

NEW JERSEY AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED AND OBLIGATIONS

May 16, 2016

REPORT SUBMITTED BY:

Econsult Solutions
1435 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102



Peter A. Angelides, Ph.D., AICP
Principal

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Peter A. Angelides'.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of Contents..... | 2 |
| 1.0 Summary of Report | 4 |
| 1.1 Background | 4 |
| 1.2 Purpose and Scope | 5 |
| 1.3 Methodology..... | 6 |
| 1.4 Results by Municipality | 10 |
| 2.0 Defining Housing Regions | 11 |
| 2.1 Definition Factors | 12 |
| 2.2 Regional Definitions | 15 |
| 3.0 Present Need | 16 |
| 3.1 Measures of Deficient Housing | 18 |
| 3.2 Unique Deficient Units | 20 |
| 3.3 LMI Proportion..... | 22 |
| 3.4 Extrapolation of Present Need | 23 |
| 3.4.1 Deficient Units in 2000 | 24 |
| 3.4.2 Trend in Deficient Units..... | 25 |
| 3.5 Present Need Results | 26 |
| 4.0 Prospective Need by Region | 27 |
| 4.1 Time Period | 28 |
| 4.2 Population Projections | 29 |
| 4.2.1 Population in Households | 34 |
| 4.3 Headship Rates and Households..... | 36 |
| 4.4 Median Income and LMI Proportion..... | 40 |
| 4.4.1 Defining Median Income | 40 |
| 4.4.2 Calculating LMI Households..... | 48 |
| 4.5 Significant Housing Assets..... | 52 |
| 4.6 Prospective Need by Region Results | 55 |
| 5.0 Municipal Allocation of Prospective Need | 58 |
| 5.1 Urban Aid Municipalities | 58 |
| 5.2 Responsibility Factors..... | 61 |
| 5.2.1 Employment Level | 63 |
| 5.2.2 Change in Employment | 63 |
| 5.3 Capacity Factors | 64 |
| 5.3.1 Aggregate Income Difference..... | 64 |
| 5.3.2 Developable Land | 66 |
| 5.4 Municipal Share of Regional Prospective Need | 68 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 6.0 | Secondary Sources of Affordable Housing Supply | 69 |
| 6.1 | Demolitions | 70 |
| 6.2 | Residential Conversions | 72 |
| 6.3 | Filtering | 74 |
| 6.4 | Allocation of Secondary Sources | 82 |
| 6.5 | Secondary Source Adjustment Results | 84 |
| 7.0 | Municipal Housing Obligations | 87 |
| 7.1 | Categories of Affordable Housing Need | 89 |
| 7.2 | Prior Round vs. Gap Period Obligations | 92 |
| 7.3 | Reconciling Prior Round (1987-1999) Obligations | 94 |
| 7.3.1 | Offset Method | 95 |
| 7.3.2 | Single Pool Method | 97 |
| 7.4 | Municipal Allocation Caps | 98 |
| 7.4.1 | 20% Cap | 99 |
| 7.4.2 | 1,000 Unit Cap | 100 |
| 7.4.3 | Municipal Allocation Cap Results | 102 |
| 7.5 | Initial Summary Obligations | 103 |
| | Appendix A: Present Need by Municipality | 104 |
| | Table A.1: Unique Deficient LMI Housing Units by Municipality (ACS 2009-2013) | 104 |
| | Table A.2: Present Need by Municipality | 118 |
| | Appendix B: Municipal Allocation of Regional Prospective Need | 131 |
| | Table B.1: Qualification of Urban Aid Municipalities | 131 |
| | Table B.2: Municipal Allocation of Regional Prospective Need | 133 |
| | Appendix C: Secondary Source Adjustments to Municipal Allocations | 148 |
| | Table C.1: Secondary Source Adjustments to Municipal Allocations | 148 |
| | Appendix D: Allocation Cap Adjustments to Municipal Obligations | 162 |
| | Table D.1: Allocation Cap Adjustments to Municipal Obligations | 162 |
| | Appendix E: Initial Summary Obligations by Municipality | 175 |
| | Table E.1: Initial Summary Obligations by Municipality | 175 |

1.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT

The report that follows develops a complete methodology yielding a calculation of regional affordable housing need and affordable housing obligations for each municipality in New Jersey. This methodology is developed in accordance with relevant Court decisions, precedents and statutes, and the Round 1 and Round 2 (Prior Round) methodologies for the calculation of affordable housing, as specified by the New Jersey Supreme Court's March 2015 decision.

This summary includes a brief overview of the relevant background, principles and methodology employed in this report. The sections that follow explain the methodology employed for each component of the calculation, detail the relevant precedents and statistical considerations used in its development, and present results at the regional and state level. The report concludes with Appendices featuring detailed tables specifying results for each municipality. This summary section concludes with a brief guide containing the section number and page location of key Appendix tables featuring municipal-level results.

1.1 BACKGROUND

In the landmark *Mount Laurel* decisions, and subsequent Fair Housing Act (FHA), New Jersey has required that each municipality make provisions for its “fair share” of affordable housing. “Affordable” housing is defined in the FHA and is generally understood to mean housing that is affordable to a family with household income that is 80 percent of median household income. Households that earn less than 80 percent of median household income are referred to as Low and Moderate Income (LMI) households (N.J.S.A (52:27D-304(c), (d) and (m)).

New Jersey has taken numerous steps over several decades to implement the *Mount Laurel* decisions with respect to the provision of affordable housing for LMI households. Relevant milestones are as follows:

- Fair Housing Act (FHA): The Fair Housing Act of 1985 is the legislative embodiment of the Mt. Laurel decision. The FHA provided the basis for the establishment of the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) to oversee the fair share housing process that it establishes.
- Round 1: COAH calculated the affordable housing obligation for all municipalities in the state. Round 1 went into effect in 1987 and covered the period 1987- 1993.
- Round 2: At the close of the Round 1, COAH again calculated the affordable housing obligation for all municipalities in the state. Round 2 went into effect in 1994 and covered the period 1993-1999. The Round 2 methodology was similar to, but not identical to, the Round 1 methodology.

- Round 3 (2004): COAH again calculated the affordable housing obligation for each municipality in 2004, using a different methodology than Round 1 or Round 2. This “growth share” approach was invalidated in 2007 by the New Jersey Appellate Court, which instructed COAH to revise its methodology for this round.
- Round 3 (2008): COAH attempted to remedy the deficiencies of the 2004 method and again calculated affordable housing obligations. While the Appellate Division, in 2010, invalidated some of the various regulations COAH adopted in 2008 including the revised “growth share” methodology, the Supreme Court considered various challenges to the Appellate Division Decision. In 2013, the Supreme Court issued its decision in which it invalidated all of the Round 3 regulations COAH adopted in 2008. In its decision, the Supreme Court instructed COAH to develop a methodology “similar to the methodologies used in the prior round rules” and to adopt new regulations in five months
- Un-adopted Round 3 (2014): COAH prepared a new affordable housing obligation for each municipality based on, but not identical to, the methodologies used in Round 1 and Round 2. COAH ultimately did not adopt these obligations.
- Supreme Court (2015): In March 2015, the New Jersey Supreme Court declared COAH moribund, and ordered the courts to resume oversight of affordable housing. The court ordered each municipality to prepare a new estimate of obligation, and provided guidance on how to do so. The Court ruling, among other things, again affirmed that the methodology for the determination of affordable housing obligations should be similar to the prior rounds.

As outlined above, since the enactment of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act in 1985, the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) has been responsible for the implementation and assignment of these affordable housing responsibilities. However, for Round 3, COAH has been unable to adopt a methodology for the calculation and assignment of housing obligations that could withstand legal challenge. The absence of precise fair share numbers approved by the courts has frustrated the ability of municipalities to adopt appropriate housing elements and fair share plans and thereby comply with the directive of the Supreme Court to update their housing elements and fair share plans.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this report is twofold. First, the report lays out a methodology for calculating affordable housing need for each municipality in New Jersey. Second, the report applies this method to the best and most updated available data to calculate the affordable housing obligation for each municipality. Courts, municipalities and other entities can then use these methods and calculations to inform their decisions about the obligation for each municipality. In sum, this report seeks to quantify the Present Need, Prospective Need, and summary municipal obligations as

accurately as possible, and to be consistent with the Supreme Court's requirement that the approach be similar to the methodologies employed in the Prior Round.

We reserve the right to adjust the report if relevant new or updated information becomes available.

All calculations are based on data sets available uniformly on a statewide basis. At the municipal level, it is possible that there may be more accurate data than that available on a statewide level. Adjustments on the municipal level based on more accurate or recent data are outside the scope of this report, but may be addressed on a case by case basis through the municipal housing plan compliance process. In addition, this report does not quantify housing activity, credits or adjustments obtained by municipalities with respect to their assigned Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations. Nothing in this report should be construed to limit appropriate recognition of this activity, credits and adjustments within the municipal compliance process.¹

1.3 METHODOLOGY

We base our methodology on several basic principles:

- The methodology is based on and similar to methods used in the Prior Rounds, and in other legislation and guidance provided by the Court. However, it is neither possible nor desirable to follow the prior round methodology precisely for several reasons. These include updates to relevant laws and regulations, differing time periods, newly available data sets, corrections to previous errors, and other changed circumstances.
- The methodology is clear and transparent. Calculation of obligations is constrained by the FHA, court decisions, prior methods, data availability, and other factors, so it is complex and lengthy. We lay out the method in significant detail and also provide an electronic appendix.
- For each calculation, we use the most recent and appropriate data that is available on a uniform statewide basis. The data is all derived from publicly available sources.
- To the greatest extent possible, the allocated municipal obligations should reflect the identifiable present and prospective need for affordable housing, as defined by the Fair Housing Act and as explained in In re Adoption of N.J.A.C. 5:96 & 5:97 ex rel. New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, 221 N.J. 1 (2015) ("Mount Laurel IV").

¹ The Municipal Joint Defense Group engaged Econsult Solutions to prepare this report. Econsult Solutions did not have a list of the participating municipalities at the time this report was issued.

The methodology involves several large-scale steps, many of which have several sub-steps. These steps comprise the sections of the report, where they are defined in greater detail. The Appendices then report results by municipality for each of the 565 municipalities in New Jersey.

The report proceeds in six sections which undertake the following steps:

Define the Regions (Section 2)

In Section 2, we investigate whether there is strong reason to adjust the groupings of New Jersey's 21 counties into the six regions that have been used since Round 2 in 1994, based on changed circumstances. We conclude that while other permutations may be plausible, the Prior Round methodologies and FHA do not provide a clear standard by which regional definitions should be adjusted. Absent a compelling rationale for change, the regional definitions are maintained unadjusted for this analysis.

Calculate Present Need (Section 3)

In Section 3, we calculate the Present Need by municipality. Present Need is an estimate of existing deficient housing currently occupied by LMI households. As in the Prior Round methodology, surrogate measures are utilized to estimate the level of inadequate housing in each municipality. It is necessary not only to determine the number of units that meet each criterion, but to adjust for the overlap between each measure to avoid double counting and to yield an estimate of unique deficient housing units. Then, the proportion of those unique deficient units occupied by LMI households is estimated.

Finally, it is necessary to extrapolate the result yielded by the most recent available data forward to produce a current estimate of Present Need as of the start of the Prospective Need period. This is done by estimating for each municipality the deficient units occupied by LMI households in 2000 (in the same manner described above) to determine an annualized trend in Present Need that is then extrapolated forward to yield a current estimate. This extrapolation procedure, combined with a more sophisticated approach to estimating the overlap in deficient units, results in a slightly higher estimate of aggregate Present Need than that produced by other recent analyses.

Nothing herein is intended to preclude a municipality from conducting an appropriate housing survey to demonstrate that the actual Present Need for their municipality differs from the estimate of Present Need presented in this analysis.

Calculate Prospective Need by Region (Section 4)

In Section 4, we calculate the Prospective Need by region. Prospective Need represents an estimate of the anticipated need for affordable housing based on projected growth in LMI households. The Prospective Need period is ten years, covering July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2025.

The calculation starts by estimating population growth in the Prospective Need period. Population projections are then translated into households. The procedure utilized in this analysis, which tracks the Round 2 methodology closely, yields an estimated population growth slightly higher than, and broadly in line with, observed statewide household growth over the past fifteen years. Next, the proportion of households qualifying as LMI is estimated, and those LMI households that are not eligible for affordable housing due to their level of housing assets are removed. This process yields estimates of eligible LMI households at the start (2015) and end (2025) of the Prospective Need period. The incremental difference between these figures represents the Prospective Need for each region.

Allocate Prospective Need to Municipalities (Section 5)

In Section 5, we calculate the regional allocation shares for Prospective Need for each municipality. First, qualifying urban aid municipalities are determined and removed from this portion of the calculation, as their Prospective Need allocation is zero. Then, as in the Prior Round methodology, an allocation formula is developed based on a combination of “responsibility” factors, which estimate the contribution of each municipality to regional need, and “capacity” factors, which estimate the ability of each municipality to absorb regional need. Specific calculations for each of these factors have been refined and updated based on the most up to date and appropriate data source.

Municipal shares as a proportion of the region for each of these responsibility and capacity metrics are then averaged to yield a single allocation share for each municipality. These shares are then applied to the regional Prospective Need calculated in Section 4 to yield the Prospective Need allocation for each municipality. Therefore, the sum of each municipality’s allocation in each region equals the regional Prospective Need.

Adjust for Secondary Sources of Affordable Housing Supply (Section 6)

In Section 6, we adjust for anticipated changes in affordable housing supply over the ten-year period. These “secondary source” adjustments account for the natural evolution of the housing stock over time due to market-based factors. This step reflects the fact that affordable housing is provided not only through dedicated planning and zoning policy, but also through changes in housing value (and thus cost) over time. Said another way, much of the housing currently occupied by LMI households was not originally built as “affordable housing.”

As in the Prior Round methodology, trends in market-based activity are analyzed and extrapolated forward to yield an estimate of future supply changes over the ten-year period. Estimates are developed for the net effect of the filtering of housing stock, the net effect of residential conversions, and the negative effect of demolitions on the supply of affordable housing for each municipality. These three figures are then summed to yield a net effect from secondary sources of supply for each municipality. This net change in supply is applied to the initial Present Need and Prospective Need for each municipality to yield an adjusted Present and Prospective Need. Since this process may yield a negative need for some municipalities, a regional allocation of additional units below this “zero bound” is undertaken to ensure that the methodology aligns aggregate municipal need with the estimated changes in affordable housing supply.

Nothing herein is intended to preclude a municipality from using local data and information to demonstrate that secondary source adjustments for their municipality differ from those set forth herein.

Determine Municipal Obligations (Section 7)

In Section 7, we reconcile the allocation of Present Need and Prospective Need yielded by Sections 3-6 with additional adjustments required by the relevant statutes and Court decisions to arrive at an initial summary obligation for each municipality.

Together, Present Need and Prospective Need completely describe the identifiable need for affordable housing within the fair share framework set forth in the FHA. Therefore, no calculations of additive housing need are undertaken.

However, the Prior Round methodology and the FHA define two caps which are applied to municipal housing allocations: (i) the 20 percent cap; and (ii) the 1,000-unit cap. Further, the Supreme Court stated that its March 2015 decision “does not eradicate” unfulfilled Prior Round (1987 – 1999) obligations, which serve as “the starting point for the determination of a municipality’s fair share responsibility” within the current cycle (221 N.J.1 at 30). Given perfect information, it would be possible to incorporate the unfulfilled portion of the Prior Round obligation into the allocation process for the current cycle, aligning aggregate housing obligations with identified housing need. Absent that information, the initial Prior Round obligation, as assigned to municipalities in Round 2 in 1993-1994, is summed with the Present Need and Prospective Need to yield an initial summary obligation for each municipality. Municipalities can then reduce that obligation, which is reported in the final table of this report, by demonstrating applicable adjustments, housing activity and credits on a case by case basis in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans.

1.4 RESULTS BY MUNICIPALITY

Results for each municipality yielded by this methodology are included in the Appendices to this report. Municipal-level results can be found in the following tables and page locations:

- Present Need by Municipality: Appendix A, Table A.2 (p. 118 - 130)
- Municipal Allocation of Regional Prospective Need: Appendix B, Table B.2 (p. 133 - 147)
- Secondary Source Adjustments to Municipal Allocations: Appendix C, Table C.1 (p. 148 - 161)
- Allocation Cap Adjustments to Municipal Obligations: Appendix D, Table D.1 (p. 162 - 174)
- Initial Summary Obligations by Municipality: Appendix E, Table E.1 (p. 175 - 188)²

² Note that the initial summary obligations include the full unadjusted Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations for each municipality as initially assigned by COAH in 1993. Municipalities can then reduce that initial obligation through the demonstration of applicable adjustments, housing activity and credits on a case by case basis in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans.

2.0 DEFINING HOUSING REGIONS

Housing regions are the geographic unit for many of the calculations that ultimately result in a fair share obligation for each of New Jersey's 565 municipalities. Regional calculations sum to, rather than derive from, statewide calculations. In other words, there is no statewide calculation of affordable housing need – there is only a series of regional calculations, which can be summed to produce a statewide result.

While the Prior Round methodologies are clear about the importance of the housing regions, they are less clear as to the standards by which regions should be defined. The Fair Housing Act defines “Housing Region” as follows:

“Housing region” means a geographic area of not less than two nor more than four contiguous, whole counties which exhibit significant social, economic and income similarities, and which constitute to the greatest extent practicable the primary metropolitan statistical areas as last defined by the United States Census Bureau prior to the effective date of P.L.1985, c. 222 (C.52:27D-301 et al.).

[N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304 b.]

Under the “Definitions” section (5:93-1.3), the Round 2 rules adopt the definition of “Housing Region” found in the FHA and quoted above.

This definition offers no clear guidance as to a statistical standard that can be applied to determine a single “best” distribution of counties into regions. PMSA’s are specifically referenced as a point of consideration, as well as the more subjective concept of “significant social, economic and income similarities.” The Round 2 methodology identifies journey-to-work data as a relevant indicator related to this standard [26 N.J.R 2315 – 2316], and we have analyzed the journey-to-work with updated data, as reported below. However, the Round 2 methodology concludes its description of the county sorting process by stating that subjective factors were also used:

After including certain judgmental decisions regarding the size of a region and its capacity to handle need, as well as the necessary inclusion in each region of at least one central city, the journey-to-work region takes the following form...

[26 N.J.R 2316]

The housing region definitions adopted in Round 2 were an alteration of those adopted in Round 1 (with Sussex moving from Region 2 to Region 1, Warren from Region 3 to Region 2, and Mercer from Region 5 to Region 4). The housing regions as defined in Round 2 have been maintained by COAH in each attempt at promulgating Round 3 rules. The Round 2 definitions are shown in Table 2.1 below.

TABLE 2.1: REGIONAL COUNTY GROUPINGS ADOPTED IN ROUND 2 METHODOLOGY

| Region | Counties |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Bergen, Hudson, Passaic, Sussex |
| 2 | Essex, Morris, Union, Warren |
| 3 | Hunterdon, Middlesex, Somerset |
| 4 | Mercer, Monmouth, Ocean |
| 5 | Burlington, Camden, Gloucester |
| 6 | Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, Salem |

2.1 DEFINITION FACTORS

The basic premise, set forth repeatedly in earlier rounds, is that employment drives much of the need for affordable housing. Accordingly, employment (and employment centers) within a region create the need for affordable housing that needs to be met within that region. The Round 2 methodology uses journey-to-work data on the origin and destination of work trips from the 1990 Census to help define appropriate regional groupings. Since that time, a more robust data set of live-work relationships between various counties has been developed by the U.S. Census Bureau through its Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD) program.

The LEHD program includes collaboration between the federal Census Bureau and 49 states³ under the Local Employment Dynamics (LED) Partnership. Under this program, states share Unemployment Insurance earnings data and Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages data with the Census Bureau, which combines these administrative data with its own administrative inputs and data from censuses and surveys. These inputs yield detailed statistics on employment, earnings and job flows at a variety of geographic levels. This data set, which was unavailable at the time of the Round 2 methodology, represents the most updated and appropriate data set for evaluating the live-work relationships between counties.

A matrix of live-work relationships between each of New Jersey's 21 counties was developed from the publicly available LODES (LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics) database. Workers were sorted based on the location of their "primary job," defined as ("the job that earned the individual the most money") since a worker's primary job is more likely than ancillary jobs to drive their choice of residential location. Next, the category of highest earners are removed, since the focus of the regional definition is in this instance the provision of affordable housing for low

³ Massachusetts does not participate in the program, and is thus not represented in the otherwise comprehensive data set.

and moderate income workers.⁴ Finally, only workers who both live and work in New Jersey are considered, since no possible regional definition will capture those workers who live or work in another state in the same region.⁵

This data matrix can then be used to calculate the proportion of low and moderate income New Jersey workers residing in each region who also work in the same region. Results based on the Round 2 regional definitions are shown below in Table 2.2. Proportions range from 61% to 76% in each region, and average 69% statewide.

TABLE 2.2: LIVE/WORK PROPORTIONS FOR LOW AND MODERATE WAGE EARNERS BY HOUSING REGION, 2013

| Region | Counties | NJ Workers Residing and Working in Region | NJ Workers Residing in Region | Live & Work Proportion |
|--------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Bergen, Hudson, Passaic, Sussex | 257,000 | 363,000 | 71% |
| 2 | Essex, Morris, Union, Warren | 215,000 | 338,000 | 64% |
| 3 | Hunterdon, Middlesex, Somerset | 133,000 | 217,000 | 61% |
| 4 | Mercer, Monmouth, Ocean | 190,000 | 273,000 | 70% |
| 5 | Burlington, Camden, Gloucester | 176,000 | 231,000 | 76% |
| 6 | Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, Salem | 97,000 | 129,000 | 76% |
| State | | 1,068,000 | 1,550,000 | 69% |

The statewide live-work percentage yielded by this combination of regions is not the highest of any possible permutation identified by ESI's statistical analysis. However, alternate combinations produce only incremental changes (not larger than 1-2 percent) in the statewide live-work proportion. Some of these combinations do so by increasing live-work proportions in some regions while reducing it in others, while other combinations alter the balance of overall population and economic activity by clustering more large counties together. Thus, while alternate possible combinations were identified based on this metric, their incremental magnitude and the distributional challenges they present suggest that none is a clear improvement relative to the current definitions.

⁴ LODES data divides earners into three income categories, with the highest earners earning greater than \$3,333 per month, or \$40,000 per year. While this income category does not precisely match the LMI thresholds in New Jersey (which vary by region and household size), removing this category provides a more accurate proxy for LMI commuting patterns than an analysis that includes all earners.

⁵ It is worth noting that a significant portion of New Jersey employees and employed residents are cross-state commuters, particularly in the counties that are part of the New York and Philadelphia metro areas. Conceptually, these cross-state commuters fall outside of the linkages between localized employment and housing that define much of the Prospective Need calculation.

