8/ 1983

Fairshare Housing Allocation Study

PGS. __35__

blue .p.i.

{ Burlington Cty }
{ Camden Cty }
{ Gloucester Cty }

ML 000 385 E

FAIR SHARE HOUSING ALLOCATION STUDY
FOR THE TRICOUNTY (BURLINGTON CAMDEN AND GLOUCESTER) REGION

PREPARED BY ALAN MALLACH

AUGUST 1983

FAIR SHARE HOUSING ALLOCATION STUDY
FOR THE TRICOUNTY (BURLINGTON CAMDEN AND GLOUCESTER) REGION

PREPARED BY ALAN MALLACH

CONTENTS

FAIR SHARE HOUSING ALLOCATION STUDY
FOR THE TRICOUNTY (BURLINGTON CAMDEN AND GLOUCESTER) REGION

PREPARED BY ALAN MALLACH

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of a fair share housing allocation study is
to establish a "fair share" of low and moderate income housing
for one or more municipalities. Such a fair share represents a
goal, in terms of production of low and moderate income housing,
that each affected municipality is obligated to meet, as set
forth in the 1983 decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court in
Southern Burlington NAACP et al. v. Township of Mt. Laurel, a
decision commonly known as Mt. Laurel II.

Whatever the uncertain history of the fair share concept
prior to Mt. Laurel II, that decision has made it a central element
in the effort to provide for the housing needs of New Jersey's low
and moderate income citizens. While that decision provides that, in
the long run, a consistent scheme of fair share allocations for the
state as a whole will be developed through the activities of the
three "Mt. Laurel judges" that have been appointed, the preparation
of a fair share allocation plan at this time, following closely the
language of the decision, should be a useful planning tool. This
study has been prepared to that end. It represents what the author
considers to be a soundly reasoned and straightforward approach to
the determination of the fair share responsibilities of the munici-
palities falling within a single region, made up of the New Jersey
portion of the Philadelphia metropolitan area (SMSA).

The process of creating a fair share housing allocation
involves three separate determinations: (1) determining a region;
(2) determining the extent of housing need, present and prospect-
ive, to be allocated; and (3) determining the manner in which need
is to be allocated. Finally, once these determinations have been
made, a mathematical procedure must be carried out in order to
arrive at the actual fair share allocation for each municipality.
These steps have been followed in this report

Before entering into the substance of the report, a final
note. There is no such thing as a definitive fair share housing
allocation, from a technical standpoint (although the eventual
determination of the three judges may be legally definitive). Thus,
there may be technical disagreements between responsible experts
over any fair share scheme. That does not mean that all such plans
are equal. There are clear, and important, distinctions between
responsible and irresponsible ways of making each of the deter-
mnations that are part of a fair share plan. It is not difficult
to distinguish, in practice, between those plans that are generally
consistent with Mt. Laurel II, and with sound practice, and those
that are not, and which are often designed to serve as a tool for

special pleading. Although one may disagree with elements of this
analysis, every effort has been made to arrive at each of the
determinations in a manner that is both objective and consistent
with the direction of Mt. Laurel II.

DETERMINATION OF A REGION

        The court in Mt. Laurel II reiterates its approval of
the regional concept adapted from a lower court opinion, and set
forth in the earlier Madison decision as follows:

        That general area which constitutes, more or
        less, the husing market area of which the subject
        municipality is a part, and from which the prospect-
        ive population of the municipality would substantially
        be drawn, in the absence of exclusionary zoning.
        (slip opinion at 92, citing 72 NJ at 543)

The court continues by making approving reference to Justice
Pashman's language in his concurring opinion in Mt. Laurel I, in
which he suggested the following additional criteria:

    - the area included in the interdependent residential
      housing market

    - the area encompassed by significant patterns of
      commutation

    - the area served by major public facilities and
      services

    - the area in which the housing problem can be solved
      (67 NJ at 16)

It should further be noted that the court is calling upon the three
judges to establish a consistent regional pattern for the juris-
diction of each, and for the state as a whole (at 89). This requires
standardized regions, and precludes certain tailored regions, in
which planners have carved unique regions to conform to the par-
ticular location of individual municipalities.

        Although there are some parts of   New Jersey in which
there may be some complexity in arriving at a region meeting the
above criteria, the area under consideration is not such an area.
There is a clear regional housing and labor market area, grounded
in a radial transportation system with Philadelphia and Camden at
its center, in Southwestern New Jersey, which in turn conforms
to the sum of three counties, Burlington, Camden, and Gloucester.
This region has been designated as the New Jersey portion of the
Philadelphia SMSA by the Bureau of the Census, and recognized as

a single labor market area by the New Jersey Department of Labor (1).
It is a large enough area to combine both a significant level of
housing need with the land availability and fiscal resources to
meet that need. For that reason, the three county area has been
selected as the region for purposes of this study; it will be
referred to in the balance of the study as the "region", or the
Tricounty Region.

DETERMINATION OF HOUSING NEED

        The determination of low and moderate income housing need
is, in actuality, the sum of two separate numerical determinations;
the establishment of present housing need, and the projection of
prospective housing need. The total housing need that is the basis
for the fair share allocation is the sum of the two categories.

