     | 5.7%             | 6.2%            |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total deficiencies in | |
| Newark | 17,649 |
| Hudson County | 22,577 |
| Excess over regional percentage | |
| Newark | 11,328 |
| Hudson County | 10,729 |
| Total | 22,057 |
| Excess to sub-regions | |
| South Metro | 12,572 |
| North Metro | 9,485 |
| Resulting present need level in | |
| South Metro | 5.7% |
| North Metro | 4.1% |

## PROSPECTIVE NEED

The Chadwick-Coppola-Moskowitz memo discusses the dual region concept on pp. 2-6 and explains their reasoning in moving away from the one fixed region approach. This section of this memo will apply the "Commuter Shed" approach to the seven Middlesex County municipalities in this case and compare the prospective need, based on the Chadwick-Coppola-Moskowitz factors (p. 9), to the prospective need in the Lerman Fair Share report.

The Commutershed defined for each municipality was based on a 45 minute driving time from the approximate center of each municipality. The driving time was computed based on the following:

> 50 miles per hour on interstate highways
> 40 miles per hour on state highways
> 30 miles per hour on local roads

The factors used were those proposed in the CCM memo: the municipality's share of 1981 employment in the commutershed region, and the municipality's share of 1972-1981 employment growth in that region. The 1990 employment in the commutershed was projected based on a straight line projection of the employment growth in the previous decade.

In developing the allocation formula, the municipality's share of employment growth for 1972 to 1981 was double-weighted, as that would be a better indicator of recent local development policy than its share of present employment. All computations are based on Private Sector Covered Employment for municipalities as reported in:

> 1972 Covered Employment Trends in New Jersey. N.J. Departmant of Labor, Division of Planning and Research, Bureau of Operational Statistics and Reports. September 1973.

> 1981 New Jersey Covered Employment Trends. N.J. Department of Labor, Division of Planning and Research, Office of Demographic and Economic Analysis. October 1982.

The individual pages which follow on each of the seven municipalities show the methodology in detail, and the resulting prospective need allocations.

CRANBURY

| | |
|---|---:|
| Total 1981 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 653,087 |
| Total 1972 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 581,818 |
| Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 71,269 |
| Percent Increase | 12.2% |
| Cranbury 1981 Employment | 3,477 |
| Percent of Region's Employment 3,477/653,087 = .0053 | 0.53% |
| Cranbury 1972 Employment | 2,774 |
| Cranbury Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 703 |
| Percent of Region's Growth | 0.99% |

$$\frac{\% \text{ of Region's Employment} + 2 \times \% \text{ of Region's Growth}}{3} = \text{Job Quotient}$$

$$\frac{.0053 + 2 \times .0099}{3} = .0084 \quad \text{Job Quotient}$$

Projected Increase in Employment in Region 1990

| | |
|---|---:|
| Straight Line 1981 - 1990 | 80,003 |

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

Cranbury's Share of New Jobs

| | |
|---|---:|
| 80,003 x .0084 = | 672 |

1980 Households : Job = 1.01

672 x 1.01 = 679 New Households

679 + 4% Vacancies = 706

706 x .394 Lower Income Households

| | |
|---|---:|
| Additional Lower Income Households | 278 |

EAST BRUNSWICK

| | |
|---|---|
| Total 1981 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 1,109,925 |
| Total 1972 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 1,065,528 |
| Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 44,397 |
| Percent Increase | 4.2% |
| East Brunswick 1981 Employment | 14,618 |
| Percent of Region's Employment 14,618/1,109,925 = .013 | 1.3% |
| Ease Brunswick 1972 Employment | 10,236 |
| East Brunswick Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 4,382 |
| Percent of Region's Growth | 9.9% |

$$\frac{\% \text{ of Region's Employment} + 2 \times \% \text{ of Region's Growth}}{3} = \text{Job Quotient}$$

$$\frac{.013 + 2 \times .099}{3} = .0703 \quad \text{Job Quotient}$$

Projected Increase in Employment in Region 1990

| | |
|---|---|
| Straight Line 1981 - 1990 | 46,617 |

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

East Brunswick's Share of New Jobs

| | |
|---|---|
| 46,617 x .0703 = | 3,277 |

1980 Households : Jobs = 1.01

3,277 x 1.01 = 3,310 New Households

3,310 + 4% Vacancies = 3,442

3,442 x .394 Lower Income Households

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional Lower Income Households | 1,356 |

MONROE

| | |
|---|---|
| Total 1981 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 676,416 |
| Total 1972 Covered Employment Commuter Shed | 589,481 |
| Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 86,935 |
| Percent Increase | 12.9% |
| Monroe 1981 Employment | 1,117 |
| Percent of Region's Employment 1,117/676,416 = .0017 | 0.17% |
| Monroe 1972 Employment | 170 |
| Monroe Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 947 |
| Percent of Region's Growth | 1.1% |

$$\frac{\% \text{ of Region's Employment} + 2 \times \% \text{ of Region's Growth}}{3} = \text{Job Quotient}$$

$$\frac{.0017 + 2 \times .011}{3} = .0079 \text{ Job Quotient}$$

Projected Increase in Employment in Region 1990

Straight Line 1981 - 1990      87,257

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

Monroe's Share of New Jobs

87,257 x .0079 =      689

1980 Households : Jobs = 1.01

689 x 1.01 = 702 New Households

702 + 4% Vacancies = 730

730 x .394 Lower Income Households

Additional Lower Income Households      288

## PISCATAWAY

Total 1981 Private Covered Employment in Commuter Shed    1,193,361
     (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas)

Total 1972 Private Covered Employment in Commuter Shed    1,103,010
     (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas)

