

9-21-77

MM

Mallach's Fair share
allocation for Burlington County

Pgs. 3

MM 000084F

Alan Mallach/Associates

April 21, 1977

TO: Carl S. Bisgaier, Esq.

FROM: Alan Mallach

RE: Fair share housing allocation for Mt. Laurel and
Burlington County

This memorandum will present a proposed numerical housing allocation for Burlington County municipalities, including Mt. Laurel Township, through the year 2000, based on the fair share methodology first outlined in this matter in my memorandum to you of September 21, 1976 entitled "Preliminary Outline Report on Issues in Mt. Laurel Litigation". In the interest of time and economy, I have written this memo to supplement the earlier one, and will not go back over the general ground of the fair share plan.

In essence, however, the plan works as follows:

- (a) a need figure is obtained (see below) representing the total number of new dwelling units needed in the county;
- (b) this need is first allocated ('gross allocation') to each municipality on the basis of employment and vacant land availability. Vacant land availability is adjusted for distance from the center of the region.
- (c) the disparity between the municipal percentage of low and moderate income households and the countywide average is then calculated; if in excess of the average, the allocation is reduced, if less than the average, the allocation is increased.
- (d) the final allocation is defined by that obtained after step (c) above, adjusted where necessary to reflect limited vacant land capacity for construction of additional units.

Thus, the methodology we are working with has not changed from that outline in the earlier memorandum. A number of specific changes, particularly in the data sources and analytical methods

Alan Mallach/Associates

Carl S. Bisgaier, Esq. (2)

4/21/77

used, have been made. These are as follows:

(1) need: the basic need data we have used is derived from the need analysis in the Department of Community Affairs fair share allocation study. In order to provide an outcome that could more readily be compared with other fair share analyses, we have brought the need figure up to the year 2000 (DCA only goes up to 1990) as follows:

(a) we utilized the Series II year 2000 projection of population by the Department of Labor & Industry. This is a direct extension of the DCA report projection, which uses the same source for 1990.

(b) we held the household size projection developed by DCA constant from 1990 to 2000. Since household size levels are generally declining, this is a very conservative procedure, and may understate need.

(c) since the DCA figure for the moderate income category is unreasonably low, we utilized the conventional ceiling used by DVRPC and others of \$10,000 as of the 1970 Census. This yields a low and moderate income percentage for the region (Burlington/Camden/Gloucester) of 42.5%.

As a result, our need analysis includes the present need figure calculated by DCA (unchanged) and a prospective need figure that represents 42.5% of the net increase in households to 2000. This yields a total need figure of 40544 NEW units by 2000 in Burlington County.

(2) vacant land: Since DCA has conducted a more recent vacant land study, we have substituted that data for the 1970 Burlington County data. It should be noted that the DCA figures refer to a highly conservative definition of developable vacant land; i.e., they exclude wetlands, land of 12% or greater slope, and qualified farmlands as well as public lands from the total.

(3) location adjustment to vacant land: we have applied a more sophisticated approach to adjusting, or weighing, vacant land availability from that applied in the earlier memo. Specifically, we have calculated an individual distance factor for each municipality in the county, based on the straight-line distance of its geographic center from the center of the region, which is held to be the center of the City of Camden. This has been

Alan Mallach/Associates

Carl S. Bisgaier, Esq. (3)

4/21/77

adjusted to reflect the proximity to Trenton of those municipalities within 10 miles of the City of Trenton.

(4) employment: DVRPC projections for the year 2000 dated 12/15/75 are utilized.

(5) income distribution: 1970 Census of Population figures are used, for families (rather than families and single individuals) only.

The fair share analysis has been presented in the following tables. Please note that a page of notes and/or commentary on each page of tables precedes the table. I believe that all of the procedures following are clearly explained, but would appreciate your indicating to me if anything is confusing or unclear.