        Present Housing Need

        Present housing need is the number of low and moderate
income households living in substandard housing conditions within
the region, for whom alternative housing should be provided. It
is unfortunate, however, that there is no statistical evidence
available for substandard or dilapidated housing, as such. As a
result, it is necessary to make use of substitute data. The 1980
Census of Housing provides data on two relevant components of
housing need; units lacking plumbing, and overcrowded units (units
occupied by more than 1 person per room; e.g., 5 or more people
in a two bedroom apartment, etc.). While the count of units lack-
ing plumbing seriously understates the extent of physically sub-
standard housing, it can be conversely argued that much of the
problem of overcrowding is a function of a mismatch of existing
housing units, rather than a need for additional units (2). It
is reasonable to assume that the two adjustments are roughly
comparable, so that the sum of the two categories represents a
sound reflection of present housing need.

TABLE 1: PRESENT HOUSING NEED IN TRICOUNTY REGION

Units lacking plumbing facilities	3475
Units overcrowded (but with all plumbing facilities)	8590
TOTAL PRESENT NEED	12065
PERCENT OF TOTAL YEARROUND HOUSING STOCK	3.3%

SOURCE: 1980 Census of Housing

Based on survey information available elsewhere, it can reasonably
be assumed that the overwhelming majority of households living in
the above units are either low or moderate. Although there is no
precise data on the breakdown between low and moderate, such data

is available on the breakdown of households spending more than 25%
of income for shelter, a related housing problem. That breakdown
is 72% low income (as defined in Mt. Laurel II) and 28% moderate
income. This breakdown will be applied to the present housing need
category to be allocated.

Prospective Housing Need

        The determination of prospective housing need is conceptually
straightforward, but technically more complex. Prospective housing
need is the number of additional low and moderate income households
to be added to the regional population, and who will therefore need
affordable housing units, during some future period. Consistency
both with language in Mt. Laurel II as well as sound planning doctrine,
including the statutorily mandated period for updating of municipal
master plans, suggests a six year period, which corresponds with a
target date of 1990. Prospective housing need, therefore, is the
prospective need for housing affordable to low and moderate income
households from today through 1990.

        In essence, prospective housing need has three subcomp-
onents:

        (1) The number of additional households in the region;

        (2) Replacement of units lost from the housing stock;
and
        (3) Maintenance of an adequate vacancy rate.

Each of these will be presented in turn.

        Additional Households: The increase in low and moderate
income households is a function of total population increase,
changes in household size, and the low and moderate income share
of the total population. This involves a considerable series of
methodological steps.

        The baseline information, which is given in Table 2 on
the following page, and derived from the 1980 Census of Population,
provides a starting point. This information includes the number of
households (and the share of population in households), and the
average household size, including the trend in household size
between 1970 and 1980. It will be noted, as a reflection of one
of the most significant demographic trends of the period, that
the average household size dropped sharply in all three counties
of the Tricounty Region. In essence, during the 1970's, the drop
in household size generated more housing demand than did the
increase in population. It is generally accepted by demographers
that the decline in household size is continuing, although, most
probably at a less dramatic rate than in the 1970's(4). That
assumption has been followed in this study; specifically, that
the rate of decline in household size, by county, during the
1980's will be 60% that experienced from 1970 to 1980.

TABLE 2:   BASELINE DATA FOR PROJECTION OF PROSPECTIVE HOUSING NEED

	BURLINGTON	CAMDEN	GLOUCESTER
1980 Population	362542	471650	199917
% in Households	95.5%	99.1%	98.9%
1980 Population in Households	346379	467476	197626
1980 Households	114969	162726	65264
1980 Household Size	3.01	2.87	3.03
1970 Household Size	3.48	3.26	3.42
Change in Household Size 1970-1980	-13.5%	-12.0%	-11.4%

SOURCE: 1980 and 1970 Census of Population

In order to project future households, it is necessary to project future population. In New Jersey, the Office of Demographic and Economic Analysis (ODEA) in the Department of Labor prepares population projections using alternative methodologies. In the case of the three counties under consideration, the two "preferred" projection methodologies yielded 1990 projections which were very close. As a result, it was determined to utilize an average of the two projections for purposes of calculating prospective housing need.

TABLE 3: 1990 POPULATION PROJECTIONS

	ODEA Economic/ Demographic Model	ODEA Demo- Graphic Cohort	AVERAGE
Burlington	407,300	422,300	414,800
Camden	508,900	497,400	503,150
Gloucester	233,200	233,600	233,400

SOURCE: ODEA

The next step is to convert this projected population into a 1990 household total, based on (a) determining the share of total population in households; and (b) applying the appropriate 1990 projection of household size. The latter has been noted above, and with regard to the former, it was assumed that it would stay the same as in 1980. If the military installations including Fort Dix, McGuire Air Force Base, were to close, however, this could change.

TABLE 4: CALCULATION OF 1990 HOUSEHOLDS IN REGION

	BURLINGTON	CAMDEN	GLOUCESTER
1990 Population	414800	503150	233400
x % in households	x .955	x .991	x .989
1990 Population in Households	396134	498622	230833
÷ 1990 average house- hold size	+ 2.77	+ 2.66	÷ 2.82
1990 Households	143009	184068	81856

SOURCE: Projection by Alan Mallach

The increase in households, by county and for the region   as a whole, from 1980 to 1990 is as follows:

TABLE 5: INCREASE IN HOUSEHOLDS 1980-1990

	1980 HOUSEHOLDS	1990 HOUSEHOLDS	CHANGE 1980-1990
Burlington	114969	143009	+ 28,040
Camden	162726	184068	+ 21,342
Gloucester	65264	81856	+ 16,592
TRICOUNTY REGION			+ 65,974

SOURCE: Projection by Alan Mallach

In order to provide enough housing units to meet the needs of this number of households, total housing production must also account for the replacement of units lost from the housing stock during the same period, from 1980 to 1990. Since no records are kept which reflect the many changes in the existing housing stock over time (of which demolitions are only one of many), which both expand and diminish the stock, one can only turn to the reflection of those changes as they appear in the 1970 and 1980 Census of Housing reports.