Further, it is unclear from the text of the FHA that live-work combinations are the primary metric by which regional definitions should be constructed. While the Round 2 methodology clearly conducts a similar analysis, it just as clearly applies additional “judgmental decisions.” Further, no references to live-work data appear in the FHA definition, and this approach represents an indirect and incomplete measure of “social, economic and income similarities.”

PMSA Definitions

The additional factor referenced in the FHA is the defined Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSA) issued by the U.S. Census Bureau. PMSAs represent clusters of counties which should form the basis of housing regions “to the greatest extent practicable.” However, PMSA’s have been discontinued as a regional grouping by the Census Bureau, with the last set of definitions issued in 1999. Table 2.3 below shows the PMSA’s into which New Jersey counties were divided in those definitions.

TABLE 2.3: NEW JERSEY COUNTIES BY PMSA DEFINITIONS FROM U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (1999)

| PMSA | New Jersey Counties |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bergen-Passaic | Bergen, Passaic |
| Jersey City | Hudson |
| Middlesex-Somerset-Hunterdon | Hunterdon, Middlesex, Somerset |
| Monmouth-Ocean | Monmouth, Ocean |
| Newark | Essex, Morris, Sussex, Union, Warren |
| Trenton | Mercer |
| Atlantic-Cape May | Atlantic, Cape May |
| Philadelphia (PA) | Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, Salem |
| Vineland-Millville-Bridgeton | Cumberland |

A 2005 Bulletin⁶ from the Federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to Executive Departments explains the evolution of statistical area definitions as follows:

The terms “Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area” and “Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas are now obsolete...A Metropolitan Division is most generally comparable in concept, and equivalent to, the now obsolete Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Therefore, Table 2.4 shows the Metropolitan Divisions into which New Jersey counties are assigned (last defined in 2013).

⁶ Bulletin 05-02, *Update of Statistical Area Definitions and Guidance on their Usage*, Office of Management and Budget, February 22, 2005. Available online at: (https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/bulletins_fy05_b05-02)

TABLE 2.4: NEW JERSEY COUNTIES BY METROPOLITAN DIVISION DEFINITIONS FROM U.S. CENSUS BUREAU (2013)

| Metropolitan Areas | New Jersey Counties |
|---|---|
| Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton (PA) | Warren |
| Atlantic City-Hammonton | Atlantic |
| Camden | Burlington, Camden, Gloucester |
| Newark | Essex, Hunterdon, Morris, Somerset, Sussex, Union |
| New York-Jersey City-White Plains (NY/NJ) | Bergen, Hudson, Middlesex, Monmouth, Ocean, Passaic |
| Ocean City | Cape May |
| Trenton | Mercer |
| Vineland-Bridgeton | Cumberland |
| Wilmington (DE) | Salem |

A review of these tables shows the challenge in executing the goal of following “to the greatest extent practicable” the PMSA definitions in defining housing regions. First, PMSA’s no longer exist, and groupings have changed significantly from PMSAs to Metropolitan Divisions for New Jersey’s counties. Second, the constraint imposed by the FHA to create groupings of “not less than two nor more than four contiguous, whole counties” must be balanced with PMSA definitions that include three single counties and a group of five counties, or Metropolitan Area definitions that contain six single counties and two groupings of six counties. Assigning these single counties to other natural “clusters,” and breaking up the large groups, creates a chain of impacts throughout the regions regardless how it is executed. Broadly speaking, the Round 2 housing region definitions do maintain the major PMSA clusters intact, and where they do not, presumably the directive to follow PMSA definitions has been balanced against the directive to define regions “which exhibit significant social, economic and income similarities.”

2.2 REGIONAL DEFINITIONS

The standards set forth in the FHA and the Prior Round methodologies do not present an objective standard by which to judge optimal housing regions. Live-work data is clearly considered a factor, as are the former PMSA definitions from the U.S. Census Bureau, but each are balanced with what the methodology terms “judgmental” factors. The regional definitions utilized in Round 2 follow neither the optimal live-work permutations nor the PMSA clusters exactly, but are nonetheless broadly in line with groupings suggested by each of those standards. Further, it is not clear what objective metric might better suit the FHA’s standard of “significant social, economic and income similarities.” In the absence of such an alternate standard, this analysis maintains the regional groupings as defined in the Round 2 methodology.

3.0 PRESENT NEED

Present Need, also commonly referred to as “the indigenous need” or “rehabilitation share”, represents an estimate of the current stock of deficient housing within each municipality occupied by low and moderate income households.

- Present Need is not estimated on a forward-looking basis, but rather is an estimate of current conditions. As such, Present Need is best estimated as of the start of the Prospective Need period. Synchronizing the calculation of Present Need and Prospective Needs avoids either a gap period during which additional Present Need may accumulate prior to the start of the period, or an overlap during which additional LMI households who live in deficient housing units would be counted in both Present Need and Prospective Need. Therefore, the Present Need estimate is calculated as of July 1, 2015, matching the start of the Prospective Need period (as discussed in Section 4.1).
- Unlike Prospective Need, for which the base unit is households, the base unit for Present Need is occupied housing units. The procedure described below identifies indicators of housing deficiency, and accounts for overlap between those deficiencies in the same unit, and then applies the estimated proportion of LMI households currently occupying those deficient units. The result of this calculation is an estimate of units, rather than households. Importantly, the analysis estimates only deficient units occupied by LMI households. Therefore, for example, housing that is deficient but vacant is excluded.

The Present Need methodology employed in Rounds 1 and 2 estimates Present Need on a municipal basis. However, after this initial calculation, the proportion of housing stock estimated to be deficient in each region is identified, and each municipality’s “indigenous” Present Need is capped at that proportion of its municipal housing stock. The remaining Present Need units are pooled regionally and distributed to municipalities based on allocation factors that are similar to those employed in the municipal allocation of regional Prospective Need (see Section 5), similarly excluding qualifying urban aid municipalities. This obligation is referred to in Rounds 1 and 2 as “Re-Allocated Present Need,” with total Present Need for each municipality comprised of the sum of “Indigenous Need” and “Re-Allocated Present Need” (See 26 N.J.R. 2317-2319).

COAH’s Round 3 methodologies published in 2004, 2008 and 2014 each eliminated the calculation of Re-Allocated Present Need, and instead simply adopted the estimate of deficient units occupied by LMI households within each municipality as that municipality’s Present Need (prior to any applicable adjustments or obligation caps). This change in methodology was challenged, but specifically upheld by the Appellate Court decisions which struck down both iterations of the “Growth Share” methodology in 2007 and 2010, and the 2013 Supreme Court decision affirming the Appellate Court. The Supreme Court’s 2015 decision explains the Court’s current position on Re-Allocated Present Need in its discussion of principles that the courts should follow in implementing its decision:

...the Appellate Division twice addressed the Third Round Rules' elimination of the reallocation of excess present need and found it permissible under both the FHA and Mount Laurel II...and this Court "substantially affirmed" that opinion. The Mount Laurel judges may proceed on this basis when reviewing the plans of municipalities.

[221 N.J. 1 (2015), page 30-31]

The procedure described below adopts the Round 3 approach specifically identified as permissible by the courts of maintaining estimated Present Need within each municipality, rather than re-allocating a portion of it within the region.

The procedure occurs in four steps, which are described in turn in the section that follows, to yield an estimate of Present Need by municipality summarized in Section 3.5 and shown in full in Appendix A:

1. First, we identify three surrogate measures of inadequate housing, and determine the current magnitude of each deficiency by municipality (Section 3.1).
2. Next, we adjust for the overlap between surrogates of deficiency (which may occur in the same unit) to arrive at a unique deficient unit estimate by municipality (Section 3.2).
3. Next, we apply the proportion of unique deficient units estimated to be occupied by LMI households to yield an estimate of unique, deficient LMI units by municipality (Section 3.3).
4. Finally, the procedure is repeated for a prior point in time to determine Present Need as of that time. An annualized growth trend in present need is determined by comparing current Present Need to the prior Present Need. That growth trend is applied to the current Present Need to yield an estimate of Present Need as of July 1, 2015 (Section 3.4).

3.1 MEASURES OF DEFICIENT HOUSING

To estimate the volume of deficient housing in each municipality, surrogate measures of housing deficiency must first be chosen. The Round 2 methodology utilizes seven proxies⁷ tracked in Census data, and classified units as deficient if they were identified in two or more of the surrogate measures. COAH's 2004 Round 3 methodology replaces these indicators with three proxies, two of which are measured directly (units with inadequate plumbing facilities and units with inadequate kitchen facilities) and one of which combines two of the prior measures (units built before a given date with 1.01 or more persons per room, i.e. "old and overcrowded"). Under this approach, identification of a unit on any one of the three surrogates⁸ results in that unit being classified as deficient.

This change in methodology was challenged, and was specifically approved by the 2007 Appellate Division decision that rejected the overall "Growth Share" approach. That decision writes, with respect to Present Need (called "rehabilitation share" in this iteration):

Because the third round methodology captures a newer overcrowded unit in the rehabilitation share if it lacks plumbing or kitchen facilities, and the other previously-used surrogates are unavailable in the current Census data, COAH's new approach as to overcrowded units is neither arbitrary nor irrational.

[In re Adoption of N.J.A.C 5:94 & 5:95, 390 N.J. Super. 1]

The Supreme Court's 2015 decision explains the Court's current position on indicators of deficient housing in its discussion of principles that the courts should follow in implementing its decision:

...the Appellate Division also approved a methodology for identifying substandard housing units that used "fewer surrogates [or indicators] to approximate the number of deficient or dilapidated housing units...the Appellate Court acknowledged a change in the available United States Census data that triggered the reduction in indicators and found that COAH did not abuse its discretion in reducing the number of factors from seven to three. That, like the previously mentioned areas left to COAH's discretion, and others not directly precluded by the Appellate Court's decision or ours remain legitimate considerations for the Mount Laurel judges when evaluating the constitutionality and reasonableness of the plans they are called upon to review.

[221 N.J. 1 (2015), page 45-46]

⁷ The proxy measures are: (1) units built prior to 1940; (2) overcrowded units, that is, units having 1.01 or more persons per room; (3) inadequate plumbing; (4) inadequate kitchen facilities; (5) inadequate heating fuel, that is, no fuel at all or using coal or wood; (6) inadequate sewer services; and (7) inadequate water supply. [Reproduced from In re Adoption of N.J.A.C 5:94 & 5:95, 390 N.J. Super 1. See also: 26 N.J.R. 2345 for description in Round 2 methodology]

⁸ Note that the third surrogate ("old and overcrowded") itself requires two different conditions to be present in the same unit; once that estimate has been developed, however, the third surrogate is treated as a single condition.

Accordingly, we adopt the Round 3 approach specifically identified as permissible by the courts with respect to the surrogate indicators of housing deficiency.

Indicators of inadequate plumbing facilities and inadequate kitchen facilities are left unchanged from the Round 3 (and indeed the Round 2) methodology. With respect to old and overcrowded housing, the age of a structure is grouped by the Census into ten year bands by year built (i.e. 1930-1939, 1940-1949, etc.).

Despite the court's acceptance of a pre-1940 cutoff date, we use a cut-off of pre-1960 as the definition of old housing units, as was done in the un-adopted 2014 Round 3 rules for COAH. We do so primarily because it strains the definition of the term "old" to fail to update the cut-off point indefinitely.⁹ The age of a structure is not an indicator of deficiency by itself; instead, units identified as both old (constructed pre-1960) AND overcrowded (as defined by more than 1 person per room) are considered deficient within this procedure.

The most up to date data source available for this calculation is the 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS) from the U.S. Census Bureau.¹⁰ The five-year ACS provides estimates of a variety of metrics needed to estimate the surrogates and some of their inter-relationships at the municipal level. To determine the inter-relationship between certain indicators (as is necessary to properly account for units with multiple deficiencies), it is necessary to utilize the Public Use Micro Sample (PUMS) from the 2009-2013 ACS, a data set which provides users with the ability to develop custom "cross-tabs" showing the inter-relationships between multiple survey questions. The PUMS represents 5 percent of total responses in the ACS. Due to the geographic classification of the data and the imperative of sufficient sample size, it is necessary to calculate relationships from the PUMS at the county level and apply those relationships back to known counts of deficient units by municipality from the full ACS.¹¹

It is important to note that the data in the 2009-2013 ACS is effectively drawn in even increments across the five-year span it represents. While a portion of the data included is from 2013, the "midpoint" of the data sample is 2011. Therefore, Present Need estimates arising from this data set are best thought of as being calculated "as of" 2011, rather than 2013. This distinction is relevant for the extrapolation calculation performed in Section 3.4 below.

⁹ The Round 2 methodology identified housing build prior to 1940 as old, explaining that "this pre-World War II cutoff is the classic differentiation point of new versus old housing in the literature." (26 N.J.R. 2345) COAH's 2004 Round 3 Present Need methodology approved by the court maintained this 1940 cutoff point, suggesting that "old" housing was defined not simply by the age of a structure, but by this pre-war/post-war distinction, which may also be associated with new building techniques and materials relevant to the soundness of a unit.

¹⁰ We note that the 2010-2014 five-year ACS data was released in December 2015, just prior to the release of this report, but too late for inclusion in the calculation. Since five-year samples are updated on a rolling basis with each new year, there is functionally an 80% overlap in data between the 2009-2013 and 2010-2014 samples.

¹¹ Note that the most recent decennial Census (Census 2010) no longer includes the "long-form" questions necessary to perform this analysis. The Census is instead now "short-form" only, with "long-form" questions appearing in the ACS.

3.2 UNIQUE DEFICIENT UNITS

The three surrogates of housing deficiency identified in Section 3.1 are not mutually exclusive, meaning that the same housing unit could suffer from multiple deficiencies. Therefore, to develop an estimate of the total number of deficient units in each municipality, reported figures from ACS for each surrogate cannot be summed together without accounting for the overlap between surrogacy measures. Accounting for this overlap allows for an estimate of unique, deficient units in each municipality to be developed.¹² We have estimated unique overlap proportions for the potential combinations of deficiencies, and municipal data is utilized to the greatest extent possible.

The procedure begins with the total count of occupied units with lacking adequate plumbing facilities by municipality, drawn from the 2009-2013 ACS.

Second, the proportion of units that are both old and crowded is determined by municipality, deducting those old and crowded units that also have inadequate plumbing (and have thus already been accounted for). The ACS provides municipal level data on occupants per room, year built and plumbing conditions within the same “cross-tab” table. However, the cut-off date for unit construction is “before 1950,” rather than the pre-1960 cut-off date needed for this procedure. Nonetheless, this table yields the best estimate of old and overcrowded units built before 1950, which would otherwise have to be estimated through proxies and ratio analysis, and additionally allows for an accounting of the overlap with inadequate plumbing units.

An additional estimate of crowded units built between 1950 and 1959 (net of those with inadequate plumbing) is needed. The first step in developing this estimate is to calculate the proportion of units built after 1949 in each municipality that are also crowded and have complete plumbing (from the same ACS table). This proportion can then be applied to the recorded total number of current units in each municipality that were built between 1950 and 1959. This procedure yields a municipal-level estimate of the number of occupied units built within the 1950 to 1959 period that are overcrowded (meaning that they qualify as deficient) but have adequate plumbing (meaning that they are not double counted). This figure is then summed with the counts of units without adequate plumbing and crowded units built prior to 1950 with adequate plumbing to yield a non-overlapped estimate of two of the three measures of deficiency using only municipal data.

¹² Previous methodologies using the three surrogate factors adopted in this procedure (specifically the un-adopted 2014 Round 3 rules for COAH and the 2015 calculation by Dr. David Kinsey for FSHC) have developed estimates of the proportion of deteriorated units with multiple deficiencies within each county. This proportion was then applied globally within each county to the sum of deficiencies identified using the surrogates in each municipality to produce an estimate of unique deficient units. This approach lacks precision with regard to the type of deficiency identified and the likelihood of overlap. For example, units with inadequate plumbing may have a greater or lesser likelihood to have additional deficiencies than the average deficient unit, or certain municipalities may have a greater proportion of overlapping deficiencies than others within the same county. Further, this approach incorrectly applies a reduction for overlap in instances where deficient units have only been identified in one of the three surrogates, and therefore by definition the overlap is zero.

Next, the number of occupied units with inadequate kitchen facilities is identified from the ACS by municipality. Data is not available from the ACS, however, on the overlap between those units with deficient kitchens and those units previous identified as having deficient plumbing or being old and crowded. Therefore, analysis is performed using the 5 percent Public Use Micro Sample (PUMS) from the 2009-2013 ACS to determine, among the units that have inadequate kitchens in each county, the proportion that have neither of the other two deficiency indicators. That proportion (which is calculated for each county) is multiplied by the number of occupied units with deficient kitchens in each municipality. This yields an estimate of units with deficient kitchens “only” (i.e. without the other indicators of deficiency) in each municipality.

Last, these three non-overlapping set of figures are summed to yield an estimate of unique non-overlapped deficient units by municipality. Table 3.1 below shows the resulting estimates, summed at the region and statewide level (see Appendix A for figures by municipality). Statewide, approximately 90,700 unique deficient units are identified.

TABLE 3.1: ESTIMATE OF UNIQUE DEFICIENT OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, ACS 2009-2013

| Region | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 and Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units |
|--------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 4,132 | 27,020 | 4,257 | 35,409 |
| 2 | 3,986 | 17,800 | 4,016 | 25,802 |
| 3 | 1,581 | 5,890 | 1,750 | 9,221 |
| 4 | 2,226 | 4,584 | 2,734 | 9,544 |
| 5 | 1,316 | 2,491 | 2,064 | 5,871 |
| 6 | 1,069 | 2,606 | 1,166 | 4,841 |
| State | 14,310 | 60,391 | 15,987 | 90,688 |

3.3 LMI PROPORTION

The next step is to estimate the proportion of these unique deficient units that are occupied by a low or moderate income household. Estimating this proportion requires cross-referencing the unique deficient housing units identified above with the household size and income characteristics of the occupants, which are then cross-referenced with regional LMI income thresholds matching those used in the Prospective Need calculation (and discussed at length in Section 4.4.1). This procedure requires the use of the Public Use Micro Sample (PUMS) from the 2009-13 ACS, and is calculated for each county.¹³ Income limits are calculated uniquely for each region and year, to ensure that household income reported in the 2009-2013 PUMS data is compared to the applicable household income threshold for that year and region. These county proportions are then applied back to the estimate of unique deficient units for each municipality to yield an estimate of unique deficient LMI units.

The deficient units are estimated at the municipal level based on county LMI shares. Table 3.2 summarizes the estimates at the regional and statewide level (see Appendix A for figures by municipality). The statewide estimate of unique deficient LMI units is 61,500.

TABLE 3.2: ESTIMATED UNIQUE DEFICIENT OCCUPIED LMI HOUSING UNITS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, ACS 2009-2013

| Region | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 35,409 | 69.2% | 24,508 |
| 2 | 25,802 | 70.7% | 18,240 |
| 3 | 9,223 | 61.7% | 5,693 |
| 4 | 9,544 | 68.3% | 6,515 |
| 5 | 5,871 | 59.3% | 3,481 |
| 6 | 4,481 | 63.3% | 3,063 |
| State | 90,690 | 67.8% | 61,500 |


¹³ Note that this procedure estimates the LMI proportion only of those households occupying deficient housing, not of all households within the county. Therefore, while LMI thresholds match those utilized in the Prospective Need calculation, results by county differ from those yielded by analyzing all households for the determination of Prospective Need. Not surprisingly, the LMI proportions are generally higher among those households living in deficient housing than among all households.

3.4 EXTRAPOLATION OF PRESENT NEED

As previously noted in Section 3.1, the most recent available data on housing deficiency is best understood as representing deficiency “as of” 2011. Therefore, the Present Need estimate is extrapolated forward from 2011 to 2015, matching the start date of the Prospective Need period (as discussed in Section 4.1). We use the 2000-2011 trend in LMI deficient units to estimate the change for each municipality from the prior period.¹⁴

We estimate unique LMI deficient units for each municipality in 2000 using data from Census 2000 and a parallel procedure to the one described above using ACS 2009-2013. The resulting estimate for each municipality for 2000 is then compared with the midpoint 2011 estimate to calculate a net change (which may be positive or negative). This net change is annualized over the 11 year period. Four years of this annualized trend are then applied to the current estimate for each municipality to extrapolate an estimate of Present Need from the 2011 estimate to 2015.

FIGURE 3.1: EXTRAPOLATION OF PRESENT NEED FOR A SAMPLE MUNICIPALITY



¹⁴ The un-adopted 2014 Round 3 methodology for COAH extrapolated a Present Need estimate drawn from the 2010 Census to 2014 (the start of the Prospective Need period within that analysis) by calculating the unique LMI deficient units as a proportion of occupied housing stock for each municipality as of 2010, and applying that proportion to the occupied housing stock as of 2014. This approach effectively ties the extrapolation of Present Need to increases in housing stock in the interim years, which is somewhat flawed as a proxy for changes in deficient housing because new units created in the interim years are highly unlikely to be deficient, meaning that the proportion of deficient units is unlikely to stay constant with growth in the housing stock. Meanwhile, older existing units may become deficient within the interim years, or deficient units may be remediated or demolished in that time. As a result, net LMI deficient units within a municipality may increase or decrease over the time period, independent of net change in the housing stock.

3.4.1 DEFICIENT UNITS IN 2000

A parallel methodology to the procedure described above is performed using Census 2000 data to estimate unique LMI deficient units by municipality as of 2000. Definitions of inadequate plumbing and inadequate kitchen are identical to those used in the current calculation. For old and crowded housing, the threshold for the year housing is constructed is moved back from the pre-1960 cut-off used in the current analysis to a pre-1950 cut-off.¹⁵

Census 2000 data provides direct cross-tabs of occupants per room and plumbing conditions by age of housing, with housing divided into pre-1950 and post-1950. It is therefore possible to identify old and crowded units by municipality directly in this data set, and to produce a non-overlapped count of units with deficient plumbing and those that are old and overcrowded. As in the 2009-13 procedure, the count of occupied units with inadequate kitchen facilities within each municipality is then adjusted by the proportion of units with inadequate kitchens within each county that have no other deficiency indicators (as identified in the PUMS data from the 2000 Census). This calculation produces an estimate of inadequate kitchen units net of any overlap with the prior deficiency indicators, meaning the categories can be summed to produce an estimate of unique deficient units by municipality. This estimate is then multiplied by the proportion of unique deficient units identified as being occupied by LMI households in each county, as identified in PUMS data based on LMI income cutoffs by household size from Census 2000 data (described in more detail in Section 4.4.1). The results of this calculation are shown by county and statewide in Table 3.3, and municipal level estimates are shown in Appendix A. The statewide estimate of deficient LMI units as of 2000 is approximately 52,400, about 9,000 less than the estimate from ACS 2009-13 data.

