

CA - Old Bridge

6/12/84

letter re: preliminary fair share analysis
of Old Bridge

- findings of fair share numbers ~~for~~
from Carla Lerman differ from Hartz's
findings

PL

CA 002336 ~~2~~ F

240 Nassau Street, Box 1241, Princeton, N.J. 08542 609-924-9153 201-873-3084

rec'd 6/14
June 12, 1984

Thomas Norman, Esq.
30 Jackson Road - Suite A-2
Medford, N.J. 08050

RE: Preliminary Fair Share
Analysis/Old Bridge

Dear Tom:

The analysis of the fair share numbers from Carla Lerman differs from our findings in the following areas:

- Our numbers for commutershed employment are higher for the region, but the percentage still computes at 0.70 for prospective.

- We planimetered the acreage of Old Bridge's growth area as 24,121 acres. If we use Carla's regional growth area, the percentage drops from 4.43 to 4.35 for "prospective" need. The present need drops to 3.45% instead of 3.51%.

- The municipal job growth vs. the region's according to our analysis is 1.68, while according to Carla, it is 2.02. She uses a linear regression method, which will be calculated by us as soon as possible.

- The municipal median household numbers agree, but our commutershed is slightly higher, giving a smaller ratio for Old Bridge (.98 instead of .997), which helps a little.

- Recalculating prospective need without the future reallocation allowance will produce a fair share of 2357 (prospective need = 1928 and present need of 746). We found a correction of units in the present need number due to a smaller growth area, by our calculations, of 24,121 acres instead of 24,518, and, thus, lost 4 units.

This is not the final word on these calculations, since we are rechecking everything again.

Pursuant to our telephone conversation, I am sending a copy to Eric Neisser.

Sincerely,


Carl E. Hintz, PP, AICP, ASLA

/pat

HINTZ/NELESSEN ASSOCIATES, P.C.