Each Census report provides tabulations of units in the housing stock by year of construction; by comparing the number of units in each category in 1970 and 1980, it is possible to determine how many units were lost, or gained, during the ten year period from 1970 to 1980. This information is presented in Table 6 on the following page.

TABLE 6: CHANGE IN REGIONAL HOUSING STOCK BY AGE GROUP 1970-1980

PERIOD OF CONSTRUCTION	NUMBER OF UNITS 1970	NUMBER OF UNITS 1980	CHANGE 1970-1980
1960-1969	78,864	79,403	+ 539
1950-1959	69,320	71,461	+ 2,141
1940-1949	26,520	33,625	+ 7,105
BEFORE 1940	107,279	92,019	(-15,260)
NET CHANGE IN TOTAL OLDER HOUSING STOCK			(- 5,475)

SOURCE: Census of Housing

While this data is somewhat questionable at a detailed level, it is, nonetheless, a sound overall indication of the trend. It is notable, and somewhat inconsistent with the general wisdom, that 2/3 of the loss in older housing units is made up by increments to that same older housing stock, the product, one can assume, largely of conversions, of which a large part are most probably without legal sanction. For purposes of this analysis, it has been assumed that the net loss during the 1980's will be the same as the net loss in the 1970's, as shown in Table 6.

Finally, a factor has been included to provide for a reasonable vacancy rate within the housing stock. Again, the need is modest; assuming that a 'reasonable' vacancy rate is 5% for rental housing and 1.5% for owner-occupied housing, we find that the 1980 vacancy rates were more than ample for rental housing, and only slightly less than necessary for sales housing. The reported vacancy rate for rental housing in the region in the Census of Housing was 8.5%. As a result, the number of units added to provide for a reasonable vacancy rate is only 525.

Given these components that make up prospective housing need, it remains to distinguish between total prospective need for housing, and that part of the prospective need which is made up of low and moderate income households, and which is the subject of a fair share housing allocation. It is reasonable to assume, barring some fundamental change in the basic nature of the American economy, that the income distribution of future households will be largely the same as the income distribution of the present household universe, relative to the median income of the universe. Although the population as a whole may become more affluent, or less affluent, the distribution relative to the median is not likely to change.

On the basis of that reasonable assumption, it is possible to determine the percentage of households in 1980 who fall within

O and 50 percent of the regional median, and 51 and 80 percent of
the median. These two ranges correspond to the low income, and the
moderate income, categories of the Mt. Laurel II decision. These
percentages are then applied directly to the prospective need total
previously arrived at. Interpolation within the income ranges pro-
vided in the Census of Population provides the following percentages:

Low income	22.2%	38.8%
Moderate income	16.6%	

It will be noted that 57% of prospective low and moderate income
housing need is low income, and 43% is moderate income.

The total prospective low and moderate income housing need to
be allocated, therefore, is as follows:

Total household increase	65,974
Replacement of units lost from stock	5,475
Provide for reasonable vacancy rate	525
Total prospective need to 1990	71,974
Low and moderate income share	x .388
Prospective low and moderate income housing need to 1990	27,926

The information is now in place to move to the actual process of
allocating low and moderate income housing needs among the muni-
cipalities of the region.

ALLOCATING LOW AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSING NEED

In Mt. Laurel II, the court offered some direction with
regard to the choice of allocation factors, noting:

> Formulas that accord substantial weight to employment
> opportunities in the municipality, especially new employ-
> ment accompanied by substantial ratables, shall be favored;
> formulas that have the effect of tying prospective lower
> income housing needs to the present proportion of lower
> income residents to the total population of a municipality
> shal be disfavored; formulas that have the effect of un-
> reasonably diminishing the share because of a municipality's
> successful exclusion of lower income housing in the past
> shall be disfavored (at 93).

Passing comments elsewhere in the decision (see at 95) support,
in addition, the commonsense judgement that availability of

vacant developable land is another significant factor (4). This, in turn suggests that three allocation factors can most appropriately be included in a fair share allocation:

- availability of vacant developable land

- total employment

- recent employment growth

It is felt that an allocation procedure using these three factors most appropriately reflects both a sensible approach and the thrust of the Mt. Laurel II decision. This is not to suggest that no other factors can or should be considered, but that these three are the most readily apparent, common sense, allocation factors available. The specific indices used were the following:

availability of vacant developable land: The inventory complied by the Department of Community Affairs, and published in the report entitled "A Revised Statewide Housing Allocation Report for New JErsey" (1978). (5)

total employment: Private sector employment for September 1981 as reported by the New Jersey Department of Labor (this is the most recent complete data available).

employment growth: The increase in employment (if any) reported by the Department of Labor between 1972 and 1981 (1972 is the earliest year in which reporting was statistically consistent with current report, and is roughly a decade prior to the most recent period).

The data for each of the municipalities in the region, for each of these three allocation factors, is given in tabular form in Appendix I. The application of these three factors is described below.