¹⁵ Note that the aim of this calculation is to estimate the number of deficient LMI units that existed in each municipality in 2000, rather than the number of currently deficient units that existed and were deficient as of 2000. Therefore, it is necessary to shift the cut-off date for the year of construction to maintain a consistent age span of approximately 50 years for the definition of “old” housing. The extrapolation methodology using this consistent age span thereby effectively proxies the housing stock that becomes old by the 50 year definition between 2011 and 2015.

TABLE 3.3: ESTIMATED UNIQUE DEFICIENT OCCUPIED LMI HOUSING UNITS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, AS OF 2000

| Region | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1950 and Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|--------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 5,785 | 24,784 | 2,852 | 33,421 | 63.1% | 21,079 |
| 2 | 4,795 | 15,002 | 2,500 | 22,297 | 69.1% | 15,403 |
| 3 | 1,529 | 4,289 | 995 | 6,813 | 67.7% | 4,609 |
| 4 | 1,891 | 4,102 | 1,055 | 7,048 | 66.0% | 4,654 |
| 5 | 1,643 | 3,258 | 1,022 | 5,923 | 71.1% | 4,213 |
| 6 | 887 | 2,312 | 856 | 4,055 | 59.9% | 2,428 |
| State | 16,530 | 53,747 | 9,280 | 79,557 | 65.8% | 52,386 |

3.4.2 TREND IN DEFICIENT UNITS

The current and past estimates of LMI deficient units are then compared to develop annualized trend based on the incremental change in units between the 2000 and 2011 midpoint estimates. This calculation is conducted for each municipality, and the trend established can be either positive or negative depending on the direction of the incremental change observed between 2000 and 2009-13. This incremental change is then annualized to produce an annual increment that can be extrapolated forward. Table 3.4 shows the results of this calculation at the regional level, which reflects a sum of the municipal incremental net changes. Statewide, the net change is an increase of approximately 830 units per year.

TABLE 3.4: ANNUALIZED NET CHANGE IN UNIQUE DEFICIENT LMI UNITS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Unique Deficient LMI Units, 2000 Census | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 ACS | Net Change | Annualized Net Change |
|--------------|---|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 21,079 | 24,508 | 3,429 | 312 |
| 2 | 15,403 | 18,240 | 2,837 | 258 |
| 3 | 4,609 | 5,693 | 1,084 | 99 |
| 4 | 4,654 | 6,515 | 1,861 | 169 |
| 5 | 4,213 | 3,481 | (732) | (67) |
| 6 | 2,428 | 3,063 | 635 | 58 |
| State | 52,386 | 61,500 | 9,114 | 829 |

3.5 PRESENT NEED RESULTS

Finally, the annualized trend developed in Section 3.4.2 is multiplied by four to estimate the incremental change in LMI deficient units by municipality from 2011 to 2015. This increment is then applied to the municipal LMI deficient unit estimate from the 2009-2013 ACS (from Section 3.3) to yield estimated Present Need by municipality as of 2015.

The results of this calculation at the region and statewide level are shown below in Table 3.5, and results by municipality are shown in Appendix A.¹⁶ Statewide Present Need as of 2015 is estimated at approximately 65,000 units.

TABLE 3.5: ESTIMATED PRESENT NEED BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, 2015

| Region | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 ACS | Net Change (4 years) | Present Need, 2015 |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 24,508 | 1,300 | 25,808 |
| 2 | 18,240 | 1,092 | 19,332 |
| 3 | 5,693 | 402 | 6,095 |
| 4 | 6,515 | 680 | 7,195 |
| 5 | 3,481 | (197) | 3,284 |
| 6 | 3,063 | 257 | 3,320 |
| State | 61,500 | 3,534 | 65,034 |

¹⁶ Note that regional numbers are a product of the sum of municipalities. The sum of incremental change for all municipalities varies slightly from the incremental change estimated at the regional level due to rounding and also because municipal Present Need estimates are bounded at zero by definition. In cases where the incremental trend yields a negative Present Need for an individual municipality, it is replaced with a zero.

4.0 PROSPECTIVE NEED BY REGION

Prospective Need represents an estimate of the anticipated need for affordable housing units over a forward-looking ten-year period. Developing such an estimate requires defining reasonable estimates of population growth, translating population estimates into households, estimating what proportion of households are likely to qualify as LMI, and removing those LMI households that will not be eligible for affordable housing. The incremental change between the estimate of LMI households at the beginning and end of the ten-year period within each region represents regional Prospective Need. This need is then allocated to municipalities within each region (see Section 5).

Prospective Need is by definition and design forward-looking. The Fair Housing Act defines Prospective Need as “a projection of housing needs based on development and growth which is reasonably likely to occur,” (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304(j)), echoing the structure of Prospective Need set forth in the Mt. Laurel II decision. Developing such an estimate, therefore, requires a series of projections about the growth and changes in composition of the population of each region over a ten-year period. The section that follows explains each projection and assumption employed in the context of relevant precedent and case law, and also checks the reasonableness of these projections against observed population and households trends and benchmarks for New Jersey.

The procedure proceeds in six steps to yield an estimate of regional Prospective Need, as shown in Section 4.6:

1. First, we identify the start and end date of the Prospective Need period (Section 4.1).
2. Next, we determine the projected population increase over the Prospective Need period, and the estimated proportion of that population living in households (Section 4.2).
3. Then, we estimate the headship rate, and hence the number of households associated with that population (Section 4.3).
4. Next, we estimate what proportion of households at the beginning and end of the period are low and moderate income (LMI) (Section 4.4).
5. Then, we remove LMI households who are ineligible for affordable housing due to their significant housing assets (Section 4.5).
6. Finally, we compare eligible LMI households at the start and end of the period to determine the incremental change, i.e. the Prospective Need, by region (Section 4.6).

4.1 TIME PERIOD

The first step in estimating Prospective Need is defining the appropriate time period. While Round 1 and Round 2 each covered a six year period, the Fair Housing Act has since been amended with respect to the time period. The FHA now states (in Section 307, which sets for the duties of the Council on Affordable Housing) that it is the duty of the Council to:

Adopt criteria and guidelines for...municipal determination of its present and prospective fair share of the housing need in a given region **which shall be computed for a 10 year-period.**

[N.J.S.A. 52:27D-307(c)(1), (emphasis added)]

Further, the FHA offers a definition of Prospective Need that clearly indicates that the calculation is forward-looking. In Section 304 (which sets forth definitions used throughout the act), the definition begins as follows:

Prospective need means a **projection** of housing needs based on development and growth which is reasonably **likely to occur** in a region or municipality...

[N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304(j), (emphasis added)]

This definition is reflective of the framework set forth by the Supreme Court in *Mount Laurel II*. In that decision, the Court similarly defined anticipated future growth as the basis for Prospective Need:

The *Mount Laurel* obligation to meet the prospective lower income housing need of the region is, **by definition, one that is met year after year in the future**, throughout the years of the particular projection used in calculating prospective need.”

[*So. Burlington County N.A.A.C.P. v. Tp. of Mount Laurel*, 92 N.J. 158, 219 (1983) (emphasis added)]

While some attempts at calculating Round 3 fair share obligations have attempted to “back date” the start of the Prospective Need period to the conclusion of Round 2 in 1999, this approach is plainly at odds with the text of the FHA, which defines the period as ten years in length, and as forward-looking. Further, such a back-dated calculation creates structural problems,¹⁷ in part because the Prior Round methodologies do not envision computing Prospective Need for a period that includes both forward-looking and retrospective components in the same calculation, and in part due to the double counting that arises when the Present Need calculation does not

¹⁷ These issues are enumerated and explained in ESI’s September 2015 *Review and Analysis or Report Prepared by David N. Kinsey PhD Entitled: “New Jersey Low and Moderate Income Housing Obligations for 1999 – 2025”* for the New Jersey State League of Municipalities

align with the start of the Prospective Need period. The time period for the Prospective Need period is therefore defined as July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2025.

4.2 POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Estimating incremental affordable housing need over a ten year period first requires a projection of population change during those years. Prior Round population projections are based on models developed by the New Jersey Department of Workforce and Labor Development (NJLWD). Every other year, the NJLWD produces a twenty year forecast of population growth using four different models (“Economic Demographic,” “Historic Migration,” “Net Migration” and “Linear Regression”). Projections start in the most recent year for which population estimates from the Census are available and project population in five-year increments. The most recent set of projections is available for 2012-2032, using the Census population estimate for 2012 and offering projections for 2017, 2022, 2027 and 2032. The Round 1 methodology utilized population projections from the NJLWD Historic Migration model, while the Round 2 methodology averaged statewide population projections from the Historic Migration and Economic Demographic models, and then adjusted the share of that population growth applied to each County using a proprietary model from the Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR) at Rutgers. The Round 2 methodology explains its decision to average outputs of the two projection models by noting that “Retrospectively, averaging has given the most accurate results over time.” (26 N.J.R 2347)

As suggested by this passage, it is useful to take the past performance of projection models relative to observed population growth as a consideration in setting appropriate future population projections.

Historic Population Projections

NJLWD has provided ESI with a time series of the past seven twenty-year population projections yielded by each of its four models. NJLWD’s website provides a document titled *Methodology – The Projection Models*¹⁸ which describes the assumptions underlying each model. Assumptions regarding base population, fertility and mortality, cohort aging, and migration of the population 65 and older are identical in the Economic Demographic and Historic Migration models. They differ in their treatment of migration of persons under 65 years old. NJLWD’s methodology explains the difference as follows (in its description of the Historic Migration model relative to the Economic Demographic):

Rather than inferring migration under age 65 by economic factors, the Historical Migration Model applies the past net migration rates directly to the population distributed at each projection interval.

[NJLWD, “Methodology – The Projection Models”]

¹⁸ Available online at: (<http://lwd.dol.state.nj.us/labor/lpa/dmograph/lfproj/method22.doc>)

Within the methodology summary, NJLWD states its rationale for providing projections from both of these models:

The only difference between the Historical Migration Model and the Economic-Demographic Model is the migration assumptions. **The projected population from these two models may be used as a range for possible population change in the future.**

[NJLWD, “Methodology – The Projection Models” (emphasis added)]

Using the data set provided by NJLWD, it is possible to identify 12 unique five-year projection periods from which compound annual growth rates¹⁹ (CAG) projected by the NJLWD can be compared to observed Census data for those periods. The results of this comparison are shown in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1: STATEWIDE POPULATION PROJECTIONS: NJLWD MODELS VS. OBSERVED CENSUS POPULATION ESTIMATES

| Projection Base Year | Projection Period | Census Estimates | | Economic Demographic (ED) | | Historic Migration (HM) | | Averaged (ED & HM) | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | | Comparable Time Period | CAG | CAG | CAG vs. Census | CAG | CAG vs. Census | CAG | CAG vs. Census |
| 2000 | 2000-2005 | 2000-2005 | 0.52% | 0.74% | 43% | 0.68% | 31% | 0.71% | 37% |
| 2000 | 2005-2010 | 2005-2010 | 0.34% | 0.72% | 111% | 0.68% | 97% | 0.70% | 104% |
| 2000 | 2010-2015 | 2010-2015 | 0.35% | 0.74% | 111% | 0.78% | 123% | 0.76% | 117% |
| 2002 | 2002-2007 | 2002-2007 | 0.29% | 0.84% | 190% | 0.93% | 218% | 0.89% | 204% |
| 2002 | 2007-2012 | 2007-2012 | 0.45% | 0.72% | 60% | 0.88% | 95% | 0.80% | 78% |
| 2004 | 2004-2009 | 2004-2009 | 0.28% | 0.50% | 78% | 0.60% | 116% | 0.55% | 97% |
| 2004 | 2009-2014 | 2009-2014 | 0.41% | 0.63% | 54% | 0.59% | 44% | 0.61% | 49% |
| 2006 | 2006-2011 | 2006-2011 | 0.41% | 0.35% | -15% | 0.70% | 71% | 0.52% | 28% |
| 2006 | 2011-2016 | 2011-2015 | 0.32% | 0.56% | 71% | 0.57% | 74% | 0.56% | 73% |
| 2008 | 2008-2013 | 2008-2013 | 0.45% | 0.32% | -28% | 0.27% | -40% | 0.30% | -34% |
| 2010 | 2010-2015 | 2010-2015 | 0.35% | 0.50% | 43% | 0.44% | 27% | 0.47% | 35% |
| 2012 | 2012-2017 | 2012-2015 | 0.31% | 0.39% | 29% | 0.36% | 17% | 0.38% | 23% |
| AVG | | | 0.37% | 0.58% | 57% | 0.62% | 67% | 0.60% | 62% |

¹⁹ Compound annual growth rates are preferred in this comparison to raw population estimates because the Census Bureau frequently “re-bases” prior population estimates, and does not hold population levels consistent across decennial Census periods. Compound annual growth rates provide a common benchmark of projection accuracy given the best information available at the time (i.e. not “penalizing” a projection for retroactive changes to the base year population) and allow for a consistent data set to be constructed across decennial Census periods. They also allow for a comparison of annualized growth rates for time periods with portions yet to be completed.

Table 4.1 illustrates that bi-annual projections from both the Economic Demographic and Historic Migration models have consistently overstated future population growth over the time period analyzed. On average, projections from the Economic Demographic model have overstated population growth observed in the Census by 57%, projections from the Historic Migration model by 67%, and the average of the two models by 62%. However, projections for each model, and in particular the Historic Migration model, appear to be more accurate for recent periods. For the current twenty-year horizon, the Historic Migration model projects a more conservative growth trend than the Economic Demographic model (see Figure 4.1 below).

The significant overstatement of growth in the NJLWD's historic population forecasts are a concern in generating an accurate Prospective Need estimate, since population growth (translated into household growth) is ultimately the driver of incremental affordable housing need. Naturally, future population growth is unknown, and no projection approach is perfect, but it is necessary to arrive at a realistic estimate to proceed with this calculation. It should also be noted that, as shown in Figure 4.1, actual population growth from 2012-2015, as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau, has again been less than projections from both the Economic Demographic and Historical Migration models.²⁰ One option would be to apply a downward adjustment to NJLWD population forecasts using additional data sources, as was undertaken in the un-adopted 2014 Round 3 rules for COAH.²¹

The second option is follow the Round 2 approach of averaging the output of the Historic Migration and Economic Demographic models. While historically, averaging the two models appears to produce a similar over-estimate of population as using the “preferred” Economic Demographic model alone, within the 2012 to 2025 forecast period (i.e. from the base year for the current projection period to the end of the Prospective Need period), the averaged output of the two models yields a growth rate 25 percent below the growth rate of the Economic Demographic model alone. In addition to following the Prior Round, this approach is supported by the NJLWD's recommendation that “these two models may be used as a range for possible population change in the future.” This approach is therefore preferred to applying a downward adjustment to NJLWD projections, and is used as the output for the population forecast in this procedure.

2015 and 2025 Population Projections

As previously noted, current population projections from NJLWD have a base year of 2012 and provide projections in five year increments through 2032. For the purpose of the Prospective Need period, it is necessary to interpolate forecasts for 2012, 2017, 2022 and 2027 using a midpoint approach. Results of this procedure are shown in Figure 4.1. Figure 4.2 compares the annual statewide population growth trend from 2000-2015 (as reported by the Census), with the

²⁰ Note that it would be possible to adjust population estimates for the start of the Prospective Need period in 2015 downward to reflect actual population estimates. However, such a procedure would also require a downward adjustment of the same amount to 2025 population estimates, in order to calculate an appropriate increment of population growth. This methodology uses the more straightforward approach of maintaining projections unadjusted.

²¹ See: “Technical Appendices: Third Round Substantive Rules, pages 10-11” (2014)

projected annualized growth over the 2015 – 2025 Prospective Need period used in this analysis, based on the average of the Historical Migration and Economic Demographic model projections.

FIGURE 4.1: NJLWD STATEWIDE POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR PROSPECTIVE NEED PERIOD





FIGURE 4.2: STATEWIDE OBSERVED POPULATION GROWTH AND NJLWD PROJECTIONS



In the case of the Economic Demographic model, which is issued by county and age cohort for each five-year increment, projections are interpolated to yield results for 2015 and 2025 by annualizing the population growth increment for each county and age cohort combination and applying the appropriate increment (for example, 3/5 of the projected growth from 2022 to 2027 is applied to the 2022 projection to interpolate the 2025 projections for each county and cohort). In the case of the Historical Migration projection, which is currently only provided on a statewide level by NJLWD, the annualized approach is applied statewide (for example 3/5 of the population change from 2022 to 2027 is applied to the 2022 projection to interpolate the 2025 projection). Results are shown in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2: NJLWD STATEWIDE POPULATION PROJECTIONS

| NJLWD Model | 2012 | 2015 (interpolated) | 2017 | 2022 | 2025 (interpolated) | 2027 |
|----------------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|
| Economic Demographic | 8,867,749 | 8,974,040 | 9,044,200 | 9,247,300 | 9,377,040 | 9,463,600 |
| Historic Migration | 8,867,749 | 8,963,960 | 9,028,100 | 9,131,900 | 9,170,000 | 9,195,400 |
| Averaged | 8,867,749 | 8,969,000 | 9,036,150 | 9,189,600 | 9,273,520 | 9,329,500 |

The averaged interpolated statewide projection from the two models is then translated into an age cohort and county distribution. To do so, the share of statewide population for each of the 168 age and count cohort combinations yielded by the interpolated Economic Demographic model is applied to the total statewide population estimate from the average of the interpolated Economic Demographic and Historic Migration models. Projected population growth by housing region between 2015 and 2025 yielded by this approach is shown in Table 4.3. The statewide population is projected to grow by approximately 305,000 over this ten-year period.

TABLE 4.3: PROJECTED POPULATION GROWTH 2015-2025 BY REGION AND STATEWIDE²²

| Region | Projected Population 2015 | Projected Population 2025 | Projected Increase | Projected Growth % |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2,263,030 | 2,382,880 | 119,850 | 5.3% |
| 2 | 1,956,860 | 2,015,420 | 58,560 | 3.0% |
| 3 | 1,298,890 | 1,363,280 | 64,390 | 5.0% |
| 4 | 1,591,250 | 1,632,620 | 41,360 | 2.6% |
| 5 | 1,263,760 | 1,284,320 | 20,560 | 1.6% |
| 6 | 595,190 | 595,000 | (200) | 0.0% |
| State | 8,969,000 | 9,273,520 | 304,520 | 3.4% |

²² Throughout this Section, population projections shown are rounded to the nearest ten. As a result, figures in the table may not sum precisely. Exact figures are used in the model as the basis of the calculation.


4.2.1 POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS

The base unit of the calculation of affordable housing need is households, rather than total population. Therefore, it is necessary to perform additional calculations with the population projection discussed in the previous section. The first, and most straightforward, is the estimation of the total population living in households. This is performed by deducting those “non-householders” that the Census Bureau classifies as living in “group quarters.” These group quarters include correctional facilities, nursing homes, college dormitories, military quarters, mental hospitals, and other such group facilities. The full population of the state is classified as either in a household or in group quarters, so estimating and deducting the group quarters population from the total population yields an estimate of the population in households.

The group quarters population is most accurately reported at the county and age cohort level in the decennial Census. Therefore, the proportion of the population in group quarters from the 2010 Census (the most recent available) is carried forward by age cohort and county, adjusted for the countywide group quarters populations reported in the 2014 ACS, to represent the best estimate of current levels. Then, half the rate of change observed in the previous decennial Census period is applied within each age and county cohort to generate the group quarters estimate for 2025.²³ This approach results in a relatively stable projection of the group quarters population over time, with the figures increasing slightly with population growth, and also varying slightly due to changes in the distribution of projected population between the county and age cohorts, even as the group quarters rate within those cohorts is held constant (see Figure 4.3 and Table 4.4). As a result of this modest growth in the group quarters population, the statewide population in households is anticipated to grow by approximately 295,000 between 2015 and 2025, slightly less than the total population growth projections of approximately 305,000.²⁴

²³ Rates for 2015 are projected by applying 5% of change from the prior decennial Census period, in proportion with the 50% of change applied over the full Prospective Need period. It should be noted that this approach is parallel to the projection approach used for headship rates, described more fully in Section 4.3 below.

²⁴ It is worth noting that prior iterations of the Round 3 rules (both the “Growth Share” versions struck down by the Courts and the un-adopted 2014 iteration) included a calculation of additional Prospective Need generated by the population currently in group quarters as they return to the household population over the projection period. This component is not a part of the Round 1 or Round 2 methodology. While it is easy to identify members of the population that might fit this description (such as college students), conceptually, its inclusion as an additive element of housing need is badly flawed. Since people in group quarters and people in households sum to the total population of the state, the relevant metric for determining households and therefore housing need is the net effect of group quarters on the population. Over a ten-year period, there will no doubt be considerable churn between the household and group quarters populations among specific individuals, who enter and exit universities, correctional facilities, military quarters, etc. as their life circumstances change. On balance, however, those individuals exiting group quarters and re-joining the population in households are replaced by an approximately equal number of people exiting the population in households and joining the population in group quarters. The proportional approach to estimating the population in households described above includes both sides of this equation, implicitly assuming that the population entering and exiting group quarters stays in balance as a proportion of the population for each age group and county. Said another way, the population exiting group quarters is already accounted for in this methodology (note they are included in the overall population estimate, from which the estimated group quarters proportion is deducted), and to create a separate and additive calculation of Prospective Need for this calculation is a clear instance of double counting. It is therefore not undertaken in this procedure, in keeping with the Round 1 and Round 2 methodology.

FIGURE 4.3: STATEWIDE POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLD PROJECTION, 2015-2025**TABLE 4.4: PROJECTED POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS 2015-2025 BY REGION AND STATEWIDE**

| Region | Projected Population 2015 | Group Quarters Rate | Population in HH 2015 | Projected Population 2025 | Group Quarters Rate | Population in HH 2025 | Pop in HH Increase 2015-2025 |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | 2,263,030 | 1.39% | 2,231,660 | 2,382,880 | 1.53% | 2,346,530 | 114,870 |
| 2 | 1,956,860 | 2.00% | 1,917,690 | 2,015,420 | 2.07% | 1,973,720 | 56,020 |
| 3 | 1,298,890 | 3.04% | 1,259,410 | 1,363,280 | 3.20% | 1,319,710 | 60,300 |
| 4 | 1,591,250 | 1.95% | 1,560,230 | 1,632,620 | 1.84% | 1,602,560 | 42,330 |
| 5 | 1,263,760 | 1.87% | 1,240,060 | 1,284,320 | 1.78% | 1,261,410 | 21,340 |
| 6 | 595,190 | 3.87% | 572,170 | 595,000 | 3.89% | 571,850 | (320) |
| State | 8,969,000 | 2.09% | 8,781,230 | 9,273,520 | 2.13% | 9,075,770 | 294,540 |

Prior iterations of Round 3 rules also included an estimate of the impact of vacancy in the affordable housing stock on the need. While vacancy is certainly a well-understood component of housing markets, it relates to housing supply, rather than the volume of households projected to be in need of affordable housing (i.e. demand). Indeed, the potential for the vacant stock to return to occupancy may also be thought of as a source of affordable housing supply, though this is outside of the COAH methodology. For these reasons, a vacancy calculation is not undertaken within this methodology, in keeping with the Round 1 and Round 2 methodology.