Employment Growth 1972 - 1981                  90,351

           Percent Increase                8.2%

Piscataway 1981 Employment                  24,949

     Percent of Region's Employment          2.1%

Piscataway 1972 Employment                  9,314

Piscataway Employment Growth 1972 - 1981      15,635

     Percent of Region's Growth             17.3%


$$\frac{\% \text{ of Region's Employment} + 2 \text{ x } \% \text{ of Region's Growth}}{3} = \text{Job Quotient}$$

$$\frac{.021 + .346}{3} = .122 \quad \text{Job Quotient}$$

Projected Increase in Employment in Region 1990
     Straight Line 1981 - 1990               97,856

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

     Piscataway's Share of New Jobs

     97,856 x .122 = 11,938

1980 Households : Jobs = 1.058

     11,938 x 1.01 = 12,057 New Households

     12,057 + 4% Vacancies = 12,539

     12,539 x .394 Lower Income Households =

         Additional Lower Income Households      4,940

PLAINSBORO

| | |
|---|---|
| Total 1981 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 503,733 |
| Total 1972 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 429,934 |
| Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 73,804 |
| Percent Increase | 17.2% |
| Plainsboro 1981 Employment | 2,092 |
| Percent of Region's Employment 2,092/503,733 = .00415 | 0.415% |
| Plainsboro 1972 Employment | 666 |
| Plainsboro Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 1,426 |
| Percent of Region's Growth | 1.93% |

$$\underline{\text{% of Region's Employment} + 2 \times \text{% of Region's Growth}} = \text{Job Quotient}$$
$$3$$

$$\frac{.00415 + 2 \times .0193}{3} = .0143 \quad \text{Job Quotient}$$

Projected Increase in Employment in Region 1990

| | |
|---|---|
| Straight Line 1981 - 1990 | 86,642 |

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

Plainsboro's Share of New Jobs

| | |
|---|---|
| 86,642 x .0143 = | 1,239 |

1980 Households : Jobs = 1.01

1,239 x 1.01 = 1,251 New Households

1,251 + 4% Vacancies = 1,301

1,301 x .394 Lower Income Households

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional Lower Income Households | 513 |

SOUTH BRUNSWICK

| | |
|---|---|
| Total 1981 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 678,929 |
| Total 1972 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 593,067 |
| Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 85,862 |
| Percent Increase | 14.5% |
| South Brunswick 1981 Employment | 8,465 |
| Percent of Region's Employment 8,465/678,929 = .0125 | 1.25% |
| South Brunswick 1972 Employment | 4,000 |
| South Brunswick Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 4,465 |
| Percent of Region's Growth | 5.2% |

$$\frac{\text{\% of Region's Employment} + 2 \times \text{\% of Region's Growth}}{3} = \text{Job Quotient}$$

$$\frac{.0125 + 2 \times .052}{3} = .0388 \quad \text{Job Quotient}$$

Projected Increase in Employment in Region 1990

    Straight Line 1981 - 1990          98,293

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

    South Brunswick's Share of New Jobs

    98,293 x .0388 =                 3,814

1980 Households : Jobs = 1.01

    3,814 x 1.01 = 3,852 New Households

    3,852 + 4% Vacancies = 4,006

    4,006 x .394 Lower Income Households

        Additional Lower Income Households        1,578

SOUTH PLAINFIELD

| | |
|---|---|
| Total 1981 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employ nt in Non-Growth Areas) | 1,338,821 |
| Total 1972 Covered Employment Commuter Shed (incl. deduction for employment in Non-Growth Areas) | 1,271,079 |
| Employment Growth 1972-1981 | 67,742 |
| Percent Increase | 5.3% |
| South Plainfield Employment 1981 | 14,728 |
| Percent of Region's Employment | 1.1% |
| South Plainfield Employment 1972 | 8,062 |
| South Plainfield Employment Growth 1972 - 1981 | 6,666 |
| Percent of Region's Growth | 9.8% |

$$\frac{\% \text{ of Region's Employment} + 2 \times \% \text{ of Region's Growth}}{3} = \text{Job Quotient}$$

$$\frac{.011 + 2 \times .098}{3} = .069 \quad \text{Job Quotient}$$

| | |
|---|---|
| Porjected Increase in Employment in Region 1990 Straight Line 1981 - 1990 | 70,958 |

Regional Increase in Employment x Job Quotient =

South Plainfield's Share of New Jobs

| | |
|---|---|
| 70,958 x .069 = | 4,896 |

1980 Households : Jobs = 1.01

4,896 x 1.01 = 4,945 New Households

4945 + 4% vacancies = 5,143

5,143 x .394 Lower Income Households

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional Lower Income Households | 2,026 |

# FAIR SHARE ALLOCATIONS OF PRESENT AND PROSPECTIVE NEED

## Comparison of Lerman and C C M Allocations

|  | Lerman | CCM |
|---|---|---|
| **Cranbury** | | |
| Present | 41 | 44 |
| Prospective | 514 | 278 |
| **East Brunswick** | | |
| Present | 638 | 694 |
| Prospective | 1028 | 1356 |
| **Monroe** | | |
| Present | 329 | 357 |
| Prospective | 440 | 288 |
| **Piscataway** | | |
| Present | 701 | 763 |
| Prospective | 2912 | 4940 |
| **Plainsboro** | | |
| Present | 174 | 190 |
| Prospective | 314 | 513 |
| **South Brunswick** | | |
| Present | 310 | 337 |
| Prospective | 1370 | 1578 |
| **South Plainfield** | | |
| Present | 355 | |
| Prospective | 1427 | 386 |
| | | 2026 |