Allocation Procedure

(1) Exclude Municipalities Not Receiving Fair Share Housing Allocations: The Mt. Laurel II decision provides that only those municipalities that are, in whole or in part, within the Growth Area as set forth by the New Jersey State Development Guide Plan have a responsibility for meeting a fair share of regional housing needs. These municipalities, therefore, are deleted from the alloc- ation procedure. In addition, municipalities with no vacant land for development, as indicated in the DCA study, are also deleted, in view of the common sense requirement that at least some vacant land is a desideratum for meaningful development

The municipalities deleted by virtue of their location outside

the "growth area" are the following:

BURLINGTON COUNTY	Bass River
	Chesterfield
	Medford
	Medford Lakes
	New Hanover
	North Hanover
	Pemberton Borough
	Pemberton Township
	Shamong
	Southampton
	Tabernacle
	Washington
	Woodland
	Wrightstown
CAMDEN COUNTY	Chesilhurst
	Waterford
GLOUCESTER COUNTY	Franklin
	South Harrison

Municipalities deleted by virtue of the absence of vacant land are the following:

BURLINGTON COUNTY	Bordentown City
CAMDEN COUNTY	Audubon Park
	Camden City
	Gloucester City
	Merchantville
	Pine Vallye
	Tavistock
GLOUCESTER COUNTY	NONE

These municipalities will have a responsibility to meet all or some, as discussed below, of their indigenous present housing need among low and moderate income households.

(2) <u>Allocate Prospective Housing Need</u>: The allocation of prospective housing need is, in itself, a multi-step procedure:

    a. Determine allocation percentage for each included municipality

    Appendix II provides the percentage for each allocation factor, and the overall allocation percentage for each municipality which has not been excluded as a result of Step 1 above. It will be noted that we have weighed each of the three factors equally in order to arrive at the allocation percentage; although

various technical arguments could be made to suggest that one factor
should be weighed more heavily than another, there are no compelling
arguments in any particular direction. Equal weight for all three
factors, therefore, is dictated.

The allocation factors range from a high of over 14% of he
total regional need (for Cherry Hill), to a low of 3/100 of 1%
(Fieldsboro and Woodlynne). Although one can argue that such
allocations are de minimus, and should be discarded, they have
been retained in the interest of consistency.

b. Allocate Prospective Need on the Basis of Allocation
Percentage

This step is largely self explanatory. The total prospective
need (27,926) is allocated by municipality on the basis of the
allocation percentage for each municipality given in Appendix II.

c. Adjust Prospective Need Allocation on the Basis of
Development Limit

In view of the significance of vacant land availability, there
may be some municipalities with extremely limited vacant land which
affects their ability to absorb a fair share housing allocation. In
order to account for this constraint, the concept of a development
limit was adapted from the DCA housing allocation study (6). Spec-
ifically, this provides that no municipality should have an allocation
of prospective housing need greater than 4 times the total vacant
developable acreage in the municipality. In essence, this would
allow for development of affordable housing at 12 units per acre
on one third of the remaining acreage, or other permutations. It
represents a commonsense adjustment reflecting the realistic feas-
ibility of development in such communities.

As it happens, only two municipalities in the region receive
allocations of prospective need in excess of the development limit,
Collingswood and Haddonfield. Applying the development limit to
those two municipalities results in a reduction of 267 units (67
from Collingswood and 200 from Haddonfield). These units are then
reallocated to the remaining municipalities in the region.

The prospective need totals, given as Column 4 in Appendix
III, are the product of this procedure, after the above adjustment
has been made.

(3) Allocate Present Housing Need: This allocation is also
a multi-step procedure:

a. Determine Indigenous Present Housing Need for each
Municipality

From the 1980 Census of Housing a tabulation was made for all
municipalities in the region, including those for which no fair
share of regional need is to be allocated, of their indigenous

present housing need; i.e., the sum of units lacking plumbing and overcrowded units.

        b. Adjust Indigenous Present Housing Need for
Selected Municipalities

    Both the specific dictates of Mt. Laurel II and the fundamental premises of the fair share concept require that no municiaplity's fair share be increased by virtue of its history as a community with a large lower income population, or decreased by virtue of its historic ability to exclude the less affluent. A municipality with a particularly large indigenous present need will have such a need as a result of its large lower income population, so that some adjustment to that need is mandatory.

    A calculation has determined that, in the region as a whole, present lower income housing need represents 3.3% of the total housing stock in the region. The adjustment, therefore, is that the indigenous present housing need that any municipality must take responsibility for shall not exceed 3.3.% of its housing stock. In this manner, no municipality is excessively burdened as a result of its historic openness to the less affluent members of the population.

        c. Reallocate Present Housing Need to Balance of
Municipalities

    The adjustment of indigenous need carried out above yields the adjusted indigenous need totals that appear as Column 1 in Appendix III. This adjustment resulted in a total of 2,766 units being removed from indigenous need totals, to be reallocated. A second allocation percentage was calculated, which represented the same percentage, but adjusted to reflect the smaller number of municipalities in the pool, and that amount allocated among the remaining municipalities in the pool. The municipalities in the pool were those who (a) had an indigenous housing need of less than 3.3% of their housing stock; and (b) were not affected by the development limit. The amount of present housing need allocated these municipalities is given in Column 2 of Appendix III.

    Column 3 in Appendix III presents the total present need allocation to each munciipality; in combination with Column 4 (prospective need), Column 5 presents the total fair share allocation for each municipality subject to Mt. Laurel II within the tricounty region.