4.3 HEADSHIP RATES AND HOUSEHOLDS

The next step in the procedure is to translate the estimate of the population in households to an estimate of the number of households, which forms the base unit for the estimation of incremental affordable housing need. This step is done in the Prior Round methodology and in this procedure by developing an estimate of the “headship rate” and applying it to the projection of the population in households. The “headship rate” is the probability that a given individual is a head of a household, or “householder.” Mathematically, the headship rate is the number of households divided by the population in households.²⁵

Headship rates can vary due to a variety of social, economic and demographic factors. Headship rates are positively correlated with age (most notably because children are rarely the head of a household, but also generally continuing to increase throughout working years and into retirement years), so a projection of future headship rates must take into account the changing age distribution of the population (the New Jersey population has in aggregate been aging for years and is projected to continue to do so). However, headship rates within age cohorts may also change moving forward for several reasons. These reasons include economic factors, such as student debt and economic challenges which have caused an uptick in the proportion of the millennial generation staying in or moving back into their parent’s households. They also include long-term societal and generational trends like longer and healthier lifespans (which reduce the proportion of widows and sole householders among the elderly) and the continued increase in the age of first marriages and children.

The Round 2 methodology sets forth an approach that accounts for both changes across age cohorts and trends within age cohorts in developing its projection of headship rates. It is described as follows:

Headship rates are determined by age group and county in New Jersey in 1990 and extended into the future at one-half the rate of change observed from 1980 to 1990.

[26 N.J.R. 2347]

Within each age cohort, therefore, the trend from the prior period is carried forward, with a downward adjustment. Simultaneously, the redistribution of the population across age cohorts and counties is incorporated. This is accomplished by multiplying the projected headship rate in each age cohort and county by the projected population in households associated with that age and county combination. This calculation yields an estimate of households. Therefore, the

²⁵ This can also be expressed as $\text{Headship Rate} = (1 / \text{Avg. Household Size})$

headship projection is not a single statewide rate but rather 168 individualized rates, which will yield a new “effective” headship rate based on the changing distribution of population.²⁶

Updating the Round 2 approach involves identifying both the appropriate estimate of current headship rates as a starting point, and the appropriate trend in headship rates to apply forward to the Prospective Need period. The most up to date data on current headship rates by county is drawn from the 2014 One-Year American Community Survey (ACS), which reports a statewide headship rate of 36.5%. However, literature on the comparability of ACS and Census data suggests systematic difference in household counts for the overlapping year of 2010, with the Census *level* considered to be more reliable due to its more robust methodology. Our analysis therefore adjusts ACS household estimates for 2014 based on the observed relationship between ACS 2010 and Census 2010 household counts in each County. This approach allows for the most reliable data source (Census) to be combined with the most up to date data source (ACS), and yields an estimated statewide headship rate of 36.99% for 2014.


The combined ACS/Census estimate is used as the starting point from which the headship rate trend is applied. Due to the greater reliability of decennial Census data, the trend observed in headship rates between 2000 and 2010 is preferred as the appropriate and most statistically robust trend from which to project future changes in headship rate.²⁷ Over decennial Census period, statewide within age cohort headship rates declined for nearly every age cohort (as shown in Figure 4.4). However, changes in the distribution of the population towards age cohorts with higher headship rates (i.e. population aging) led to a slight increase in the statewide headship rate on a statewide basis over this period, from 37.28% in 2000 to 37.35% in 2010.

The Round 2 methodology applies half of the rate of change observed over a ten-year decennial Census period to formulate its projection for the Prospective Need period. As noted above, while the statewide headship rate is relatively flat over the prior period, within age cohort headship rates declined consistently. We follow this Prior Round method, applying half the rate of change observed between the 2000 and 2010 Census for each age and county cohort to the starting point estimate developed as of 2014 from ACS and Census data.²⁸ Figure 4.4 below shows the resulting headship rate estimates aggregated statewide by age cohort for 2025, relative to the same aggregations in the Census 2000, Census 2010 and ACS/Census 2014 data:

²⁶ Note that the effective rate changes due to changes in the population distribution even if the headship rate within each age cohort and county is assumed to stay flat. The only way to produce a truly constant statewide headship rate irrespective of the population distribution is to apply a single statewide rate.

²⁷ It should be noted that this downward trend from Census 2000 to Census 2010 is less steep for most county and age cohort combinations than the trend yielded by including the most up to date ACS data for 2014. In this instance, the advantage of the statistical robustness of the decennial Census trend is judged to outweigh the advantage of recency gained by incorporating the most up to date data from ACS.

²⁸ Estimates for 2015 apply 5% of the rate of change from the decennial Census period to the 2014 starting point rates, consistent with the proportion of the total Prospective Need time period represented by one year of change.


FIGURE 4.4: STATEWIDE HEADSHIP RATE BY AGE COHORT

The resulting headship rates for each age cohort and county are then multiplied by the projected population in households to arrive at a projection of the number of households headed by members of that age and county combination in 2025. The effective headship rate yielded by this procedure is 37.45% for 2025, up from the 36.99% statewide rate from 2014 (see Table 4.5). This result indicates that the within-age cohort trend is slightly outweighed by the between-age cohort population distribution changes in this projection. Set against the population in household projections shown in Table 4.4, the projected headship rates yield an estimate of household growth by region across this period totaling approximately 146,200 households statewide (see Table 4.5).

TABLE 4.5: HEADSHIP RATES AND HOUSEHOLDS 2015-2025 BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Pop in HH 2015 | Headship Rate | Households 2015 | Pop in HH 2025 | Headship Rate | Households 2025 | HH Increase 2015-2025 |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2,231,660 | 36.9% | 823,090 | 2,346,530 | 37.1% | 870,050 | 46,970 |
| 2 | 1,917,690 | 36.7% | 702,920 | 1,973,720 | 37.2% | 734,800 | 31,870 |
| 3 | 1,259,410 | 35.9% | 451,960 | 1,319,710 | 36.2% | 477,200 | 25,230 |
| 4 | 1,560,230 | 37.6% | 586,870 | 1,602,560 | 37.9% | 607,830 | 20,960 |
| 5 | 1,240,060 | 37.6% | 466,180 | 1,261,410 | 38.5% | 486,190 | 20,010 |
| 6 | 572,170 | 38.7% | 221,190 | 571,850 | 38.9% | 222,380 | 1,200 |
| State | 8,781,230 | 37.04% | 3,252,210 | 9,075,770 | 37.45% | 3,398,450 | 146,240 |

The methodology described above for population projections, group quarters estimates, and headship rates is based on the approach employed in Round 2. It is also useful to examine the reasonableness of the projections that it yields relative to observed population and household growth trends in New Jersey. Figure 4.5 shows that from 2000-2015, New Jersey saw an increase of approximately 187,600 households or 12,500 households per year.²⁹ The household forecast methodology described above yields an annualized estimate of approximately 14,620 incremental households per year, higher than (and broadly in line with) the recent observed trend.

FIGURE 4.5: PROJECTED STATEWIDE POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH RELATIVE TO PRIOR PERIOD

²⁹ Note that 14/15th of this time period is represented by observed Census Bureau data, with projections for 2015 only.

4.4 MEDIAN INCOME AND LMI PROPORTION

Once the projected number of households at the start and at the end of the Prospective Need period has been determined, the next step is to estimate the proportion of those households that qualify as low or moderate income at each point in time. This step yields an estimated number of LMI households at the beginning and end of the prospective period. The difference between these figures is the incremental LMI household growth.

Multiple challenges must be addressed to perform this calculation correctly. The first is properly defining the median income and the LMI thresholds. The second is accounting for changes in the population distribution over the course of the Prospective Need period relative to the LMI thresholds. The methodology employed for both of these aspects in the Prior Round is highly problematic, with clear conceptual and statistical flaws. In order to correct these flaws, this analysis develops and executes a new procedure consistent with both applicable law and statistical principles.

4.4.1 DEFINING MEDIAN INCOME

The Fair Housing Act offers definitions of low and moderate income housing which form the textual basis for defining median income and LMI thresholds in the calculation of affordable housing obligations. The FHA defines moderate income housing³⁰ as follows:

“Moderate income housing” means housing affordable according to federal Department of Housing and Urban Development or other recognized standards for home ownership and rental costs and occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to more than 50% but less than 80% of the median gross household income for households of the same size within the region in which the housing is located.

[N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304(d)]

Prior Round methodologies have determined regional median incomes according to the procedures employed by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), as suggested in the first clause of the definition in FHA. However, the language suggests that HUD standards are not the only option for defining LMI households. Rather, the definition may use HUD standards or “other recognized standards for home ownership and rental costs,” providing that units are “occupied or reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income equal to more than 50% but less than 80% of the median gross household income for households of the same size within the region in which the housing is located.”

³⁰ The discussion below focuses on the definition of “moderate income housing,” since the threshold for this group forms the upper bound on the statistical LMI definition. The definition of “low income housing” is parallel in construction and in concept to the definition of moderate income. The income threshold for low income housing is simply set at “50% or less of the median,” rather than “more than 50% but less than 80% of the median” for moderate income housing (N.J.S.A 52:27D-304 c).

An analysis of household income definitions and data, undertaken below, demonstrates that the procedure utilized by HUD (and adopted by COAH) does not in fact properly identify “households with a gross household income equal to more than 50% but less than 80% of the median gross household income for households of the same size within the region in which the housing is located.” This indicates that an alternate standard should be developed that does satisfy that requirement.

The LMI standard utilized in the Prior Round methodology is based on a transformation of income thresholds defined by the HUD. HUD defines median family income for a family of four in each county. The Prior Round methodology then multiplies this figure by the number of households in each county, sums this number with the parallel number from the other counties in the region, and divides the total by the total number of households in each region. This process produces what the Prior Round methodology calls “the region weighted average of median income for a household of four” (26 N.J.R. 2332). This estimated median for a family of four is then adjusted based on a “factor,” or multiplier, supplied by HUD to adjust median income for household sizes smaller and larger than four.³¹ The LMI threshold for the purpose of estimating affordable housing need is then calculated as 80% of this adjusted estimate of the median for each household size. This threshold is then compared to household income data from the ACS to estimate the proportion of LMI households.

Serious statistical problems arise from this methodology. The first is an intermixing and comparison of non-like data sources. A HUD standard, which uses median *family* income, is used to establish an income threshold against which median *household* income is compared.³² Second, as a matter of mathematics, the median for a region is not the weighted average of medians for component counties of the region. In other words, COAH’s method of calculating region-wide medians does not necessarily result in the correct median for the region.

Another major statistical issue is the factors applied to adjust this threshold up (for household sizes above four) and down (for household sizes below four). Unfortunately, these factors do not reflect the actual relationships between median household incomes for various household sizes.

³¹ For example, the factor is 0.9 for a family of three, meaning that the median income threshold is set to 90% of the median income defined for a family of four. See the bottom row of Table 4.6 for the full list of factors applied.

³² This issue was identified by Regional Special Master Richard Reading in the October 30th *Preliminary Review and Assessment of Low and Moderate Income Housing Needs of Ocean County Municipalities* as “intermixing results.” In discussing Dr. Kinsey’s use of HUD and ACS data in his methodology for FSHC, the Special Master writes: “Dr. Kinsey’s calculation of LMI ratio uses different sources for estimating the number of households (ACS) and for establishing the low- and moderate income levels (HUD Section 8 household size/family income qualification criteria). These are different sources that are compiled for different purposes” (page 25)

Dr. Kinsey himself does not dispute this claim, writing in his October 28th *Response to Special Regional Master’s Inquiry on Qualifying Low and Moderate Income Households in the Fair Share Methodology* that: “Because income qualification of LMI HH’s under the Prior Round methodology is not based on the actual median income of New Jersey households (3.2. million), but rather is based on HUD’s estimate of the median income of New Jersey families (2.2 million), with adjustments by family size, it is not necessarily the case that exactly 40% of households will be at less than 80% of median family income.” (p. 10, emphasis in original).

Table 4.6 below shows the median income by household size and region used by COAH to compute LMI thresholds, while Table 4.7 shows median income by household size and region as reported in 2014 One-Year ACS data.

TABLE 4.6: COAH CALCULATED MEDIAN INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND REGION, 2014

| Region | Household Size ³³ | | | | | | | |
|--------|------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8+ |
| 1 | \$59,095 | \$67,538 | \$75,980 | \$84,422 | \$91,176 | \$97,930 | \$104,683 | \$111,437 |
| 2 | \$63,430 | \$72,492 | \$81,553 | \$90,614 | \$97,864 | \$105,113 | \$112,362 | \$119,611 |
| 3 | \$73,500 | \$84,000 | \$94,500 | \$105,000 | \$113,400 | \$121,800 | \$130,200 | \$138,600 |
| 4 | \$64,830 | \$74,091 | \$83,353 | \$92,614 | \$100,023 | \$107,432 | \$114,841 | \$122,250 |
| 5 | \$57,050 | \$65,200 | \$73,350 | \$81,500 | \$88,020 | \$94,540 | \$101,060 | \$107,580 |
| 6 | \$51,085 | \$58,383 | \$65,681 | \$72,979 | \$78,817 | \$84,656 | \$90,494 | \$96,332 |
| Factor | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.08 | 1.16 | 1.24 | 1.32 |

TABLE 4.7: MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY REGION, 2014 ACS

| Region | Household Size | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7+ ³⁴ |
| 1 | \$35,150 | \$75,420 | \$85,300 | \$100,000 | \$94,400 | \$103,400 | \$98,200 |
| 2 | \$34,000 | \$78,400 | \$90,000 | \$107,500 | \$103,100 | \$96,400 | \$92,000 |
| 3 | \$44,400 | \$85,900 | \$100,500 | \$127,000 | \$120,400 | \$150,000 | \$82,020 |
| 4 | \$32,400 | \$78,400 | \$97,290 | \$109,660 | \$120,000 | \$101,004 | \$99,600 |
| 5 | \$31,200 | \$76,800 | \$96,600 | \$112,900 | \$97,700 | \$102,500 | \$111,200 |
| 6 | \$25,000 | \$61,200 | \$67,500 | \$86,200 | \$69,900 | \$49,500 | \$72,600 |

The COAH calculation implies, for example that one-person households have a median income 7/8 as high as that two-person households (since the median calculation is to multiply the four-person household benchmark by 0.7 for a one-person household and by 0.8 for a two-person

³³ We note that COAH's published income limits refer to "persons" rather than "household size." Since the affordable housing eligibility limits in the FHA are defined relative to household size, and this definition is incorporated into this methodology and the associated ACS data used for analysis, the term "household size" is used throughout this section for consistency.

³⁴ Due to sample size limitations for households of 8 persons or larger at the county level, LMI calculations from ACS data throughout this section aggregate all households of 7 persons or larger into one category.

household). ACS data, however, shows that median household incomes for two-person households are in fact more than twice as high as that of one-person households in every region in New Jersey.³⁵ As a result, median incomes estimated for one-person households in every region using the COAH calculation are well above (in some cases nearly double) the actual median income for one-person households in those regions. Conversely, median incomes do not always rise linearly with increasing household size. The medians resulting from the COAH calculation for large households are well above the actual median income for those household sizes in most regions, but below the actual median income for households of two to four persons.

FIGURE 4.6: COMPARATIVE 2014 MEDIAN INCOME CALCULATIONS BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE, REGION 1




Table 4.8 shows that as a result of these definitional issues, ACS data indicates that more than 70% of one-person households in each region have a household income below the COAH-calculated median. Statewide, 52.2% percent of households have incomes lower than the COAH-calculated median for their household size, which of course violates the statistical principle of a

³⁵ This is likely reflective of the fact that two-person households tend to have dual earners, and may tend to correlate with other markers of higher earnings, such as age or marital status. Regardless of the causal mechanism, it is unquestionably true according to Census data.

median. This flawed median thereby produces a flawed calculation of LMI households based on income thresholds set at 80% of that median.

**TABLE 4.8: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BELOW COAH CALCULATED MEDIAN INCOME
BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, 2014**

| Region | State | Household Size | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8+ |
| 1 | 51.4% | 70.1% | 44.9% | 45.3% | 42.3% | 48.7% | 46.5% | 52.2% | 66.3% |
| 2 | 53.6% | 75.4% | 46.2% | 45.5% | 40.3% | 47.4% | 50.6% | 62.7% | 57.5% |
| 3 | 52.2% | 73.4% | 49.2% | 45.6% | 38.5% | 46.4% | 43.8% | 81.9% | 65.5% |
| 4 | 53.2% | 76.1% | 47.4% | 41.8% | 40.9% | 41.2% | 53.9% | 57.4% | 59.5% |
| 5 | 48.5% | 75.5% | 42.3% | 36.5% | 32.6% | 42.4% | 45.3% | 45.0% | 33.3% |
| 6 | 55.4% | 75.6% | 47.4% | 49.1% | 40.9% | 57.5% | 62.1% | 73.2% | 37.0% |
| State | 52.2% | 74.0% | 46.1% | 43.8% | 39.6% | 46.4% | 49.3% | 60.8% | 57.4% |

**TABLE 4.9: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BELOW COAH CALCULATED LMI THRESHOLD
BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, 2014**

| Region | State | Household Size | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8+ |
| 1 | 42.4% | 60.9% | 36.1% | 37.3% | 33.3% | 38.3% | 34.9% | 50.5% | 41.0% |
| 2 | 44.4% | 66.2% | 37.1% | 35.5% | 31.4% | 38.6% | 48.2% | 44.3% | 55.0% |
| 3 | 42.5% | 63.2% | 39.4% | 36.6% | 29.1% | 36.0% | 34.4% | 72.3% | 55.6% |
| 4 | 42.9% | 67.3% | 35.7% | 30.9% | 30.8% | 33.1% | 41.9% | 52.4% | 45.1% |
| 5 | 39.2% | 66.4% | 33.5% | 26.3% | 24.5% | 31.9% | 31.1% | 39.4% | 25.7% |
| 6 | 46.2% | 68.1% | 36.4% | 37.5% | 34.6% | 48.4% | 60.2% | 62.2% | 35.6% |
| State | 42.7% | 64.9% | 36.3% | 34.2% | 30.6% | 36.8% | 39.8% | 52.6% | 45.2% |

As shown in Table 4.9, 65% of one-person households statewide are estimated to have incomes below the regional LMI threshold for their household size (which are shown in Table 4.10). By contrast, far less than 40% of households with 2-5 people are estimated as LMI. Statewide, 42.7% of households are estimated to be LMI under this method, which follows directly from the 52.2% of households that are (incorrectly) estimated to be below the median income (see Figures 4.7 and 4.8).



FIGURE 4.7: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BELOW COAH-CALCULATED MEDIAN INCOME, 2014**FIGURE 4.8: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BELOW COAH-CALCULATED MEDIAN INCOME AND COAH LMI LIMIT, 2014**

TABLE 4.10: COAH-CALCULATED LMI THRESHOLD BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND REGION, 2014

| Region | Household Size | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8+ |
| 1 | \$47,276 | \$54,030 | \$60,784 | \$67,538 | \$72,941 | \$78,344 | \$83,747 | \$89,150 |
| 2 | \$50,744 | \$57,993 | \$65,242 | \$72,492 | \$78,291 | \$84,090 | \$89,890 | \$95,689 |
| 3 | \$58,800 | \$67,200 | \$75,600 | \$84,000 | \$90,720 | \$97,440 | \$104,160 | \$110,880 |
| 4 | \$51,864 | \$59,273 | \$66,682 | \$74,091 | \$80,018 | \$85,946 | \$91,873 | \$97,800 |
| 5 | \$45,640 | \$52,160 | \$58,680 | \$65,200 | \$70,416 | \$75,632 | \$80,848 | \$86,064 |
| 6 | \$40,868 | \$46,707 | \$52,545 | \$58,383 | \$63,054 | \$67,725 | \$72,395 | \$77,066 |
| Factor | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1 | 1.08 | 1.16 | 1.24 | 1.32 |

This definitional problem is not simply a statistical one. The FHA defines moderate income housing as “reserved for occupancy by households with a gross household income...less than 80% of the median regional gross household income for households of the same size within the region...” (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304d). The HUD/COAH standard plainly fails that test. For example, the regional median income for three-person households in Region 1 is \$85,300 according to 2014 ACS (as shown in Table 4.7), and 80% of that amount is \$68,240. A three-person household in Region 1 with a household income of \$65,000 earns less than 80% of the regional median income but nonetheless is excluded from the projection of regional need under the HUD/COAH standard, which sets the LMI threshold for a three-person households in Region 1 at \$60,784 (as shown in Table 4.10). By contrast, a one-person household in Region 2 with a household income of \$50,000 (nearly 50% above the actual median income for one-person households in Region 2 of \$34,000 shown in Table 4.7) is considered LMI under the HUD/COAH calculation.

The solution to this definitional problem is straightforward – to calculate median household incomes directly from One-Year 2014 ACS data for each household size and region. This approach eliminates the mismatch between family and household incomes, eliminates the need for county data to be weighted to a regional average, and eliminates the flawed household size factors by using observed data for each household size to calculate a unique median. Then, in keeping with the FHA, LMI thresholds are set at 80% of this median household income for each household size by region. Table 4.11 shows the resulting LMI income thresholds for each region and household size.


TABLE 4.11: LMI THRESHOLD (80% OF MEDIAN) BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY REGION, 2014 ACS

| Region | Household Size | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7+ |
| 1 | \$28,120 | \$60,336 | \$68,240 | \$80,000 | \$75,520 | \$82,720 | \$78,560 |
| 2 | \$27,200 | \$62,720 | \$72,000 | \$86,000 | \$82,480 | \$77,120 | \$73,600 |
| 3 | \$35,520 | \$68,720 | \$80,400 | \$101,600 | \$96,320 | \$120,000 | \$65,616 |
| 4 | \$25,920 | \$62,720 | \$77,832 | \$87,728 | \$96,000 | \$80,803 | \$79,680 |
| 5 | \$24,960 | \$61,440 | \$77,280 | \$90,320 | \$78,160 | \$82,000 | \$88,960 |
| 6 | \$20,000 | \$48,960 | \$54,000 | \$68,960 | \$55,920 | \$39,600 | \$58,080 |

PUMS data from the One-Year 2014 ACS can then be used to estimate the proportion of households that are LMI for each household size and region. Statewide, 39.9% of households are estimated to be LMI using this procedure (see Table 4.12 and Figure 4.9).

TABLE 4.12: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BELOW 80% OF MEDIAN INCOME BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, 2014 ACS

| Region | State | Household Size | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7+ |
| 1 | 40.9% | 42.6% | 39.9% | 40.8% | 40.4% | 40.3% | 36.5% | 46.1% |
| 2 | 40.4% | 43.3% | 39.9% | 39.6% | 38.1% | 39.8% | 43.0% | 35.7% |
| 3 | 39.3% | 40.5% | 40.5% | 38.5% | 37.6% | 39.4% | 41.7% | 28.7% |
| 4 | 39.6% | 41.3% | 39.2% | 38.2% | 39.1% | 38.7% | 39.6% | 43.8% |
| 5 | 38.8% | 40.6% | 39.4% | 38.8% | 37.0% | 35.4% | 39.7% | 34.0% |
| 6 | 39.1% | 40.4% | 38.1% | 37.8% | 39.4% | 41.9% | 40.7% | 46.6% |
| State | 39.92% | 41.8% | 39.7% | 39.3% | 38.7% | 39.2% | 39.9% | 39.0% |

FIGURE 4.9: PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BELOW ACS 2014 LMI THRESHOLD

4.4.2 CALCULATING LMI HOUSEHOLDS

Next, the median income limits and resulting proportions of households estimated to be LMI (from Section 4.4.1) are matched with the population and household projections for 2015 and 2025 to produce an estimate of incremental growth in LMI households for each region between the beginning and end of the Prospective Need period. This step requires translating the projections of population in households and total households for 2015 and 2025 into an estimated distribution of household sizes.³⁶ The LMI proportions by household size and county can then be applied to this estimated distribution.

Projections for 2015 and 2025 begin with the projections of population in households and total households for each county, which have been established through prior steps in the procedure. The distribution of household sizes needs to be consistent with the population and household numbers (determined via the forecast headship rates). We determine the 2015 and 2025 distribution of household sizes by calculating the distribution that a) yields the correct number of households, and b) is most similar to the distribution of household sizes observed in the 2010

³⁶ The “distribution” of household sizes throughout this section refers to the proportion of households in a county that are one person households, two person households, and so on up to households of seven persons or more. This distribution by definition sums to 100% of households.

Census for each county.³⁷ This step is undertaken by using the “Solver” function in Microsoft Excel (though other software packages would return the same result).³⁸ Households by size estimates for each county are then aggregated to the regional level and the calculated LMI rate for each region and household size from 2014 (using ACS data, as described in Section 4.4.1) is applied to produce estimated numbers of LMI households in 2015 and 2025.

This household size based approach can reasonably apply the LMI proportions from the beginning of the Prospective Need forward to the end of the Prospective Need because proportions are calculated for the same groups as the definition of the median income (by household size and region). Changes in the median caused by an increase or decrease in incomes in New Jersey are thus “built-in” to the metric, because those changes will cause a corresponding increase or decrease in the median income level. As a result, absent a change in the distribution of incomes the proportion of households within a given household size and region will stay consistent.³⁹

This approach avoids problems inherent in the Prior Round methodology, which did not account for accompanying changes in the median income as the demographics of a region changed. The Prior Round method projects future income levels by “carrying forward the income characteristics of all households...by age cohorts” (26 N.J.R. 2347). In the context of the methodology, this means that the estimated proportion of households that are LMI by age cohort and county at the beginning of the Prospective Need period is carried forward to the end of the Prospective Need period, at which time to relative proportions of those age and county cohorts in the State’s population is projected to have changed. This is not a mathematically sound approach for projecting county, regional or statewide incomes *relative to the median*.⁴⁰

³⁷ “Most similar” is here defined mathematically as the solution which minimizes the sum of the squared differences in percent change in the proportion of the total distribution within each household size relative to the 2010 distribution.

³⁸ It should be noted that given the established projections of households and population in households, variance in the distribution of those households by household size has little impact on the estimated number of LMI households in a region. This is the case because median income and the resultant LMI thresholds are set uniquely by household size and region, and as a result LMI rates are nearly 40% for each household size (as shown in Table 4.12). This means that that applying the LMI rates from the current distribution would produce nearly the same result in terms of estimated LMI households as under the re-estimated distribution. This step of re-estimating the distribution is undertaken primarily to maintain internal consistency with the headship rate and population in households estimates used, even though its impact on the overall number of LMI households is minor.

³⁹ It is of course possible for the distribution of incomes to change, independent of the income level. However, the Prior Round methodology makes no attempt to project such change. Further, the LMI proportions derived from 80% of the median income using the ACS (shown in Table 4.12) illustrate that the proportion of households those in the “income band” between 80-100% (the relevant proportion to the calculation of LMI households) is currently near 10% for all household sizes, yielding the 39.96% statewide LMI proportion. Said another way the gap between the 50% of the population below the median income and the 40% of population below the LMI threshold does not suggest any unusual distribution of income. Therefore, no change in distribution is assumed in this procedure.

⁴⁰ This statistical effect, manifested at the national level, is the subject of a recent article in “The Economist” magazine entitled *Silver-Haired in Clover: How Demography Distorts Household Income Statistics* (May 7, 2016).

Said another way, it may be reasonable to project that New Jersey's households will get poorer based on demographic changes. It does not follow from that circumstance, however, that New Jersey's households would be getting poorer relative to the median – since by definition, the median income itself is a statistical result of the income conditions of New Jersey's households. As the state's households get richer or poorer, due to demographic, economic, or other factors, the median household income by definition tracks that change. A change in incomes relative to the median would only be caused by changes in the *distribution* of incomes around the median, which are unrelated to the income level captured by the Prior Round methodology. In a state with an aging population, applying the income shift caused by demographic changes without accounting for the accompanying effects on the median income is a clear mathematical flaw of the Prior Round methodology that will result in an overestimate of the LMI proportion of the population at the end of the Prospective Need period.

The same principle that has been described with respect to population aging and its impact on the median also applies to changes in the distribution of population and households within a region comprised of counties of varying wealth levels. For example, in a region where the population of a wealthy county (relative to the regional median) is projected to increase as a proportion of the regional population, the Prior Round methodology would conclude that the region would have fewer LMI households, since the relatively low LMI proportions from that county would be applied to a proportionally larger base of households. While it is true that aggregate wealth of a region would be increasing in this circumstance, this would not necessarily lead to changes in LMI rates relative to the median for that region, since the median incomes in the various household bands would rise to account for the wealthier population, an effect missed by the Prior Round methodology. To account for this, we aggregate households by household size at the regional level and apply the LMI proportion regionally, rather than applying proportions by county.

The results of this procedure are shown for each region and statewide for 2015 and 2025 in Table 4.13. The effective LMI rate (yielded by applying the LMI proportion by household size and region to the projected distribution of households by household size and region and aggregating the results) is 39.92% in 2015 and 39.96% in 2025.

TABLE 4.13: PROJECTED LMI HOUSEHOLDS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, 2015 AND 2025

| Region | Total Households 2015 | Effective LMI Rate 2015 | LMI Households 2015 | Total Households 2025 | Effective LMI Rate 2025 | LMI Households 2025 |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 823,090 | 40.9% | 336,510 | 870,050 | 40.9% | 355,770 |
| 2 | 702,920 | 40.4% | 283,980 | 734,800 | 40.5% | 297,250 |
| 3 | 451,960 | 39.3% | 177,740 | 477,200 | 39.3% | 187,760 |
| 4 | 586,870 | 39.6% | 232,530 | 607,830 | 39.6% | 240,940 |
| 5 | 466,180 | 38.8% | 181,090 | 486,190 | 38.9% | 189,210 |
| 6 | 221,190 | 39.1% | 86,550 | 222,380 | 39.1% | 87,020 |
| State | 3,252,210 | 39.92% | 1,298,400 | 3,398,450 | 39.96% | 1,357,940 |

The resulting estimate of incremental LMI household growth over the Prospective Need period is shown in Figure 4.10 and Table 4.14. Statewide, LMI households are projected to increase by approximately 59,500 from 1,298,400 in 2015 to 1,357,900 in 2025.


FIGURE 4.10: PROJECTED INCREMENTAL GROWTH IN STATEWIDE LMI HOUSEHOLDS, 2015 – 2025

TABLE 4.14: PROJECTED CHANGES IN LMI HOUSEHOLDS 2015-2025 BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | LMI Households 2015 | LMI Households 2025 | LMI HH Increase 2015-2025 |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 336,510 | 355,770 | 19,250 |
| 2 | 283,980 | 297,250 | 13,280 |
| 3 | 177,740 | 187,760 | 10,010 |
| 4 | 232,530 | 240,940 | 8,410 |
| 5 | 181,090 | 189,210 | 8,120 |
| 6 | 86,550 | 87,020 | 470 |
| State | 1,298,400 | 1,357,940 | 59,540 |

4.5 SIGNIFICANT HOUSING ASSETS

The estimation of incremental LMI household growth over the Prospective Need period does not represent the completion of the calculation of Prospective Need by region.⁴¹ One notable group that is captured in the LMI household projections but does not represent need for affordable housing is those households that are LMI with respect to their annual household income, but possess significant housing assets. The 2001 Uniform Housing Affordability Controls (UHAC), which set forth standards concerning eligibility for affordable housing units, specifically cite “equity in real estate” as a form of income to determine eligibility in N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.16(b)1. Each iteration of the Round 3 methodology adopted by COAH since UHAC was instituted has included a “test” to determine the proportion of incremental LMI households who do not represent affordable housing need due to their real estate assets.

The UHAC standard with respect to housing assets reads as follows:

If the applicant household owns a primary residence with no mortgage on the property valued at or above the regional asset limit as published annually by COAH, a certificate of eligibility shall be denied by the administrative agent, unless the applicant’s existing monthly housing costs (including principal, interest, taxes, homeowner and private mortgage insurance, and condominium and homeowner association fees as applicable) exceed 38 percent of the household’s eligible monthly income.

[N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.16(b)3]

⁴¹ As Special Regional Master Richard Reading notes in his October 30th *Preliminary Review and Assessment of Low and Moderate Income Housing Needs of Ocean County Municipalities*, “the intent of the calculation of prospective need...is to define the housing need for lower income households, not the total volume of LMI households.” (page 26)

Accordingly, data from the One-Year 2014 ACS PUMS on the real estate assets held by LMI households is used to apply this “asset test” at the beginning and end of the Prospective Need period. This calculation determines the proportion of LMI households, by region and household size, that:

- a) Own a primary residence valued at or above the regional asset limit published by COAH with no mortgage; and
- b) Pay less than 38% of eligible monthly income on housing costs, as per the standard established in UHAC.

It should be noted that eligible income, as defined in UHAC, includes:


...income from assets such as savings, certificates of deposit, money market accounts, mutual funds, stocks, bonds and imputed income from non-income producing assets, such as equity in real estate...Assets not earning a verifiable income shall have an annual imputed interest income using a current average annual savings interest rate. Assets not earning income include present real estate equity.

[N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.16(b)1 and (b)3]

PUMS data contains incomplete information on the full investment portfolios of households with respect to mutual funds, stocks, etc. Investment income is therefore conservatively excluded from the analysis, which results in an underestimate of the proportion of households that spend less than 38% of their income on housing and are therefore excluded from affordable housing need based on the asset test. However, it is possible based on PUMS data to calculate imputed income from real estate equity as described in the UHAC regulation (using the yield on a money market account as a proxy interest rate). This calculation is undertaken and added to the calculation of eligible monthly income utilized in this procedure.

The significant asset test is applied by comparing the sum of eligible assets as reported in the 2014 One-Year PUMS to the 2014 regional asset limits published by COAH. The proportion of LMI households disqualified from eligibility for affordable housing by this standard is calculated for each region and household size combination. Statewide, this proportion sums to 8.8% for both 2015 and 2025. These proportions are then applied, by county and household size, to the projected population of LMI households for 2015 and 2025 (as estimated in Section 4.4). This yields an estimate of eligible LMI households at the beginning and end of the Prospective Need period.

The results of this calculation are shown in Figure 4.11 and Table 4.15. Approximately 114,200 households are disqualified by the significant asset test in 2015, and approximately 119,600 households are disqualified by the asset test in 2025. Eligible LMI households are estimated to increase by approximately 54,100 over the Prospective Need period.

FIGURE 4.11: PROJECTED INCREMENTAL GROWTH IN STATEWIDE ELIGIBLE LMI HOUSEHOLDS, 2015 – 2025**TABLE 4.15: HOUSEHOLDS WITH SIGNIFICANT REAL ESTATE ASSETS 2015-2025 BY REGION AND STATEWIDE**

| Region | LMI Households 2015 | HH with Significant Assets 2015 | Eligible LMI Households 2015 | LMI Households 2025 | HH with Significant Assets 2025 | Eligible LMI Households 2025 | Eligible LMI HH Increase 2015-2025 |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | 336,510 | (23,020) | 313,490 | 355,770 | (24,340) | 331,420 | 17,930 |
| 2 | 283,980 | (18,510) | 265,470 | 297,250 | (19,430) | 277,820 | 12,350 |
| 3 | 177,740 | (20,300) | 157,440 | 187,760 | (21,530) | 166,230 | 8,780 |
| 4 | 232,530 | (26,010) | 206,520 | 240,940 | (26,990) | 213,950 | 7,430 |
| 5 | 181,090 | (17,180) | 163,900 | 189,210 | (18,060) | 171,150 | 7,240 |
| 6 | 86,550 | (9,220) | 77,330 | 87,020 | (9,290) | 77,730 | 400 |
| State | 1,298,400 | (114,240) | 1,184,160 | 1,357,940 | (119,640) | 1,238,290 | 54,140 |

4.6 PROSPECTIVE NEED BY REGION RESULTS

The final step is to summarize the increase in eligible LMI households to yield the Prospective Need for the July 2015 – June 2025 period by region. Regional Prospective Need is calculated as the incremental difference between eligible LMI households at the start of the Prospective Need period in 2015 and the end of the Prospective Need period in 2025. Table 4.16 below shows Prospective Need by region and statewide. Statewide need totals approximately 54,100.

TABLE 4.16: PROSPECTIVE NEED BY REGION AND STATEWIDE, 2015-2025

| Region | Eligible LMI Households 2015 | Eligible LMI Households 2025 | Regional Prospective Need |
|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 313,490 | 331,420 | 17,930 |
| 2 | 265,470 | 277,820 | 12,350 |
| 3 | 157,440 | 166,230 | 8,780 |
| 4 | 206,520 | 213,950 | 7,430 |
| 5 | 163,900 | 171,150 | 7,240 |
| 6 | 77,330 | 77,730 | 400 |
| State | 1,184,160 | 1,238,290 | 54,140 |

It should be noted that the Round 2 methodology added an additional step to the calculation of regional Prospective Need not undertaken in Round 1, which was a re-allocation of projected need for LMI households under the age of 65 between the regions. This step is the only cross-regional calculation in the entire methodology, and merits further discussion.

The rationale set for in the Round 2 methodology for the re-allocation of prospective need for households where the householder is under 65, but not those where the householder is over 65, is as follows:

Growth in the working-age component of low and moderate income households was assigned to regions where jobs previously grew. On the other hand, growth in the elderly and presumably non-working population was retained in the original region where this growth took place. This procedure creates a demand to house low and moderate income families of working age in locations where jobs grew and a similar demand to house the elderly where their growth occurred naturally.

[26 N.J.R. 2347]

Thus, the goal of the re-allocation of Prospective Need for householders under 65 is to match need with locations “where jobs grew.” To do so, employment is not measured directly, but

instead a proxy metric of the growth in non-residential property valuation (also called “ratables”) from the prior period (in this case 1980 to 1990 is used).

This procedure is problematic on a number of levels.

- First, it seeks to determine where jobs grew in the past in order to allocate future affordable housing needs. In fact, the more relevant metric for determining future affordable housing need is the employment change over the Prospective Need period, which may not be correlated with changes by region over the prior period.
- Second, projected changes in future employment by location are already built into the population model. The Economic Demographic population projection model from the NJLWD explicitly uses employment forecasts as the driver of net migration, and therefore population growth, by county. While the Economic Demographic model is averaged with the Historic Migration model to determine the overall population base, as described in Section 4.2, the distribution of population by county for 2025 is drawn directly from the Economic Demographic model, and then re-based to the averaged population estimate. Thus, anticipated employment growth by region is already included in the projections of populations and households by region.
- Further, the regions themselves are defined in part by the live-work relationships within their borders, as described in Section 2.1. This process ensures that the majority of in-state commuters working in each region live in that region as well (approximately 68% statewide, based on 2013 data). Therefore, it is unclear why re-allocation between the regions is necessary.
- 65 is not necessarily the end of “working age,” and seniors do not necessarily “age in place.” The 1983 Social Security Amendments phased in an increase in the full retirement age to 67, citing “improvements in the health of older people and increases in average life expectancy.”⁴² Further, LMI retirees do not necessarily stay in their original locations. Many move to take advantage of lower costs of living or communities geared towards their needs. Some regions of the state may have a positive or negative “net migration” from this group.
- Finally, the metric used for this re-allocation is highly problematic. The use of non-residential valuation as a proxy for employment growth is discussed in more detail in Section 5.2 of this analysis, which evaluates its suitability for use in the municipal allocation calculation, and substitutes more appropriate direct measures of employment within that allocation formula. As that section makes clear, the link between employment growth and non-residential valuation growth is weak. While it is understandable that this proxy was employed at the municipal level, where direct measures of employment were problematic at the time the Round 2 methodology was developed, it is surprising that

⁴² As reported by the Social Security Administration, available online at: (<https://www.ssa.gov/planners/retire/ageincrease.html>).

direct employment counts were not used in this procedure at the regional level, where they are readily available from government sources. Further, it is surprising that this flawed proxy was used as a sole re-allocation factor for this procedure, when it represents just one of several metrics in the municipal allocation process.

It is straightforward to evaluate the accuracy of non-residential valuation change as a proxy for employment growth at the regional level by simply comparing observed changes in valuation (reported by NJ DCA) relative to observed changes in employment growth (as reported by the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics). A comparison of the shares of valuation change and employment change for each region over the 1990 – 2015 period reveals stark differences between observed employment trends and the trends revealed by the “ratables” proxy (see Table 4.17):

TABLE 4.17: NON-RESIDENTIAL VALUATION CHANGE VS. EMPLOYMENT CHANGE BY REGION 1990 – 2015

| Region | Non-Residential Valuation Change 1990-2015 (\$B) | % of Statewide Change 1990 - 2015 | Employment Change 1990-2015 | % of Statewide Change 1990-2015 |
|--------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | 27.0 | 28.3% | 4,787 | 1.5% |
| 2 | 18.1 | 19.0% | (21,948) | (6.8%) |
| 3 | 16.7 | 17.6% | 116,254 | 36.2% |
| 4 | 18.6 | 19.6% | 140,119 | 43.6% |
| 5 | 9.4 | 9.9% | 75,562 | 23.5% |
| 6 | 5.4 | 5.6% | 6,563 | 2.0% |
| State | 95.2 | 100% | 321,337 | 100% |

Regions 1 and 2, which are located in northern New Jersey and include large parts of the New York metropolitan area, collectively represent nearly 50% of the non-residential ratables growth over the period. Yet, collectively, these regions have experienced negative employment change over this time. Therefore, the allocation factor utilized in the Round 2 methodology fails in its stated task of assigning need “where jobs grew.” Further, the radical misalignment of employment and valuation growth at the regional level strongly suggests that this metric is an inaccurate surrogate at the municipal level as well

For these reasons, we follow the Round 1 methodology and do not re-allocate Prospective Need between the regions for householders under 65.

5.0 MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION OF PROSPECTIVE NEED

After Prospective Need has been determined by Region (Section 4), it is translated into individual obligations for each municipality. This process begins with the municipal allocation formula described in this section, which allocates the full quantity of need identified in each region among the municipalities within that region. This process arrives at initial municipal Prospective Need obligations. Adjustments to those obligations, along with Present Need obligations, are then undertaken in subsequent sections.

The procedure used to complete municipal allocation proceeds in four steps:

1. First, qualifying urban aid municipalities are identified and excluded from the remainder of the calculation, as they have no prospective need obligations under the Prior Round methodologies (Section 5.1).
2. Next, measures of municipal “responsibility” for affordable housing need are defined and calculated for each municipality as a share of their region (Section 5.2).
3. Then, measures of municipal “capacity” for affordable housing need are defined and calculated for each municipality as a share of their region (Section 5.3).
4. Finally, the resulting regional shares on each measure are averaged for each municipality to produce a total obligation share as a proportion of regional need. Those shares are set against total regional Prospective Need, as determined in Section 4, to arrive at initial municipal allocations of Prospective Need (Section 5.4).

5.1 URBAN AID MUNICIPALITIES

Round 1 and Round 2 methodologies each establish a category of “selected” municipalities that are excluded from responsibility for Prospective Need (and, in the Prior Round methodologies, Re-Allocated Present Need). These municipalities are those that are designated “urban aid” by the State, and also meet one of three criteria (specified below) related to the level of existing LMI housing deficiency, population density, and available land within the municipality. A majority of the state-designated urban aid municipalities typically qualify under one or more of these standards (for example, 45 municipalities qualified in Round 2) and are therefore excluded from Prospective Need obligations.

The qualifying urban aid standards from the Round 2 methodology are applied, unadjusted, in this analysis. This approach applies the following three standards to each of the municipalities on the current (in this case, FY 2016) State urban aid list, and excludes municipalities meeting any of the standards:

1. A level of existing LMI housing deficiency exceeding average LMI housing deficiency for the region in which they are located (as determined by the Present Need calculation described in Section 3 and shown in Appendix A); OR
2. A population density of greater than 10,000 persons per square mile (as measured by a comparison of 2014 municipal population from the American Community Survey and municipal land area as reported by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs); OR
3. A population density of 6,000 to 10,000 persons per square mile AND less than 5 percent of vacant, non-farm municipal land as measured by the average of the proportion of land valuation and the proportion of total parcels represented by vacant parcels (as reported by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs for 2014).

There are 58 municipalities on the State's urban aid list for FY 2016.⁴³ Table B.1 in Appendix B below shows the results of the application of these standards to each of the 58 municipalities. In total, 42 municipalities are determined to be "qualifying" and are thus exempted from any Prospective Need allocation.

It is important to note that qualifying urban aid municipalities are not included in the municipal share calculations for each region, in accordance with the methodology utilized in Round 2:

Only those municipalities designated here-in to receive re-allocated present need and prospective need shall be included in the housing region totals...for the purpose of distributing need.

[26 N.J.R. 2318]

Mechanically, this means that the denominator for the regional share calculated for each municipality for each factor discussed below is the sum total of all non-urban aid municipalities only within the region. This ensures that the allocation percentages for each municipality within a given region add up to 100%.

Table 5.1 shows the 42 qualifying urban aid municipalities excluded from the municipal allocation of regional Prospective Need.