REPRESENTATIVE HOUSING ALLOCATIONS BROKEN DOWN BY LOW AND BY
MODERATE INCOME CATEGORIES

       This final section presents allocations for selected municipal-
ities within the region broken down by that part of the total fair
share attributable to low income, and that part attributable to
moderate income, households. Such a breakdown is called for in
Mt. Laurel II (at 93), and is suggested by reasonable planning
practice. It will vary from municipality to municipality, since
(a) the breakdown is different for present and for prospective
need; and (b) the distribution of fair share between those two
categories varies by municipality. The basic distribution, as
discussed briefly above, is as follows:

	PRESENT NEED	PROSPECTIVE NEED
LOW INCOME	72%	57%
MODERATE INCOME	28%	43%

It should be stressed that these percentages should not be applied
arbitrarily to the percentage of low and moderate income housing
that may be required of a builder developing housing under the
"mandatory setaside" provisions of Mt. Laurel II. As the court
noted, "the provisions and devices need to produce moderate income
housing may fall short of those needed for lower." A test of reason-
ableness; i.e., what can be accomplished within the realm of
economic feasibility must be applied to any such remedy. An
imposition of a requirement which has the effect of discouraging
builders from building is simply eclusionary zoning in a new
guise.

       The table on the following page presents representative
municipal breakdowns by low and moderate income categories. The
same breakdowns can be computed for other municipalities by applying
the above percentages to the present and prospective need totals
given for each municipality in the region in Appendix III.

TABLE 7: FAIR SHARE HOUSING ALLOCATION FOR SELECTED MUNICIPALITIES
BROKEN DOWN BY LOW AND MODERATE INCOME CATEGORIES

	PRESENT NEED		PROSPECTIVE NEED	TOTAL NEED
BORDENTOWN TOWNSHIP	111		458	569
low (72%)	80	(57%)	261	341
mod (28%)	31	(43%)	197	228
CINNAMINSON	128		559	687
low	92		319	411
moderate	36		240	276
DELRAN	133		340	473
low	96		194	290
moderate	37		146	183
EASTHAMPTON	47		113	160
low	34		64	98
moderate	13		49	62
EVESHAM	197		1049	1246
low	142		598	740
moderate	55		451	506
MOORESTOWN	185		989	1174
low	133		564	697
moderate	52		425	477
BERLIN BOROUGH	90		325	415
low	65		185	250
moderate	25		140	165
RUNNEMEDE	117		160	277
low	84		91	175
moderate	33		69	102
VOORHEES	245		1394	1639
low	176		795	971
moderate	69		599	668

TABLE 7: CONTINUED

	PRESENT NEED	PROSPECTIVE NEED	TOTAL NEED
DEPTFORD	255	1149	1404
low	184	655	839
moderate	71	494	565
GLASSBORO	165	394	559
low	119	225	344
moderate	46	169	215

SOURCE: Analysis by Alan Mallach

(1) It should be noted that pure logic dictates that Philadelphia, as the principal regional generator of lower income housing demand should also be included. The court, however, in Mt. Laurel, recognized the problems that might cause, and noted that "restriction (of a region) within the boundaries of the State seems practical and advisable" (67 NJ at 189-90).

(2) Unfortunately, the existing workings of the housing market do not have an efficient means of correcting this mismatch; there has been, however, gradual dimminution of the percentage of overcrowded units in the American housing stock.

(3) Unpublished 1980 Census data; cited in Caton, Mahwah Township Fair Share Housing Report (1983)

(4) Logic dictates that, since the thrust of the decision deals with the zoning of land for development, as distinct from redevelopment or housing rehabilitation policies, vacant land is an essential factor in a fair share plan. It should be further noted that the critical language in the Supreme Court's discussion of Mt. Laurel Township's proposed fair share plan (slip opinion at 163-166) was not directed at the use of vacant land as an element in a fair share plan, but the blatant misuse of that element by Mt. Laurel.

(5) It is acknowledged that the date of this inventory indicates that significant changes are likely to have taken place between then and now; indeed, although the inventory is dated 1978, much of the primary data gathering took place in the early and middle 1970's. That notwithstanding, it is essential for a fair share analysis that the data be internally consistent. For that reason, even if more recent data were available for certain municipalities, it would be impossible to substitute it unless comparable data were available for the entire region.

(6) DCA, op. cit., at 17. Credit is given there to an earlier study by Rahenkamp Sachs Wells & Associates (1971) for this approach.

APPENDIX I

BASELINE COEFFICIENTS FOR DETERMINATION OF FAIR SHARE HOUSING
ALLOCATION

BURLINGTON COUNTY

	VACANT LAND AVAILABLE	1981 COVERED JOBS	1972-1981 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH	INDIGENOUS PRESENT HOUSING NEED
BASS RIVER	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED			
BEVERLY	46	596	NONE	44
BORDENTOWN CITY	0	NO VACANT LAND - EXCLUDED		
BORDENTOWN TWP	1907	2824	1649	52
BURLINGTON CITY	327	4282	NONE	159
BURLINGTON TWP	3757	6096	3730	160
CHESTERFIELD	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED			
CINNAMINSON	1165	4982	2047	56
DELANCO	305	1129	336	31
DELRAN	1415	2142	1189	89
EASTHAMPTON	1699	91	62	32
EDGEWATER PARK	598	1039	230	86
EVESHAM	7283	4789	3032	62
FIELDSBORO	37	104	22	10
FLORENCE	1977	1880	NONE	91
HAINESPORT	1100	1145	485	31
LUMBERTON	1832	659	161	45
MANSFIELD	3991	681	351	22
MAPLE SHADE	375	3729	975	190
MEDFORD	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED			
MEDFORD LAKES	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED			
MOORESTOWN	2803	14283	1702	57
MOUNT HOLLY	279	5813	601	197
MOUNT LAUREL	5023	5598	3729	63
NEW HANOVER	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED			
NORTH HANOVER	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED			