⁴³ Available from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs website at: (<http://www.nj.gov/dca/divisions/dlgs/resources/stateaidinfo.shtml>)

TABLE 5.1: QUALIFYING URBAN AID MUNICIPALITIES⁴⁴

| Municipality | County | Region | Municipality | County | Region |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Asbury Park City | Monmouth | 4 | Long Branch City | Monmouth | 4 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | Montclair Township | Essex | 2 |
| Bayonne City | Hudson | 1 | Mount Holly Township | Burlington | 5 |
| Belleville Township | Essex | 2 | New Brunswick City | Middlesex | 3 |
| Bloomfield Township | Essex | 2 | Newark City | Essex | 2 |
| Bridgeton City | Cumberland | 6 | North Bergen Township | Hudson | 1 |
| Camden City | Camden | 5 | Orange City | Essex | 2 |
| Carteret Borough | Middlesex | 3 | Passaic City | Passaic | 1 |
| Clifton City | Passaic | 1 | Paterson City | Passaic | 1 |
| East Orange City | Essex | 2 | Penns Grove Borough | Salem | 6 |
| Elizabeth City | Union | 2 | Pennsauken Township | Camden | 5 |
| Garfield City | Bergen | 1 | Perth Amboy City | Middlesex | 3 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | Plainfield City | Union | 2 |
| Hackensack City | Bergen | 1 | Pleasantville City | Atlantic | 6 |
| Hillside Township | Union | 2 | Rahway City | Union | 2 |
| Hoboken City | Hudson | 1 | Roselle Borough | Union | 2 |
| Irvington Township | Essex | 2 | Trenton City | Mercer | 4 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | Union City | Hudson | 1 |
| Lakewood Township | Ocean | 4 | Vineland City | Cumberland | 6 |
| Lindenwold Borough | Camden | 5 | Weehawken Township | Hudson | 1 |
| Lodi Borough | Bergen | 1 | West New York Town | Hudson | 1 |

We note that the term “urban aid” does not appear in the Fair Housing Act, and both the exclusion of urban municipalities and the standards by which they are excluded are regulatory standards developed as part of the Prior Round methodologies. The rationale for this exclusion is set forth in the Round 1 methodology:

⁴⁴ All municipalities on the State urban aid list qualified as exempt from obligation except for the following: Brick Township (Ocean County), Glassboro Borough (Gloucester), Gloucester Township (Camden), Kearny Town (Hudson), Millville City (Cumberland), Monroe Township (Gloucester), Neptune City Borough (Monmouth), Neptune Township (Monmouth), Old Bridge Township (Middlesex), Pemberton Township (Burlington), Phillipsburg Town (Warren), Salem City (Salem), Willingboro Township (Burlington), Winslow Township (Camden), Woodbridge Township (Middlesex), Woodbury City (Gloucester). See Appendix B for detail on qualification standards by municipality.

Neither prospective need nor re-allocated present need are directed to Urban Aid municipalities which have the characteristics of older core areas to avoid reconcentration of low and moderate income families in these fiscally/economically stressed locations.

[18 N.J.R. 1136]

It is unclear if the standards chosen in the Prior Round methodologies in fact accomplish that goal. Specifically, they appear to reflect a dated conception (understandably, given that Round 1 and Round 2 were created in 1986 and 1994, respectively) of housing capacity and demand dynamics. As evidenced by recent population growth in urban areas throughout the state, density and a lack of vacant land are not necessarily impediments to housing unit growth. Indeed, housing demand is often higher in dense, amenity rich areas. For a nearby example, one need look no farther than downtown Manhattan, where vacant land is non-existent, population density is at a national peak, and yet housing demand and supply continue to rise. Said another way, the consideration of available vacant land implicitly assumes that New Jersey's residents, LMI and otherwise, are interested only in housing that is built "out" rather than built "up." This assumption does not appear to be supported by recent population and housing trends in the State.

However, the population and housing dynamics described above certainly do not apply to all urban aid municipalities within the state, and certainly cases of fiscal and economic stress remain. A more appropriate set of standards might seek to distinguish those factors by looking at fiscal and economic conditions within urban aid municipalities, and potentially metrics related to prior growth in population and/or housing units. We therefore concur with Regional Special Master Richard Reading, who writes in the October 30th *Preliminary Review and Assessment of Low and Moderate Income Housing Needs of Ocean County Municipalities*:

....new economic circumstances suggest that the list of exempted urban aid municipalities should be reviewed and perhaps revised as increasing proportions of the State's population and housing growth are now occurring within those exempted urban aid municipalities (page 28).

5.2 RESPONSIBILITY FACTORS

The municipal allocation formula for the distribution of regional prospective need in the Prior Rounds has relied on a mix of "responsibility" and "capacity" factors. The premise of the responsibility factors is defined as follows in the Round 1 methodology:

These factors...represent measures of *responsibility*, i.e. the labor force drawn to the municipality needing housing.

[18 N.J.R. 1136 (emphasis in original)]

The apparent intent of this step is to build into the municipal allocation formula consideration for the proportion of regional employment and/or employment growth attributable to each

municipality. The Round 1 methodology accomplishes this aim directly; the two responsibility factors in the municipal allocation formula are employment change shares, measured as the “regressed covered employment change” within each municipality from 1977-84 as a share of regional employment change, and employment shares, measured as the 1984 covered employment in each municipality as a share of the regional employment.

However, while the conceptual basis for utilizing employment and employment change shares is clear, the covered employment data utilized in Round 1 proved problematic. The Round 2 methodology therefore replaced this metric to avoid the “zip code problem associated with Covered Employment data,” which it describes as “situations where the zip code address of a firm does not reflect the actual location of its employment” (26 N.J.R. 2346). This direct measure of employment was therefore replaced with a surrogate measure in the form of equalized nonresidential property valuation (both the level, as of 1990, and the change from 1980 to 1990).

As discussed and demonstrated in Section 4.6, this measure is problematic as a surrogate for employment. Changes in non-residential property valuation for a municipality may in some cases reflect changes in employment within that municipality (for example, if a new office building were constructed on a vacant lot, increasing both employment and property valuation). However, there are many counter-examples where property valuation is disconnected from employment levels. For example, a property may change from a use with high employment intensity to a use with low employment intensity (or vice versa) without materially changing the property valuation. In fact, a non-residential property can switch between vacancy and occupancy, potentially with major employment impacts, without materially changing valuation.

In addition, valuation changes may have little connection with the activity at the site. In areas with strong real estate markets, valuation is likely to increase due to strong market conditions regardless of the employment patterns within the municipality, while weak real estate markets may produce decreases or moderate increase in valuation even when employment is growing. Additionally, many large employers hold property that is exempt from local property tax (such as educational institutions, hospitals, religious uses, governments, etc.). In these instances, there is no incentive for local governments to carefully and regularly assess these property values. Finally, the method implicitly assumes that properties are revalued regularly, consistently and uniformly in New Jersey. In practice, these valuations take place at different times in different locations across the state, meaning that data at any given point in time is not truly comparable. In sum, the use of property valuation as a proxy for employment change is deeply flawed, as demonstrated by Table 4.17 of this report, which shows a significant misalignment in observed data on residential valuation growth and employment change by region for the 1990 – 2015 period.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Indeed, as the Regional Special Master Richard Reading notes in his October 30th report *Preliminary Review and Assessment of Low and Moderate Income Housing Needs of Ocean County Municipalities*, “the new surrogate may actually be more problematic than the discarded employment data.” (page 28)

Fortunately, as described in Section 2.1, data on employment by municipality with a consistent time series back to 2002 is now available through the Local Employment Dynamics (LED) Partnership program of the U.S. Census Bureau.⁴⁶ Based on a combination of state and federal administrative data and data from census and surveys, the Census Bureau reports detailed statistics on employment at a variety of geographic levels, including municipalities. This data source, which was not available in the Round 2 methodology, allows for the use of direct employment data as originally envisioned in the Round 1 methodology, replacing the flawed proxy of non-residential valuation growth. The consistent time series associated with this metric allows for the calculation of both the change in employment over time in each municipality, and the level of employment in each municipality as of the most recent data release (2013), mirroring the treatment of non-residential valuation (which included both change and level) in Round 1.⁴⁷

5.2.1 EMPLOYMENT LEVEL

Employment data by municipality for 2013 is drawn from the LEHD Origin-Destination Employment Statistics (LODES) dataset publicly available from the U.S. Census. As in Section 2, “primary jobs” held by New Jersey residents are considered, since they represent the drivers of housing need. These municipal employment counts are then aggregated by region to produce a regional total. The employment share for each municipality is simply the proportion of aggregate regional employment within each municipality based on the 2013 primary jobs data.⁴⁸

5.2.2 CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT

The same LODES dataset is also utilized to determine each municipality’s share of regional change in employment over the prior period. Since a continuous data set is available back to 2002, that year is set as the beginning of the prior period. Employment change for each municipality is calculated by subtracting the 2002 employment level from the 2013 employment level.

⁴⁶ As described in Section 2.1, the LEHD program includes collaboration between the federal Census Bureau and 49 states (Massachusetts chooses not to participate) under the Local Employment Dynamics (LED) Partnership. Under this program, states share Unemployment Insurance earnings data and Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages data with the Census Bureau, which combines these administrative data with its own administrative inputs and data from censuses and surveys. These inputs yield detailed statistics on employment, earnings and job flows at a variety of geographic levels. This data set, which was unavailable at the time of the Round 2 methodology, represents the most updated and appropriate data set for evaluating the live-work relationships between counties.

⁴⁷ The un-adopted 2014 Round 3 methodology for COAH relied only on the change in non-residential valuation, discarding the traditional “level” metric. The reason for this change is unclear, and this procedure returns to the Round 2 approach of evaluating regional shares of both change and levels. One advantage of this approach is that it results in an even weighting of responsibility factors (of which there are two) with capacity factors (of which there are two) when an overall municipal allocation share is calculated (see Section 5.4).

⁴⁸ Appendix B contains shares by municipality for this factor, as well as the three other municipal factors described below.

One challenge in calculating employment change is that net employment for some municipalities is negative across the prior period. Since the municipal allocation formula ultimately averages shares of the region across the four allocation factors, a negative result in one of the four will result in a negative overall allocation for a municipality, which is statistically problematic. To address this issue, employment change is aggregated regionally only for those municipalities that have observed employment growth, and shares of regional growth are calculated for those municipalities only (ensuring that the regional share sums to 100%). Municipalities with negative job growth are assigned a 0% share for this metric.⁴⁹

5.3 CAPACITY FACTORS

The premise of capacity factors is defined as follows in the Round 1 methodology:

...represent measures of *capacity*, i.e. the physical and fiscal capacity to absorb and provide for such housing.

[18 N.J.R. 1136 (emphasis in original)]

In both the Round 1 and Round 2 methodologies, as well as the un-adopted 2014 Round 3, the “fiscal capacity” was evaluated based on municipal income levels, while the “physical capacity” was based on an analysis of land that can accommodate development. These measures are retained in this procedure and calculated as described below.

5.3.1 AGGREGATE INCOME DIFFERENCE

Municipal income share was evaluated in Round 2 through a complicated procedure that utilized two different metrics with respect to “income differences” between a municipality and a “regional income floor.” This procedure replaced a more straightforward calculation of the municipal share of aggregate regional income that was utilized in Round 1. The rationale for this change is described as follows:

This procedure replaces the unaltered share of aggregate income (from Round 1) that tended to give large middle-class municipalities an overabundance of low- and moderate-income housing need because they had a lot of households with reasonably healthy incomes. This new procedure employs not income but income differences...It is believed that this procedure achieves both equity and more incisive income targeting.

⁴⁹ It is worth re-iterating that qualifying urban aid municipalities are excluded from both the numerator and the denominator of all regional share calculations. In the case of employment growth, the combination of the exclusion of these municipalities and the zero share assigned to those municipalities with negative job growth may result in relatively high shares for those municipalities with positive job growth in low-growth regions.

[26 N.J.R. 2346-2347]

The Round 2 methodology determines a regional income difference share for each municipality based on the average of the following two measures:

- a. Municipal share of the regional sum of the differences between median 1993 municipal household income and an income floor (\$100 below the lowest average household income in the region), and
- b. Municipal share of the regional sum of the differences between median 1993 municipal household incomes and an income floor (\$100 below the lowest 1993 median household income in the region) weighted by the number of households in the municipality.

[26 N.J.R. 2346]

Conceptually, averaging an unweighted measure of income differences with a measure of income differences weighted by population may be reasonable. However, as executed in Round 2, each component has a major mathematical flaw requiring adjustment:

- The first income difference calculation in Round 2 compares the *median* income for a given municipality to a regional income floor based on *average* income. While the procedure is intended to produce a positive result⁵⁰ for all participating municipalities,⁵¹ it is possible for a comparison of a median income with a regional floor based on average income to produce a negative result, which would be problematic for translating the income share average to the regional allocation formula. This negativity can occur because a municipal median can, as a statistical matter, be lower than the lowest average income for any municipality in the region. This negative effect does in fact appear in the 2009-2013 data prior to the removal of qualifying urban aid municipalities from the calculation. In addition, it is questionable whether the comparison of a median to an average is statistically valid for the purposes of determining income differences.
 - To correct this deficiency, the *median* income for each municipality is compared to a regional floor set \$100 below the lowest *median* income in the region in this procedure, using median income by municipality from the 2009-2013 Five-Year ACS.

⁵⁰ Endnote 19 in the Round 2 methodology explains that the placement of an income floor \$100 below the lowest municipal income in the region is done “to ensure that all pool numbers on this variable are positive” (26 N.J.R. 2353).

⁵¹ In addition to excluded qualifying urban aid municipalities, three municipalities (Walpack Township in Sussex County and Pine Valley Borough and Tavistock Borough in Camden County) have insufficient population for a median or average income to be generated in the ACS data. These municipalities are removed from the calculation and assigned an income share of 0 to avoid adverse effects the regional floor and regional differences calculations.

- The second income difference calculation in Round 2 compares the median income for a given municipality to a regional income floor based on median income, and then weights those difference by the number of households in each region to determine the regional income pool from which income share is calculated. However, this weighting procedure does not constitute a statistically valid use of a difference in medians.⁵² By contrast, weighing the difference in average (i.e. mean) income by the number of households produces a statistically valid estimate of aggregate income differences attributable to the total household population of each municipality.⁵³
 - To correct this deficiency, the *average* (i.e. mean) income for each municipality is compared to a regional floor set \$100 below the lowest *average* (mean) income in the region in this procedure, with the difference is weighted by the number of households in each municipality. Average income and the number of household by municipality are drawn from the 2009-2013 Five-Year ACS.

5.3.2 DEVELOPABLE LAND

The second responsibility factor utilized has traditionally been the proportion of regional undeveloped land in each municipality “that can accommodate development” (26 N.J.R. 2346). This calculation involves a number of steps to account not only for the acreage of undeveloped land, but for various environmental and planning constraints on that available acreage. This procedure is undertaken in order to be “sensitive to the State Planning Commission’s goals for each Planning Area” (26 N.J.R. 2346), and to account for applicable environmental designations in arriving at an estimate through a uniform statewide methodology of the proportion of regional undeveloped land that “can accommodate development” in each municipality.

The first step in this process is to utilize tax assessment data by parcel to determine the potentially developable acreage by parcel in each municipality. This data is available on a uniform basis through the state’s MOD-IV property tax system.⁵⁴ Parcel classifications within MOD-IV are utilized to determine which parcels may be developable, and the acreage of those parcels. Non-developable parcels are excluded from further analysis at this stage.⁵⁵ The potentially

⁵² This is the case because the median is, in statistical terms, a non-parametric measure, meaning that it does not imply a normal distribution around it. As a result, the median cannot be accurately applied to the full household population of a municipality, since (unlike the mean) the median by itself provides no information as to the level or distribution of income in those households.

⁵³ This is the case because the mean is in itself derived from the aggregate household wealth of the municipality (mean household income = aggregate household income / households).

⁵⁴ The MOD-IV data and the parcel shapefiles were downloaded from the New Jersey Geographic Information Network (NJGIN). It is available online at: (https://njgin.state.nj.us/NJ_NJGINExplorer/IW.jsp?DLayer=Parcels%20by%20County/Muni).

⁵⁵ Properties were coded as potentially developable if:

- a) their property classification is 1 (Vacant Land), 3A (Non-Qualified Farm), or 3B (Farm Qualified); OR
 - b) their property classification is 2 (Residential -four families or less), 4A (Commercial), 4B (Industrial), or 4C (Apartment)
- AND the “improvement value” for the parcel is 0.

developable parcels as determined by the MOD-IV data were then joined to a parcel shapefile for each county.

Next, these parcels are overlaid with official State geographic information system (GIS) layers to account for various environmental restrictions, and to classify parcel according to state planning designation. In instances where the environmentally sensitive lands overlapped with the potentially developable parcels, the land area that was considered to be environmentally sensitive was removed from the developable parcels.⁵⁶ The next step determined which planning area each parcel is located in.⁵⁷ This procedure yields an estimate of qualified developable acreage for each municipality classified by state planning designation (including environmental designations in the Pinelands, Meadowlands and Highlands areas).⁵⁸

The final step is to apply a weighting to undeveloped acreage in each planning area to account for the degree to which that area can accommodate development. We replicate the Round 2 methodology in assigning weights of 0 for acreage in planning designations not conducive to development, 0.5 for acreage in planning designations that are somewhat conducive to development and 1 for acreage in planning designations that are conducive to development. Importantly, the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act passed in 2004 (N.J.S.A 13:20-1 et Seq.) defines a new “Highlands Region,” divided into the “Highlands Preservation Area” and “Highlands Planning Area,” which did not exist at the time the Round 2 methodology was developed and must be accounted for properly. We assign a weight of 0 to the Highlands Preservation Area, which is afforded a strong preservation policy by the Act, and assign weights

Properties that are subject to an abatement and/or PILOT are in the MOD IV data twice – once for the parcel itself and a second time for the exempt structure. The parcel is usually coded as having an improvement value of “0” when in fact it does have an improvement on it and is not therefore vacant. The entry for the building can be identified as having “BLDG” or “X” in the qualifier code. These parcels were dropped from the analysis.

⁵⁶ The land that was considered environmentally constrained includes 300 foot C1 stream buffers, 50 foot C2 stream buffers, wetlands, surface water, land preserved by State and County Government, state and local parks, preserved Farms and preserved land managed by non-profits and local governments. This is the same suite of environmentally sensitive lands uses that are used by NJDEP as part of their wastewater estimator model.

⁵⁷ Official State Plan geographic layers are available on the website of the New Jersey State Department of Planning. These layers are reflective of the most recent approved state plan, adopted and released on March 1, 2001 by the New Jersey Department of State, Office of Planning Advocacy.

⁵⁸ As of December 2015, 59 of the 88 municipalities in the Highlands area are considered to be “participating” in the Highlands Plan Conformance Process, based on their submission of a Petition for Plan Conformance to the Highlands Council. The latest Plan Conformance Petition Status was provided by the Highlands Council. It is available online at: (http://www.highlands.state.nj.us/njhighlands/news/brochures/fact_sheet_11x17.pdf). Reliance upon this list as the most up to date data source for this analysis does not preclude a municipality from providing local information demonstrating that it is participating in the process in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans. We also understand that the Highlands Council has provided a build out analysis to Highlands municipalities, and that there is litigation about the role this analysis should play in determining the fair share number for a Highlands municipality. Because the legal matter is not settled, we have not incorporated the build out analysis in our report.

in the Highlands Planning Area based on how similar areas are weighted in the Round 2 methodology.⁵⁹

Developable acreage in each planning designation is then multiplied by the weight assigned to that planning designation, and are summed to yield a total estimate of weighted developable acreage for each municipality. Results for each municipality are summed into regional totals, and shares of the regional total are computed for each municipality in each region. This proportion represents the developable land factor for each municipality in the municipal allocation formula.

We note that even though we follow the Round 2 method in including this factor, we find the notion of vacant, undeveloped land as the measure of capacity not fully convincing. Repurposing existing non-residential buildings, or demolishing underutilized structures and building more densely is a common approach to housing development, and that possibility is ignored in the Round 2 methodology. The implicit result of this approach is to bias development towards suburban green field locations.

5.4 MUNICIPAL SHARE OF REGIONAL PROSPECTIVE NEED

Finally, the regional shares by municipality of the two responsibility factors and two capacity factors described above are averaged together to yield a share of regional prospective need for each municipality.⁶⁰ Municipal shares within each region sum to 100%. These shares are then set against the regional Prospective Need as determined in Section 4 to yield the initial Prospective Need allocation for each municipality.⁶¹

Table 5.2 illustrates the mechanics of this calculation for a hypothetical municipality in Region 1. Full results by municipality are shown in Appendix B.

TABLE 5.2: SAMPLE MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION CALCULATION

| Name | Region | Regional Prospective Need | Employment Level Share | Employment Change Share | Income Differences Share | Developable Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|------|--------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| abc | 1 | 17,930 | 1.50% | 1.75% | 2.25% | 2.50% | 2.00% | 359 |

⁵⁹ This method is similar to the weighting approach used in Dr. David Kinsey's 2015 methodology for the Fair Share Housing Center

⁶⁰ As described in Section 5.1, this share is zero for qualifying urban aid municipalities, which are not included in the regional share calculation.

⁶¹ The sum of municipalities will vary incrementally from the regional Prospective Need due to rounding (since a municipality cannot be assigned a fractional portion of a unit).

6.0 SECONDARY SOURCES OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLY

The adjustment for secondary sources of affordable housing supply within the fair share calculation reflects the fact that the stock of affordable housing does not stay static absent the planning and zoning efforts of municipalities. As a result, the LMI housing need identified in the Present Need and Prospective Need calculations will in part be answered by market driven changes in supply. The projected magnitude of these changes on affordable housing supply is therefore estimated over a ten-year period, and adjustments to affordable housing need are made accordingly.

Three sources of market-based supply changes (referred to collectively as the “secondary sources”) are estimated.⁶²

1. **Demolitions:** Existing housing structures are at times demolished. To the extent that those units were previously occupied by LMI households and were not deficient (in which case they would already be captured within the Present Need calculation), these demolitions subtract from affordable housing supply, and therefore add to affordable housing need.
2. **Residential Conversions:** Existing residential structures can also be converted to yield a greater or lesser number of housing units. A portion of these changes impact the supply of affordable housing units. This impact may be positive or negative for a given geography, although it is typically positive, implying that conversions on net create additional supply, and therefore subtract from affordable housing need.
3. **Filtering:** Finally, existing housing stock changes value over time through depreciation or appreciation and real estate market forces. These changes can make existing units newly available or unavailable to LMI households, thus altering affordable housing supply. This estimate is the net difference between units filtering “down to” and “up from” the affordable housing category, and may be positive or negative for a given geography. A positive filtering estimate implies an addition to affordable housing supply (i.e. more units down than up) and subtracts from affordable housing need.