BURLINGTON COUNTY

	VACANT LAND AVAILABLE	1981 COVERED JOBS	1972-1981 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH	INDIGENOUS PRESENT HOUSING NEED	
PALMYRA	297	1185	NONE	59	
PEMBERTON BOR	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
PEMBERTON TWP	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
RIVERSIDE	112	2700	NONE	89	
RIVERTON	15	1349	NONE	32	
SHAMONG	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
SOUTHAMPTON	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
SPRINGFIELD	4666	303	187	35	
TABERNACLE	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
WASHINGTON	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
WESTHAMPTON	2021	936	439	13	
WILLINGBORO	664	4401	855	304	
WOODLAND	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
WRIGHTSTOWN	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				

CAMDEN COUNTY

	VACANT LAND AVAILABLE	1981 COVERED JOBS	1972-1981 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH	INDIGENOUS PRESENT HOUSING NEED	
PENNSAUKEN	1693	20055	139	233	
PINE HILL	1248	203	83	115	
PINE VALLEY	0	NO VACANT LAND - EXCLUDED			
RUNNEMEDE	271	1612	558	96	
SOMERDALE	197	911	107	56	
STRATFORD	142	2218	540	68	
TAVISTOCK	0	NO VACANT LAND - EXCLUDED			
VOORHEES	3899	8034	5999	65	
WATERFORD	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
WINSLOW	18506	2918	1418	281	
WOODLYNNE	20	87	25	31	

CAMDEN COUNTY

	VACANT LAND AVAILABLE	1981 COVERED JOBS	1972-1981 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH	INDIGENOUS PRESENT HOUSING NEED	
AUDUBON	45	1670	NONE	54	
AUDUBON PARK	0	NO VACANT LAND - EXCLUDED			
BARRINGTON	77	2259	NONE	61	
BELLMAWR	322	3321	764	159	
BERLIN BOR	1017	2508	1165	48	
BERLIN TWP	1251	1109	NONE	65	
BROOKLAWN	93	638	27	18	
CAMDEN	0	NO VACANT LAND - EXCLUDED			
CHERRY HILL	5061	38487	15381	283	
CHESILHURST	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
CLEMENTON	503	1529	491	81	
COLLINGSWOOD	28	2491	549	160	
GIBBSBORO	97	510	NONE	11	
GLOUCESTER	8250	4734	176	302	
GLOUCESTER CITY	0	NO VACANT LAND - EXCLUDED			
HADDON	135	2927	184	94	
HADDONFIELD	16	4307	631	38	
HADDON HEIGHTS	46	1104	52	46	
HI-NELLA	54	83	40	16	
LAUREL SPRINGS	23	542	284	19	
LAWNSIDE	416	1125	390	50	
LINDENWOLD	901	1971	1199	221	
MAGNOLIA	98	602	108	48	
MERCHANTVILLE	0	NO VACANT LAND- EXCLUDED			
MOUNT EPHRAIM	62	881	NONE	39	
OAKLYN	28	827	52	34	

	VACANT LAND AVAILABLE	1981 COVERED JOBS	1972-1981 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH	INDIGENOUS PRESENT HOUSING NEED	
CLAYTON	3298	• 760	373	94	
DEPTFORD	5670	5556	4217	295	
EAST GREENWICH	2481	444	128	27	
ELK	5758	360	343	54	
FRANKLIN	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
GLASSBORO	3171	3656	403	239	
GREENWICH	1458	1296	112	28	
HARRISON	2589	850	672	24	
LOGAN	2437	1284	697	36	
MANTUA	6040	1802	766	88	
MONROE	23103	2479	1039	223	
NATIONAL PARK	143	107	37	57	
NEWFIELD	720	889	241	10	
PAULSBORO	210	3890	NONE	124	
PITMAN	361	3370	274	58	
SOUTH HARRISON	MUNICIPALITY OUTSIDE GROWTH AREA - EXCLUDED				
SWEDESBORO	133	1444	420	47	
WASHINGTON	5905	3513	2065	108	
WENONAH	185	295	40	7	
WEST DEPTFORD	3506	3597	1929	119	
WESTVILLE	159	2319	NONE	38	
WOODBURY	159	6378	1344	140	
WOODBURY HEIGHTS	224	1181	NONE	19	
WOOLWICH	2536	304	151	24	