Estimates in each category are summed for each municipality to yield a calculation of net impact from secondary sources. This net figure may increase or decrease need for a given municipality. As in the Round 2 methodology, this adjustment is set against the initially calculated and allocated Present Need and Prospective Need. Further, an additional procedure is added to ensure that supply changes from secondary sources for municipalities with no need are allocated

⁶² Note that the Round 2 methodology includes a fourth source of market-based affordable housing supply, “spontaneous rehabilitation,” which estimates investments by private property owners to upgrade existing deficient units. The methodology and justification for estimating this category is questionable in its accuracy, and it was not included in the un-adopted 2014 Round 3 methodology. It has been omitted from this analysis.

within the housing region, aligning the net effect of secondary source adjustments with the net difference between housing need and supply changes as intended.

6.1 DEMOLITIONS

An estimate of demolitions of LMI housing units has been included as a secondary source of affordable housing supply in each iteration of the fair share methodology. The Round 2 methodology draws on data from the NJ Department of Community Affairs (DCA) for the prior period to develop an annualized estimate of demolition activity by municipality. This estimate is utilized to project future demolition levels. An estimate is then developed of the proportion of these demolitions impacting LMI housing supply.

This procedure updates this approach by using additional data to refine the estimate of the proportion of demolitions impacting LMI housing supply. Further, it makes an adjustment to exclude demolitions of deficient units occupied by an LMI household. Since those units are already identified and included in the Present Need calculation, including them in the secondary source adjustments as increasing need is a clear instance of double-counting.⁶³

First, historic data on demolitions by municipality, as reported by DCA, are analyzed for the 2000 to 2014 time period. An average is calculated excluding the years 2012 and 2013, which saw unusual demolition activity due to Super Storm Sandy and thus are not predictive of future demolition levels. This annualized trend is then projected out over a ten year period to estimate future demolition levels.

Next, the LMI proportion of these demolitions is estimated. The American Housing Survey, which was used as a data source in secondary source calculations in the Round 2 methodology, provides a breakout of national demolitions by two factors relevant to this calculation: the occupancy status of the unit, and in the case of occupied demolitions, the income level of the occupant. For a demolition to count as reducing the amount of affordable housing, the unit must be 1) occupied, and 2) occupied by a LMI household.⁶⁴ Our analysis therefore uses the national proportion of demolitions of occupied (rather than vacant or seasonal) units, drawn from an average of five iterations of the Components of Inventory Change (CINCH) report issued from 2003-2011.⁶⁵ The same data set is used to estimate the proportion of occupied demolished units

⁶³ In effect the same deficient unit is counted twice, once when it is identified as LMI deficient and once when it is estimated to be demolished. In reality that demolition does not create additional need, since that same unit has already been identified as in need of replacement or rehabilitation in the Present Need calculation.

⁶⁴ As noted by the Special Regional Master Richard Reading in the October 30th *Preliminary Review and Assessment of Low and Moderate Income Housing Needs of Ocean County Municipalities*, the connection between demolitions and affordable housing need “assumes the displacement of a household, rather than a “vacant” unit.” (page 29) The report also notes that “demolitions may involve seasonal housing units that are neither subject to full-time housing before or after the demolition.” (page 29)

⁶⁵ This report is issued by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) based on American Housing Survey data. The reports are available online at: (<https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cinch.html>)

that were occupied by an LMI household.⁶⁶ According the averaged CINCH data, 53% of demolished units are occupied, and 79% of those units are low income, yielding an estimate that 42% of demolitions are LMI occupied units. This proportion is applied to the total demolitions projection.

Further, the CINCH surveys identify the proportion of housing with severe and moderate problems. This is used as a proxy for the proportion of demolished units that have markers of deficiency, and thus have already been captured in the Present Need estimate. The averaged proportion across the surveys (9%) is multiplied by the estimate of LMI occupied demolitions, and the resulting total is netted out of the estimate to yield an estimate of occupied, non-deficient LMI demolitions.

Table 6.1 shows the result of this demolitions estimate by region and statewide (see Appendix C for estimates by municipality). Statewide, LMI demolitions are anticipated to subtract approximately 18,700 sound affordable units, increasing affordable housing need.

TABLE 6.1: LMI OCCUPIED NON-DEFICIENT DEMOLITIONS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Annualized Demolitions, 2000-2011 & 2014 | Projected Residential Demolitions (10 year) | LMI Occupied (41.6%) | LMI Occupied and Deficient (8.9%) | LMI Occupied non-Deficient Demolitions |
|--------------|--|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | 1,000 | 9,995 | 4,161 | (372) | 3,788 |
| 2 | 996 | 9,963 | 4,147 | (371) | 3,771 |
| 3 | 314 | 3,138 | 1,306 | (117) | 1,189 |
| 4 | 1,099 | 10,992 | 4,576 | (409) | 4,168 |
| 5 | 511 | 5,108 | 2,127 | (190) | 1,937 |
| 6 | 1,003 | 10,032 | 4,176 | (374) | 3,800 |
| State | 4,923 | 49,230 | 20,493 | (1,834) | 18,653 |

⁶⁶ This proportion is estimated by aggregating the bottom three income bands provided in the survey results, which collectively capture all households below \$50,000 in income.

6.2 RESIDENTIAL CONVERSIONS

An estimate of residential conversions, which captures the net effect of residential structures splitting into more units or consolidating into fewer units, has been included as a secondary source of affordable housing supply in each iteration of the fair share methodology. Since direct data on this activity is unavailable, the methodology employed in Round 1 and Round 2 estimates residential conversions by taking the net change in regional housing stock over a prior period, accounting for construction and demolition activity, and estimating conversions to be responsible for the remaining unexplained change.⁶⁷ This activity is then allocated to municipalities based on a proxy measure of multi-family housing, and an estimate of the proportion of these conversions impacting the LMI housing supply is applied.

This procedure follows the structure from Round 2, updating data sources as necessary. Change in the occupied residential housing stock is measured from 2000 to 2010 (using decennial Census data) at the county level, and then aggregated to the housing regions.⁶⁸ Housing unit certificates of occupancy for this period, as reported by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA) at the municipal level, are used rather than residential building permits⁶⁹ to deduct the portion of the observed increase in housing units attributable to construction activity. Demolitions are also drawn from DCA data at the municipal level. Both construction and demolition activity are summed to the regional level, and the net difference is then compared to net difference in housing units.⁷⁰ As in the Round 2 approach, the remaining difference in housing supply unexplained by construction or demolitions is assumed to be the

⁶⁷ Expressed mathematically, in Round 2: Residential Conversions = (Change in Housing Units) – (Building Permits) + (Demolitions)

⁶⁸ Census estimates are as of April 1 of the year they represent (in this case 2000 and 2010). Construction and demolition data are therefore adjusted to 75% for 2000 (to estimate the period from April – December) and 25% for 2010 (to estimate the period from January to March). The April 2010 end-date means that the housing stock is prior to Super Storm Sandy. Data recency is also deprioritized relative to data consistency for this calculation because the relevant result for this calculation does not depend on projecting forward the current level of any metric. Instead, the residual approach is used to develop the best estimate of conversion activity over a prior period in order to apply an annualized estimate forward to the Prospective Need period.

⁶⁹ Certified units serve as a more reliable metric for completed residential construction activity than building permits, since the volume of building permits issued for construction commencement diverge from the volume of completed units in a given year for any of a number of reasons (projects completed in a subsequent year, projects never completed, etc.)

⁷⁰ It should be noted that the measures of both construction and demolition activity include all units, while the change in housing stock is calculated in occupied units. Both construction and demolition activity are therefore likely to be overstated with respect to their impact on the observed change in occupied units. In the case of demolitions, as discussed in Section 6.1, a portion of demolitions take place on units that are already vacant, and thus do not change the occupied stock. In the case of COs, while most new construction results in an occupied unit, if the newly created unit is occupied by a household shifting from within the region rather than arriving from outside the region or newly forming, a vacancy may be created in an existing unit somewhere within the region, meaning that the newly created CO does not change the occupied stock. This effect is demonstrated by the surplus in new housing construction (i.e. the gap between construction activity and newly forming households) shown in Table 6.3 below. Since the magnitude of this vacancy effect on both demolitions (which decreases the stock) and construction activity (which increases the stock) is not known precisely, and it is unclear which effect is larger, it is not accounted for within the conversions calculation, in keeping with the Prior Round methodology.

result of housing conversions. The resulting estimate from this period is annualized and applied to the ten year prospective need period.

While certificate of occupancy data represents the most appropriate source for completed construction activity on a statewide basis, CO data may be problematic for Region 1, and in particular Hudson County. Data reported by NJ DCA during the prior decennial Census period indicates that in Region 1, the ratio between certificates of occupancy (for completed units) and building permits (issued at the start of the construction process) is 65.0%, well below the 90.0% ratio observed for the same time period in the other five regions of the state. Therefore, construction activity for Region 1 is estimated by applying the ratio between COs and building permits observed elsewhere in the state (90.0%) to the volume of building permits over the time period to yield a corrected estimate of completed construction activity for Region 1.

Next, the net regional conversions estimate is shared to municipalities within each region. The Round 2 methodology asserts that “residential conversion is highly correlated with the presence of two- to four-family housing units” (26 N.J.R. 2320) and therefore allocates conversions to municipalities based on their proportion of regional two- to four-family housing units. This procedure repeats that methodology utilizing 2009-2013 ACS data on municipal housing stock.

Finally, an estimate must be developed as to the proportion of these conversions that are affordable to LMI households. The Round 2 methodology asserts that “on a percentage basis, a greater share of residential conversion units flows to the low-and moderate-income population than to the population as a whole.” (26 N.J.R. 2349) However, it does not specify how this proportion is estimated within the calculation. For this procedure, 120% of the proportion of households qualifying as LMI within each county⁷¹ is applied to the estimate of residential conversions for each municipality to yield an estimate of LMI residential conversions.

Table 6.2 shows the result of this net LMI residential conversions estimate by region and statewide (see Appendix C for estimates by municipality). Statewide, residential conversions are projected to add approximately 11,700 affordable units from 2015 to 2025, reducing affordable housing need.

⁷¹ This assumption mirrors a similar calculation that is enumerated in the Round 2 methodology with respect to demolitions. Like demolitions, residential conversions are likely to disproportionately impact LMI households, since such conversions generally create multiple smaller (and therefore less expensive) units out of larger units.

TABLE 6.2: LMI RESIDENTIAL CONVERSIONS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Est. Residential Conversions (Apr 2000 – Apr 2010) | Effective LMI Rate | Projected LMI Residential Conversions, 2015-2025 |
|--------------|---|--------------------|--|
| 1 | 5,988 | 52.4% | 3,139 |
| 2 | 5,225 | 54.2% | 2,833 |
| 3 | 5,071 | 48.3% | 2,451 |
| 4 | 4,273 | 47.4% | 2,025 |
| 5 | 222 | 44.6% | 99 |
| 6 | 2,499 | 44.6% | 1,115 |
| State | 23,161 | 50.1% | 11,662 |

6.3 FILTERING

Filtering of affordable housing stock occurs when housing becomes newly accessible (“filtering down”) or inaccessible (“filtering up”) to LMI households. While the fair share obligation process envisions zoning for and building affordable housing, **most of the housing affordable to LMI households in New Jersey was originally market rate housing that has become part of the affordable housing supply over time through downward filtering**, and not housing specifically built for the affordable market.⁷²

Downward filtering occurs because housing ages, the design and style of the house falls out of fashion, and because neighborhoods fall out of favor. As housing units age, deteriorate, and become outdated, they move down the “quality ladder.” Higher income households, attempting to maintain their desired housing quality, often move into high-quality new construction rather than rehabilitate their current unit, which can require significant investment to achieve the same quality as new construction.^{73,74} The departure of these households frees up existing units up for medium, moderate, and then low income households.⁷⁵

⁷² See e.g. Stuart Rosenthal, *Are Private Markets and Filtering a Viable Source of Low Income Housing? Estimates from a “Repeat Income” Model*, American Economic Review (2014), which finds:

“Filtering has long been considered the primary mechanism by which markets supply low-income housing... the nation’s housing stock filters down at a rate of roughly 1.9 percent per year in real terms.”

⁷³ O’Sullivan, A. (2009). *Urban economics* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

⁷⁴ Kim, Chung & Blanco (2012). *The Suburbanization of Decline: Filtering, Neighborhoods and Housing Market Dynamics*. Original Source: Milis, E., & Hamilton, B. (1989). *Urban economics*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

⁷⁵ It is worth noting that there are exceptions to this simple model of filtering. For example, high income households might be incentivized to restore and maintain very amenity-rich, high-end units, as these units are less likely to effectively filter to lower

Upward filtering occurs because a location has become more valuable, and is sometimes referred to as “gentrification.” Across the overall housing market, downward filtering is more common than upward filtering.⁷⁶

Filtering occurs when new market rate housing is being constructed faster than the number of households is increasing. The newly constructed housing in excess of household growth frees up existing units for occupancy by other households. In basic economic terms, the supply of housing has increased, and so prices will decrease on existing houses, and some existing units will become affordable. Indeed, every new market rate unit in excess of household growth means an existing unit ultimately becomes affordable, as once all the non-LMI households have housing, the owners of other housing units will have to lower their prices until an LMI household can afford it, or the unit will go vacant. Historically, in the 1999-2014 period, we observed significantly more new housing stock than household growth (as illustrated in Table 6.3):

TABLE 6.3: 1999-2014 NEW JERSEY HOUSING MARKET FACTS

| Category | Value |
|--|----------------|
| New housing stock (COs) | 317,691 |
| New households | 201,122 |
| Surplus of new housing construction | 116,569 |

Court Guidance on Filtering

Filtering estimates in the Round 1 and Round 2 methodology were based on longitudinal data from the American Housing Survey. Specific units were tracked across a given time period, and the net difference between housing units filtering down and filtering up from the affordable housing categories were measured, annualized, and used to estimate future filtering effects. A similar methodology was included in the 2004 Round 3 methodology, and was rejected by the Appellate Court in 2007. With respect to filtering, that decision (In re Adoption of N.J.A.C. 5:94 & 5:95) held:

We conclude that the COAH premise, that housing is filtering down to low and moderate income households, lacks support in the record.

income populations until housing supply increases sufficiently to absorb this increase in value. Source: O'Sullivan, A. (2009). Urban economics (7th ed.).

⁷⁶ See, e.g. Stuart S. Rosenthal, *Old homes, externalities, and poor neighborhoods A model of urban decline and renewal*, Journal of Urban Economics 63 (2008), p. 823. According to Bier in *Moving Up, Filtering Down: Metropolitan Housing Dynamics and Public Policy* (2001), annual housing construction typically exceeds household growth. As discussed later in this section, downward filtering will occur when new housing construction outstrips household growth.

[In re Adoption of N.J.A.C. 5:94 and 5:95, 390 N.J. Super. 1]

Importantly, that decision with respect to filtering was limited to the methodology employed by COAH for the 2004 estimates:

We do not invalidate the use of filtering as a secondary source...if the data and methodology have a rational basis, then COAH remains free to incorporate filtering and other secondary sources in to the overall calculation of statewide housing need.

[Ibid]

The Court further pointed to five conditions, put forth by Anthony Downs, a housing economist at The Brookings Institution, which it suggested must be satisfied for filtering to occur:

“(1) an overall housing surplus; (2) a surplus of new housing construction over new household formation; (3) no major non-price barriers, such as discrimination, that limit mobility among low-income households; (4) moderate operating costs for newly built units; and (5) a limited number of poor households.”

[Id. at 5801-03]

We do not necessarily agree with these factors as they relate to the calculation of filtering within this context, but we nevertheless analyze whether the conditions have been satisfied:

- 1) There are currently approximately 250,000 non-seasonal vacant units in New Jersey, according to the ACS, which means that there is a surplus.
- 2) From 1999-2014, there was a surplus of new housing construction over new household formation, of more than 110,000 units, as illustrated in Table 6.3. Historically, new units exceeded population growth, and there is no reason to expect that they will not continue to do so over the 2015-2025 period
- 3) There is no measure to indicate that there are major non-price barriers that limit low-income household mobility.
- 4) New units are expected to have moderate operating costs because they require relatively little maintenance, and are constructed with modern, efficient appliances and HVAC systems. There is no evidence that newly built units have anything other than moderate operating costs.
- 5) As indicated in Section 4.4, the number of LMI households is expected to grow approximately in proportion to the population.

Thus, we conclude that these five criteria will likely be satisfied.

Filtering Model

Subsequent to the 2007 Appellate Court decision, COAH engaged Econsult Corporation to create a new filtering methodology based on housing transaction data and a more sophisticated econometric approach for the 2008 Round 3 rules.⁷⁷ The Appellate Court rejected the overall “Growth Share” approach in 2010, but did not specifically address the filtering component.⁷⁸

The current filtering calculation is an econometric approach based on housing transaction data, and focusing specifically on filtering with respect to affordability for an LMI household.

We follow a three-step process to estimate filtering:

1. We use a data set of all housing transactions in New Jersey from 2000-2014 which measures which units became affordable or unaffordable to LMI households.
2. We then create a model, based on historic filtering measured in step 1, to determine the probability of filtering based on geographical characteristics.
3. We apply the model from step 2 to the municipalities to estimate filtering for 2015-2025 on a municipal level.

Each step is described in detail below.

1 – Identify units that filtered historically

A unit filters up or down if the value of the house rises above LMI affordability or falls below LMI affordability, respectively. Our data include all owner-occupied housing transactions in New Jersey between 2000 and 2014. From these transactions, we identify houses that sell more than once, and use the prices of the two sales, compared to income limits, as the basis for our analysis of filtering. Directly comparing sales of the same unit over time, as opposed to comparing overall transactions by geographic conditions, controls for variation in building stock, and quality, and allows us to identify specifically when units cross between affordable and not affordable to LMI households.

⁷⁷ New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing: Task 2 – Estimating the Degree to which Filtering is a Secondary Source of Affordable Housing, Econsult Corporation, 2007

⁷⁸ Both COAH's un-adopted 2014 Round 3 methodology and Dr. Kinsey's 2015 methodology for the Fair Share Housing Center utilized annualized results from Econsult Corporation's 2007 analysis.

For each region, for each year, we calculate the annual amount an LMI household can afford to pay for housing, based on regional income limits. For owner occupied units, this calculation requires annualizing the sales price of a unit into an ‘annual cost of ownership’. We calculate the annual cost of ownership based on mortgage interest rates, insurance costs, property tax rates, and the price of a housing unit. We use the return from the 10 year T-bill plus 100 basis points to estimate an interest cost, based on 100 percent of the purchase price. We combine this with effective property tax rates for each municipality, as well as costs for both homeowners insurance and private mortgage insurance (PMI), based on New Jersey-specific estimates.⁷⁹

These factors are summed to calculate the annual cost associated with the sales price of units in our data.⁸⁰ If this annual cost is less than 28% of the LMI income threshold for the region, the unit is considered affordable.⁸¹ In paired transactions, a unit that was affordable in the first transaction and was not affordable in the second transaction filtered up. Conversely, a unit that was not affordable in the first transaction and was affordable in the second transaction filtered down. Note that filtering among paired sales does not represent all filtering because not all houses have sold twice during the sample period, and rental units are not included. The filtering directly observed in paired sales forms the basis for constructing a statistical model for the determination of filtering of all housing units.

2 – Filtering Model

The filtering model is a statistical relationship between the characteristics of a community and the likelihood that a unit will filter up, down or not at all.⁸² The characteristics of the community include the density of the community, how built out the community is, the community size, the stage of the housing cycle, recent growth in the housing stock, household income, median sales price, and a county-specific fixed effect.

⁷⁹ Effective property tax rates were provided by State of New Jersey Department of Treasury, Government Records Access Unit. PMI is estimated at an annual rate of 0.78% of the estimated mortgage amount, based on NJ DCA’s affordable unit calculator, while homeowners insurance is estimated in the amount of \$981, based on the analysis of national insurance industry data from 2012 by Jeffery Chu (2015). The interest rate tracks the costs of a 5/1 hybrid mortgage (a 30 year mortgage with interest rates fixed for the first five years and adjustable once per year thereafter) used by many homeowners to lower housing expenditures.

⁸⁰ The results of this calculation track closely with ownership costs as reported in the ACS PUMS data. The median annual owner cost estimated using this method on the observed transactions is \$26,802, while the median annual owner costs for all occupied units according to 2014 PUMS data for New Jersey is \$25,188.

⁸¹ Standards for what percent of income a household can afford to pay for housing (excluding utilities) vary from 28 percent of income to 31 percent and greater. We have conservatively used a value of 28 percent of income, resulting in a potential expenditure at the low end of what could be paid by a LMI household. Further, we have compared the potential expenditure against interest costs assuming the buyer borrows 100 percent of the purchase price. Since the buyer will likely borrow less than the full amount of the cost, this assumption increases interest costs relative to what a LMI household would actually have to pay. Similarly, many borrowers do not need PMI, but we have assumed PMI payments as well. Principal costs are not included, as these are not costs in the sense that interest and taxes are costs, since principal payments represent savings to the household. We note that this definition of housing costs treats owner-occupied units equivalently to rental housing.

⁸² This method builds upon Somerville, C. Tsurriel, and Christopher J. Mayer, *Government Regulation and Changes in the Affordable Housing Stock*, FRBNY Economic Policy Review, June 2003.

The filtering model is based on a multinomial logit regression. The dependent variable, filtering, can take one of three outcomes: filtered up, filtered down, or did not filter. The multinomial logit regression assesses the relative likelihood that the paired housing transactions of a unit will take one of these three outcomes, given the independent variables shown below.

TABLE 6.4: INDEPENDENT VARIABLES USED IN MULTINOMIAL LOGIT REGRESSION

| Variable | Definition | Source |
|----------------------|---|--------------------|
| HGrowth00to14 | Change in housing stock from 2000 to 2014, per municipality | US Census |
| hhmedinc | Median Household Income, per census tract | US Census |
| hhmedincsquared | Squared median income term | US Census |
| Hunits | Number of Housing Units, per municipality | US Census |
| medianmunisalesprice | Median value of a sale in the municipality | SRIA |
| medianpricesquared | Squared median sales value | SRIA |
| density | Density of municipality housing stock | US Census |
| pctbuiltout | Percent of estimated "Build Out" limit, per municipality | Econsult Solutions |
| NJpricepctchg | change in real estate prices in the State of New Jersey | FHFA |
| NJsquaredpricepctchg | Squared real estate price term | FHFA |
| county | County geographic fixed effect | NJ COAH |

We estimate the model using annual data from 2000 to 2014. For home sales occurring in years without corresponding census data, linear interpolations of the variables are used. Due to the low volatility in the census variables used here (over short-term horizons) linear interpolation is appropriate. The model establishes the outcome of "did not filter" as the base outcome: likelihoods of filtering up or down are expressed relative to the likelihood of not filtering. Coefficients from the multinomial logit regression are expressed as the change in the likelihood of an outcome (with respect to the base outcome), given a unit change in the predictor variable, holding all other variables constant (expressed in log-odd terms).

In terms of magnitude, multinomial logit results are not easy to directly translate, as they are expressed in log-odd terms. Using post-estimation functions, these results can be interpreted as a system of effects on the net probability of either filtering up or down. Results from these post-estimation techniques are discussed below.