APPENDIX II

MUNICIPAL PERCENTAGES FOR EACH ALLOCATION FACTOR AND TOTAL
ALLOCATION PERCENTAGE

	% VACANT LAND	% TOTAL JOBS	% JOB GROWTH	ALLOC- ATION %	
BASS RIVER					
BEVERLY	.03	.26	0	0.097	
BORDENTOWN CITY					
BORDENTOWN TWP	1.20	1.24	2.45	1.63	
BURLINGTON CITY	.21	1.88	0	0.697	
BURLINGTON TWP	2.37	2.67	5.53	3.523	
CHESTERFIELD					
CINNAMINSON	.74	2.18	3.04	1.987	
DELANCO	.19	.49	.50	0.393	
DELRAN	.89	.94	1.76	1.21	
EASTHAMPTON	1.07	.04	.09	0.40	
EDGEWATER PARK	.38	.46	.34	0.393	
EVESHAM	4.60	2.10	4.50	3.733	
FIELDSBORO	.02	.05	.03	0.033	
FLORENCE	1.25	.82	0	0.69	
HAINESPORT	.69	.50	.72	0.637	
LUMBERTON	1.16	.29	.24	0.53	
MANSFIELD	2.52	.30	.52	1.113	
MAPLE SHADE	.24	1.63	1.45	1.107	
MEDFORD					
MEDFORD LAKES					
MOORESTOWN	1.77	6.26	2.53	3.52	
MOUNT HOLLY	.18	2.55	.89	1.207	
MOUNT LAUREL	3.17	2.45	5.53	3.717	
NEW HANOVER					
NORTH HANOVER					

	% VACANT LAND	% TOTAL JOBS	% JOB GROWTH	ALLOC-ATION %	
PALMYRA	.19	.52	0	0.237	
PEMBERTON BOR					
PEMBERTON TWP					
RIVERSIDE	.07	1.18	0	0.417	
RIVERTON	.01	.59	0	0.197	
SHAMONG					
SOUTHAMPTON					
SPRINGFIELD	2.94	.13	.28	1.127	
TABERNACLE					
WASHINGTON					
WESTHAMPTON	1.28	.41	.65	.78	
WILLINGBORO	.42	1.93	1.27	1.207	
WOODLAND					
WRIGHTSTOWN					

	% VACANT LAND	% TOTAL JOBS	% JOB GROWTH	ALLOC- ATION %
PENNSAUKEN	1.07	8.79	.21	3.357
PINE HILL	.79	.09	.12	0.333
PINE VALLEY				
RUNNEMEDE	.17	.71	.83	0.57
SOMERDALE	.12	.40	.16	0.227
STRATFORD	.09	.97	.80	0.62
TAVISTOCK				
VOORHEES	2.46	3.52	8.90	4.96
WATERFORD				
WINSLOW	11.68	1.28	2.10	5.02
WOODLYNNE	.01	.04	.04	0.03

CAMDEN COUNTY

	% VACANT LAND	% TOTAL JOBS	% JOB GROWTH	ALLOC- ATION %
AUDUBON	.03	.73	0	0.253
AUDUBON PARK				
BARRINGTON	.05	.99	0	0.347
BELLMAWR	.20	1.46	1.13	0.93
BERLIN BOR	.64	1.10	1.73	1.157
BERLIN TWP	.79	.49	0	0.427
BROOKLAWN	.06	.28	.04	0.127
CAMDEN				
CHERRY HILL	3.19	16.87	22.82	14.293
CHESILHURST				
CLEMENTON	.32	.67	.73	0.573
COLLINGSWOOD	.02	1.09	.81	0.64
GIBBSBORO	.06	.22	0	0.093
GLOUCESTER	5.21	2.07	.26	2.513
GLOUCESTER CITY				
HADDON	.09	1.28	.27	0.723
HADDONFIELD	.01	1.89	.94	0.947
HADDON HEIGHTS	.03	.48	.08	0.197
HI-NELLA	.03	.04	.06	0.043
LAUREL SPRINGS	.01	.24	.42	0.223
LAWNSIDE	.26	.49	.58	0.443
LINDENWOLD	.57	.86	1.78	1.07
MAGNOLIA	.62	.26	.16	0.347
MERCHANTVILLE				
MOUNT EPHRAIM	.04	.39	0	0.143
OAKLYN	.02	.36	.08	0.153

APPENDIX III

ALLOCATION OF PRESENT AND PROSPECTIVE HOUSING NEED BY MUNICIPALITY
AND TOTAL FAIR SHARE HOUSING ALLOCATION BY MUNICIPALITY

	% VACANT LAND	% TOTAL JOBS	% JOB GROWTH	ALLOC- ATION %
CLAYTON	2.08	.33	.55	0.987
DEPTFORD	3.58	2.43	6.26	4.09
EAST GREENWICH	1.57	.19	.19	0.65
ELK	3.63	.16	.51	1.433
FRANKLIN				
GLASSBORO	2.00	1.60	.60	1.40
GREENWICH	.92	.57	.17	0.553
HARRISON	1.63	.37	1.00	1.00
LOGAN	1.54	.56	1.03	1.043
MANTUA	3.81	.79	1.14	1.913
MONROE	14.58	1.09	1.54	5.737
NATIONAL PARK	.09	.05	.05	0.063
NEWFIELD	.45	.39	.36	0.40
PAULSBORO	.13	1.70	0	0.61
PITMAN	.23	1.48	.41	0.707
SOUTH HARRISON				
SWEDESBORO	.08	.63	.62	0.443
WASHINGTON	3.73	1.54	3.06	2.777
WENONAH	.12	.13	.06	0.103
WEST DEPTFORD	2.21	1.58	2.86	2.217
WESTVILLE	.10	1.02	0	0.373
WOODBURY	.10	2.80	1.99	1.63
WOODBURY HEIGHTS	.14	.52	0	0.22
WOOLWICH	1.60	.13	.22	0.65

BURLINGTON COUNTY	ADJUSTED INDIGEN- OUS NEED	ALLOCATED PRESENT NEED	TOTAL PRESENT NEED	PROS- PECTIVE NEED	TOTAL FAIR SHARE	
BASS RIVER						
BEVERLY	34		34	27	61	
BORDENTOWN CITY						
BORDENTOWN TWP	52	59	111	458	569	
BURLINGTON CITY	135		135	196	331	
BURLINGTON TWP	139		139	990	1129	
CHESTERFIELD						
CINNAMINSON	56	72	128	559	687	
DELANCO	31	14	45	111	156	
DELRAN	89	44	133	340	473	
EASTHAMPTON	32	15	47	113	160	
EDGEWATER PARK	86	14	100	111	211	
EVESHAM	62	135	197	1049	1246	
FIELDSBORO	6		6	9	15	
FLORENCE	91	25	116	194	310	
HAINESPORT	31	23	54	179	233	
LUMBERTON	45	19	64	149	213	
MANSFIELD	22	40	62	313	375	
MAPLE SHADE	190	40	230	311	541	
MEDFORD						
MEDFORD LAKES						
MOORESTOWN	57	128	185	989	1174	
MOUNT HOLLY	129		129	339	468	
MOUNT LAUREL	63	135	198	1045	1243	
NEW HANOVER						
NORTH HANOVER						

BURLINGTON COUNTY

	ADJUSTED INDIGEN-OUS NEED	ALLOCATED PRESENT NEED	TOTAL PRESENT NEED	PROS-PECTIVE NEED	TOTAL FAIR SHARE	
PALMYRA	59	9	68	66	134	
PEMBERTON BOR						
PEMBERTON TWP						
RIVERSIDE	89	15	104	117	221	
RIVERTON	32	7	39	55	94	
SHAMONG						
SOUTHAMPTON						
SPRINGFIELD	30		30	317	347	
TABERNACLE						
WASHINGTON						
WESTHAMPTON	13	28	41	219	260	
WILLINGBORO	304	44	348	339	687	
WOODLAND						
WRIGHTSTOWN						

CAMDEN COUNTY

	ADJUSTED INDIGEN-OUS NEED	ALLOCATED PRESENT NEED	TOTAL PRESENT NEED	PROS-PECTIVE NEED	TOTAL FAIR SHARE	
AUDUBON	54	9	63	71	134	
AUDUBON PARK						
BARRINGTON	61	13	74	97	171	
BELLMAWR	155		155	262	417	
BERLIN BOR	48	42	90	325	415	
BERLIN TWP	57		57	120	177	
BROOKLAWN	18	5	23	35	58	
CAMDEN						
CHERRY HILL	283	518	801	4016	4817	
CHESILHURST						
CLEMENTON	77		77	161	238	
COLLINGSWOOD	160		160	112	272	DEVELOPMENT LIMIT
GIBBSBORO	11	3	14	26	40	
GLOUCESTER	302	91	393	707	1100	
GLOUCESTER CITY						
HADDON	94	26	120	203	323	
HADDONFIELD	38		38	64	102	DEVELOPMENT LIMIT
HADDON HEIGHTS	46	7	53	55	108	
HI-NELLA	16	2	18	12	30	
LAUREL SPRINGS	19	8	27	62	89	
LAWNSIDE	36		36	125	161	
LINDENWOLD	221	39	260	301	561	
MAGNOLIA	48	13	61	97	158	
MERCHANTVILLE						
MOUNT EPHRAIM	39	5	44	40	84	
OAKLYN	34	6	40	43	83	

CAMDEN COUNTY

	ADJUSTED INDIGEN- OUS NEED	ALLOCATED PRESENT NEED	TOTAL PRESENT NEED	PROS- PECTIVE NEED	TOTAL FAIR SHARE	
PENNSAUKEN	233	122	355	943	1298	
PINE HILL	115	12	127	93	220	
PINE VALLEY						
RUNNEMEDE	96	21	117	160	277	
SOMERDALE	56	8	64	63	127	
STRATFORD	68	23	91	174	265	
TAVISTOCK						
VOORHEES	65	180	245	1394	1639	
WATERFORD						
WINSLOW	214		214	1411	1625	
WOODLYNNE	31	1	32	8	40	

GLOUCESTER COUNTY

	ADJUSTED INDIGENOUS NEED	ALLOCATED PRESENT NEED	TOTAL PRESENT NEED	PROSPECTIVE NEED	TOTAL FAIR SHARE	
CLAYTON	77		77	278	355	
DEPTFORD	255		255	1149	1404	
EAST GREENWICH	27	24	51	183	234	
ELK	38		38	403	441	
FRANKLIN						
GLASSBORO	165		165	394	559	
GREENWICH	28	20	48	155	203	
HARRISON	24	36	60	281	341	
LOGAN	36	38	74	293	367	
MANTUA	88	69	157	537	694	
MONROE	223	208	431	1612	2043	
NATIONAL PARK	37		37	18	55	
NEWFIELD	10	14	24	113	137	
PAULSBORO	85		85	171	256	
PITMAN	58	26	84	198	282	
SOUTH HARRISON						
SWEDESBORO	26		26	125	151	
WASHINGTON	108	100	208	781	989	
WENONAH	7	4	11	29	40	
WEST DEPTFORD	119	80	199	623	822	
WESTVILLE	38	14	52	104	156	
WOODBURY	137		137	458	595	
WOODBURY HEIGHTS	19	8	27	61	88	
WOOLWICH	12		12	183	195	