3 – Forecasting

To forecast results from the multinomial logit regression, we must create future values for the independent variables used in the regression model, including changes in house and apartment prices, the number of units that will be available to transact, and changes in income, and then apply the parameter estimates.

Prices for owner occupied housing and rental housing move together over the long run, but can diverge in the short run. Owner-occupied housing values are more volatile, and our analysis incorporates housing cycle considerations.⁸³ We use an average annual growth rate of 4 percent over the next ten years.⁸⁴ In order to capture the nonlinear movement of prices during that time, we employ an ARIMA regression procedure using historic data from the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) on owner occupied housing prices dating back to 1975. Rental prices, however, are not anticipated to follow the same cyclical trajectory, as data on average rental rates in New Jersey show a significantly steadier trend than in single family home prices. Because of this, filtering forecasts for apartments are modeled on a smooth trajectory of rental rates. Because cities and urban areas, where much of the rental stock is concentrated, have generally experienced relatively stronger growth than suburban and rural areas than in the past, we use an average annual growth rate in rent of 4.5 percent.

The number of units available to filter also varies between owner occupied units and rental units.⁸⁵ We base the number of owner-occupied units that could potentially filter on an analysis of historic sales volume in New Jersey from 2000 to 2014 to movements in real estate prices. Using this relationship, we forecast the number of single family home sales (and which are therefore available to filter) that will occur in each year. For apartments, we first account for rent controlled units that cannot be expected to behave as though they are market units. There are approximately 100 municipalities with some form of rent control, covering a significant portion of the rental stock in those municipalities. The restrictions imposed by rent control suppress the likelihood of filtering up, and, because the rents are often already below market, they are not anticipated to filter down. Accordingly, the number of units estimated to be under rent control in each applicable municipality are removed from the stock of rental units. The multinomial logit model used to calculate the probability of filtering is based on fifteen years of sales data; the number of sales represented in that data (approximately two million) is approximately equal to the stock of owner occupied houses in New Jersey. Because of this, we assume that the entirety of the rental stock, not covered by rent control, will be available to filter every fifteen years.⁸⁶ Accordingly, we estimate that two thirds of the non-rent controlled rental stock will be available to filter over the next ten years.

⁸³ Federal Housing Finance Agency, *House Price Index*

⁸⁴ Historic rates from 1975-2015 show an average growth rate of approximately 5.3 percent, and rates from 2000-2015 show an average growth rate of approximately 3.5 percent.

⁸⁵ Note that net filtering for a unit cannot be greater than one for any given unit, even if the units itself filters up and down multiple times.

⁸⁶ This is likely very conservative, due to the short-term nature of leases.

Income is anticipated to grow at 2% per year. Municipal density, and percent built out are anticipated to remain at their 2015 levels.

The final step is to apply the parameter estimates from the model in step 2 to the estimated independent variable values for each municipality. We convert the coefficients from the model into aggregate percent probabilities of filtering up or down for each municipality, given the level of the independent variables for each year. This percent is then applied to the base of sales and rentals as described above.⁸⁷ This approach yields an estimate of upward and downward filtering. This number is aggregated for each municipality, and the difference between the two represents the net number of units estimated to be added to or removed from the stock of affordable housing over the 2015 to 2025 period.

Table 6.5 shows the result of the net filtering estimate on the anticipated supply of affordable housing in each region and statewide (see Appendix C for estimates by municipality). Statewide, downward filtering is anticipated to add approximately 135,500 units of affordable housing supply from 2015 to 2025, while upward filtering is anticipated to reduce affordable housing supply by approximately 97,900. Therefore, net filtering is anticipated to increase affordable housing supply by approximately 37,600 units, reducing affordable housing need.

⁸⁷ With a large enough number of iterations (such as the total number of sales and rental units in a geography), the probability of an event converges on the percent of the population which that probability applies to.

TABLE 6.5: NET FILTERING OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Units Filtering Down | Units Filtering Up | Net Filtering (Supply Change) |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | 19,121 | 16,852 | 2,269 |
| 2 | 30,621 | 13,249 | 17,372 |
| 3 | 15,429 | 15,306 | 123 |
| 4 | 28,124 | 20,347 | 7,777 |
| 5 | 25,088 | 21,624 | 3,464 |
| 6 | 17,132 | 10,533 | 6,599 |
| State | 135,515 | 97,911 | 37,604 |

6.4 ALLOCATION OF SECONDARY SOURCES

The Round 2 methodology is clear that secondary source adjustments apply to both Present and Prospective Need, explaining that “reductions apply to housing need no matter how the need was generated.” (26 N.J.R. 2348) Further, the Round 2 methodology is explicit that, unlike the municipal allocation process described in Section 5, “in the reductions of increases to housing need due to secondary supply and demand, all municipalities, including Urban Aid locations, participate”⁸⁸ (26 N.J.R. 2348). This approach is consistent with the policy allowing Present Need obligations to be addressed either through rehabilitation of deficient units or creation of new units.⁸⁹

We apply secondary source adjustments as follows. First, municipal Prospective Need is adjusted to reflect an increase or decrease in need based on projected secondary supply changes. In

⁸⁸ It should be noted that while qualifying urban aid municipalities do not receive any allocation of the regional Prospective Need, it is possible for those municipalities to have a Secondary Source adjustment that adds to their Prospective Need (in cases where the secondary sources, on net, are estimated to reduce the affordable housing supply in those municipalities). It is therefore possible for a qualifying urban aid municipality to have a Prospective Need greater than zero as a result of secondary source adjustments. In the Round 2 methodology, secondary source adjustments for urban aid municipalities were applied “before these areas send excess need to the re-allocation pool” (26 N.J.R. 2348), meaning that these adjustments were reflected in the Re-Allocated Present Need calculation, which yielded a new construction obligation. Since the Re-Allocated Present Need calculation has been eliminated, it is appropriate in keeping with the Prior Round method for the secondary source adjustments to be reflected in the new construction obligation within the current methodology, i.e. Prospective Need, and for these adjustments to be first applied in the municipality in which they are estimated to occur, whether this municipality is a qualifying urban aid municipality or not.

⁸⁹ It is important to note that the majority of units are identified as deficient in the Present Need calculation due not to inadequate plumbing or kitchen facilities but due to their designation as “old and overcrowded.” While the creation of a new unit does not address the integrity of a structurally deficient unit, it can alleviate the overcrowding of units. Further, any addition to supply creates effects down the chain of the housing market that may eventually allow the deficient unit to be replaced or demolished.

cases where these adjustments bring Prospective Need to zero, or in cases where Prospective Need begins at zero (as with urban aid municipalities), remaining adjustments are made to Present Need.

It is possible, however, for a municipality to have a downward secondary source adjustment that is larger than the sum of Present Need and Prospective Need for that municipality. A strict application of secondary sources to such a municipality would result in a *negative* need allocation. In the Round 2 methodology, these units below the “zero bound” for a municipality are simply dropped from the methodology and left unaccounted for. From the perspective of the municipality at the zero bound, whether these units are otherwise accounted for is immaterial, since its need is already zero. However, from the perspective of the region, failing to account for these units creates a mismatch between the identified regional affordable housing need and regional affordable housing supply provided through market-based forces.

This mismatch between affordable housing need and supply is problematic because need is calculated regionally, meaning that LMI household growth anticipated in one county (or in one municipality) spills over into another for the purpose of estimating housing need. Conceptually, the secondary source adjustments partially offset this need, recognizing that a portion of the incremental LMI household population that has been estimated will be housed in units created by the market forces enumerated within the calculation. Logically, this is still true in cases where the municipality has no allocated need – an additional unit created in that municipality still provides housing for an LMI household, thereby reducing by one the housing need for the region. Within the confines of the Prior Round methodology, however, this adjustment is not made properly and regional need is thus improperly inflated. This “zero bound” flaw can theoretically produce a circumstance in which the net effect of secondary source adjustments which collectively add to affordable housing supply is to *increase* rather than *reduce* aggregate municipal affordable housing need.

To correct for this occurrence, additional downward adjustments to need for secondary supply that take place beneath the “zero bound” are summed for each region. These additional secondary source adjustments for each region are then allocated to municipalities in proportion to the share of total regional Present Need and Prospective Need that each municipality represents.⁹⁰ This methodology aligns aggregate municipal need with the increment between changes in LMI housing need and affordable housing supply, as intended.

⁹⁰ For example, suppose the sum of Present and Prospective Need for a municipality represents 2% of the aggregate Present and Prospective Need for the region, and that the “pool” of Remaining Secondary Source Allocation of units below the “zero bound” is 200 units for the region. In this case, the municipality would be allocated an adjustment of four units to reduce allocated need (200 x 2%). This adjustment is first applied to Prospective Need, and then, in cases where Prospective Need is zero, to Present Need. This example is illustrated in Figure 6.1 below.

6.5 SECONDARY SOURCE ADJUSTMENT RESULTS

Table 6.6 shows the results of these adjustments aggregated to the regional level (see Appendix C for estimates by municipality). On net, the three secondary sources of market-based supply (LMI Demolitions, LMI Residential Conversions, and Net Filtering) are estimated to add approximately 30,600 units of affordable housing supply over the ten-year period. Accordingly, aggregate statewide Present Need and Prospective Need decrease by a commensurate level to reflect adjustments for this anticipated supply.⁹¹

TABLE 6.6: SECONDARY SOURCE ADJUSTMENTS TO PRESENT NEED AND PROSPECTIVE NEED BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Present Need | Allocated Prospective Need | LMI Demolitions | LMI Conversions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net Supply | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Aggregate Need Adjustment |
|--------------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 25,808 | 17,928 | (3,788) | 3,139 | 2,269 | 1,620 | 23,292 | 18,822 | (1,622) |
| 2 | 19,332 | 12,345 | (3,771) | 2,833 | 17,372 | 16,434 | 9,190 | 6,056 | (16,431) |
| 3 | 6,095 | 8,784 | (1,189) | 2,451 | 123 | 1,385 | 5,188 | 8,307 | (1,384) |
| 4 | 7,195 | 7,427 | (4,168) | 2,025 | 7,777 | 5,634 | 4,409 | 4,577 | (5,636) |
| 5 | 3,284 | 7,245 | (1,937) | 99 | 3,464 | 1,626 | 2,309 | 6,593 | (1,627) |
| 6 | 3,320 | 393 | (3,800) | 1,115 | 6,599 | 3,914 | 0 | 0 | (3,713) |
| State | 65,034 | 54,122 | (18,653) | 11,662 | 37,604 | 30,613 | 44,388 | 44,355 | (30,413) |


Table 6.7 and Figure 6.1 show the results of the secondary source adjustment process described above for two hypothetical municipalities in Region 1. The first municipality is assumed to have a Secondary Source adjustment greater than the sum of their Present and Prospective Need, to illustrate the “zero bound” problem. The second municipality is assumed to have a Secondary Source adjustment less than the sum of their Present and Prospective Need, and thus receives a regional Remaining Secondary Source adjustment. Full results by municipality are shown in Appendix C.

⁹¹ Slight differences emerge due to rounding, since a municipality cannot be assigned a partial unit, and because need cannot be reduced below zero in Region 6.

TABLE 6.7: SAMPLE MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION CALCULATION

| Category | Calculation | Muni A (units) | Muni B (units) |
|--|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Region | | 1 | 1 |
| (A) Allocated Prospective Need | Sec 4 & 5 | 100 | 130 |
| (B) Present Need | Sec 3 | 125 | 20 |
| (C) Demolitions (negative) | Sec 6.1 | (50) | (25) |
| (D) Residential Conversions | Sec 6.2 | +150 | +45 |
| (E) Net Filtering | Sec 6.3 | +175 | +100 |
| (F) Secondary Source Net | C + D + E | +275 | +120 |
| (G) Net Impact on Need (inverted) | (F) * -1 | (275) | (120) |
| (H) Adjusted Prospective Need | A + G (zero bounded) | 0 | 10 |
| (I) Remaining Secondary Source Adjustment | G + (A - H) | (175) | (0) |
| (J) Adjusted Present Need | B + I (zero bounded) | 0 | 20 |
| (K) Remaining Secondary Source Adjustment | I + (B - J) | (50) | (0) |
| (L) Regional Remaining Secondary Source Units | Sec 6.4 | 200 | 200 |
| (M) Share of Regional Present + Prospective Need | (H + J) / L | 0% | 2% |
| (N) Additional Secondary Source Adjustment | (L * M)* -1 | (0) | (4) |
| (O) Sum of Adjusted Present + Prospective Need | H + I + J + K + N | 0 | 26 |

FIGURE 6.1: SAMPLE MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION OF SECONDARY SOURCE ADJUSTMENTS



7.0 MUNICIPAL HOUSING OBLIGATIONS

The affordable housing calculations described in Sections 3-6 yield a complete estimate of the current affordable housing need and need anticipated to emerge over the next decade. Present Need estimates all deficient housing currently occupied by LMI households, while Prospective Need estimates all additional housing required by the incremental growth in LMI households over ten years. By design, these calculations are non-duplicative and therefore additive, and their sum represents all identifiable housing need for the 2015-2025 period. As detailed in this section, any additive calculations of need above and beyond these categories either double count LMI households already captured within this framework, or attribute a housing need to households that do not currently fall under the FHA definition of need (and in some cases may not even exist). In sum, Present Need and Prospective Need together completely describe the need for affordable housing within the fair share framework.⁹²

Importantly, the design and definition of these categories mean that all prior contributions of population shifts, income changes, housing market dynamics, and municipal affordable housing activities are subsumed within the calculation. This was true at the start of Round 1, and it is equally true at the start of any round. By design, the extent to which municipalities have produced affordable housing is captured within the determination of need for the current cycle. Therefore, the degree to which municipalities have satisfied or failed to satisfy their Prior Round obligations does not change the most accurate estimate of the Present Need and Prospective Need for the current cycle from that which has been calculated and reported in Sections 3-6 of this analysis.

However, there is a distinction between affordable housing “need,” which represents identifiable LMI households in need of or anticipated to be in need of housing, and affordable housing “obligations,” which represent legal requirements placed on municipalities related to fulfilling this need. Conceptually, aggregate need should align with aggregate municipal obligations. Historically, however, need and obligations have diverged within the methodology.

There are multiple instances of this divergence. One is municipal allocation caps, which are included in the Round 2 methodology and the Fair Housing Act and are applied to adjust municipal obligations. The 20% cap safeguards against a “drastic alteration” of the established pattern of a community, while the 1,000 unit cap recognizes that imposing fair share obligations on municipalities beyond what could reasonably be achieved given market considerations is impractical and warrants an adjustment.⁹³

Another instance is the “carryover” of unfulfilled Prior Round obligations. Though the “carryover” obligations are not mentioned in the FHA, the Round 2 methodology carried forward Round 1 Prospective Need into the Round 2 obligation (against which appropriate activity and credits were

⁹² Section 7.1 discusses more fully the categories of affordable housing need within the FHA framework, and how they account for LMI households of various types.

⁹³ Section 7.4 reviews in greater detail the rationale and calculations for the allocation caps.

applied). The Supreme Court has stated that its March 2015 decision “does not eradicate” the unfulfilled portion of the Round 1 and Round 2 obligations, which serve as “the starting point for the determination of a municipality’s fair share responsibility” within the current cycle (221 N.J.1 at 42).

The core reason for this divergence, and the primary challenge in reconciling the identifiable need into assigned obligations, is the need to create a system that provides compliance incentives for municipalities. While unfulfilled obligations from prior cycles do not represent additional identifiable need, ignoring them entirely would discourage municipalities from complying with legally assigned obligations. Therefore, adjustments may need to be undertaken to the Present Need and Prospective Need assigned to each municipality in Sections 3-6 of this report to yield an appropriate municipal obligation. This distinction between identifiable *need* and compliance-based *obligations* has implications for developing an approach that appropriately reconciles these categories into municipal obligations.

- First, it suggests that the obligations for Round 1 and Round 2 as originally assigned by COAH in 1993 are the appropriate standard against which the “unfulfilled” Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations should be determined, as indicated by the Supreme Court decision. While some previous iterations of the methodology have re-calculated prior cycle obligations retrospectively based on observed data on population and housing activity, such a calculation is not necessary for assigning need because this observed data does not have any bearing on the current or future need for affordable housing. The entirety of current and future need within the FHA framework is represented by Present Need and Prospective Need. Instead, Round 1 and Round 2 obligations are relevant only within the compliance-based framework of municipal *obligation*. As suggested by the Courts, the originally assigned Round 1 and Round 2 obligations provide the municipalities with a defined and predictable target that is the appropriate standard for this purpose.
- Second, while obligations have been legally assigned by COAH and upheld by the Courts for Round 1 and Round 2 (1987-1999), no comparable obligations have been legally assigned and upheld for the “gap period” (1999-2015). Since this period generates no identifiable, additive housing need to that calculated for the current cycle, and the period is not associated with a legally defined obligation against which compliance can reasonably be judged, no calculation of additional need is appropriate to conduct for this period.⁹⁴

An ideal methodology for the assignment of obligations would align the aggregate identified housing need (i.e. the sum of the Present Need and Prospective Need) and the aggregate municipal obligations for the current cycle, while simultaneously rewarding municipalities for past (and future) compliance. A potential solution, referred to as the “Offset Method,” is developed and detailed. Unfortunately, as discussed below, this methodology cannot be executed for the current

⁹⁴ Section 7.2 discusses more fully the distinction between the Prior Round (1987-1999) and the “Gap period” (1999-2015), as well as the appropriate source of Prior Round obligations.

cycle given the lack of reliable and uniformly available data on the degree to which Prior Round obligations have been fulfilled.⁹⁵

Therefore, in keeping with the Supreme Court's decision and the approach in Prior Rounds, the "Single Pool Method" is defined and executed to yield initial summary obligations for each municipality.⁹⁶ Within this approach, allocation caps are first applied to the municipal Present Need and Prospective Need emerging from Sections 3-6.⁹⁷ Next, the Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations as initially assigned by COAH in 1993 are carried over and summed with the Present Need and Prospective Need to yield an initial summary obligation for each municipality.⁹⁸ All applicable adjustments, activity and credits must then be demonstrated by municipalities as part of their efforts to identify the correct number and to secure approval of their affordable housing plans.

7.1 CATEGORIES OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED

The Fair Housing Act contains specific guidance on the categories of need that comprise fair share obligations. The FHA provides for the determination of Present Need and Prospective Need at both the regional and municipal level, and does not define any additional categories of need beyond these two (N.J.S.A. 52:27d-301 et. seq.).

These two categories are additive. Present Need enumerates housing needs for low- and moderate-income (LMI) households currently living in deficient housing units. Prospective Need enumerates housing needs for additional LMI households projected to be added over the ten year period (based upon population projections extrapolated into an estimate of incremental growth in eligible LMI households). Together, these categories capture all recognized need as of the start of the Prospective Need period (Present Need), and all recognized need anticipated to be generated during the Prospective Need period (Prospective Need).

This framework is evident in the approach taken to the calculation of Round 1 housing obligations in 1986-87. In keeping with the FHA, the Round 1 methodology calculated obligations for Present Need and Prospective Need, which together represented the sum of all obligations. The Prospective Need calculation was strictly forward-facing, capturing the incremental need anticipated to be generated between 1987 and 1993. By definition, therefore, the Present Need calculated in Round 1 captured all LMI population and housing activity prior as of that point in time. Said another way, the contributions of population shifts, income changes, housing market

⁹⁵ Section 7.3.1 describes this method in detail, and discusses the flaws in available data on prior activity, adjustments and credits.

⁹⁶ Section 7.3.2 describes this method in greater detail.

⁹⁷ Section 7.4 details the mechanics and results of this step.

⁹⁸ The results of this calculation are presented in the aggregate in Section 7.5, and for each municipality in Appendix D.

dynamics, and municipal affordable housing activities up to the beginning of Round 1 were all by definition and by design subsumed within the calculation of Present Need as of that time.

With respect to affordable housing *need*, the circumstances at the beginning of any round of calculations are no different than they were at the start of Round 1. Taken together, Present Need and Prospective Need completely describe the identifiable need for affordable housing within this framework, and any additional calculated *obligation* assigned above and beyond it does not change this *need*. This point can be demonstrated by examining the current circumstances of incremental LMI households that were added to the New Jersey household population in the past. Take for instance an LMI household that moved into the state in 2010.⁹⁹ As of the beginning of the current cycle in July 2015, that household by definition is either (a) an LMI household living in deficient housing in New Jersey; (b) an LMI household living in non-deficient housing in New Jersey; or (c) no longer an LMI household living in New Jersey.¹⁰⁰

- In the case of (a), *an LMI household living in deficient housing as of July 2015*, this household would be captured in the Present Need calculation. To attribute a “need” for the same household based on the addition of that household to the LMI population at a prior point in time, and to then add that “need” to the sum of Present Need and Prospective Need for the upcoming cycle, would be a clear instance of double counting of the same household.
- In the case of (b), *an LMI household living in non-deficient housing as of July 2015*, this household would not represent an identifiable need for the current cycle within the Present Need and Prospective Need framework set forth in the FHA. They would represent neither a source of current, identifiable need for housing (since the household by definition currently has sound housing), nor a source of anticipated housing need emerging from population growth (since the household by definition is a part of the current population). Logically, therefore, the construction or rehabilitation of an additional unit of affordable housing over the upcoming period is not necessary to accommodate it. This is supported by extensive precedent (discussed in more detail below) excluding cost-burden from the categories of affordable housing need considered within the fair share framework.
- Finally, in the case of (c), *no longer an LMI household living in New Jersey*, this household clearly would not represent housing need for the current cycle. Such a household may have moved to another state, increased its income such that it no longer qualifies as LMI, or may no longer exist at all. Regardless, the construction or rehabilitation of an additional

⁹⁹ We recognize that the incremental LMI household growth over a given period that forms the basis for the Prospective Need calculation is not simply the product of migration, but of a host of characteristics, including household formation, income changes (in and out of the LMI category), in and out migration, etc. This example is chosen purely for simplicity. The logic applied here holds for incremental LMI households generated through any of the mechanisms described herein.

¹⁰⁰ As described in the previous footnote, this may occur through out-migration, a change in income status, a change in household composition, etc.

unit of affordable housing over the upcoming period is self-evidently not necessary to accommodate it.

Any need that is assigned additively to the sum of Present Need and Prospective Need therefore either double counts LMI households already captured within this framework, or wrongly attributes a current housing need to households that are not currently within the FHA definition of need, or in some cases may not even exist.

The Round 2 methodology justifies the addition of Round 1 re-calculated Prospective Need to Present Need and Prospective Need for Round 2 by arguing that if the prior round Prospective Need is not met, “people are forced into more crowded housing or are obliged to pay more than 28 percent of their income for housing” (26 N.J.R. 2348). Both of these concerns are examples of non-additive categories described above:

- In the first case, *people are forced into more crowded housing*, overcrowded housing built before 1960 serves as a metric of housing deficiency in the Present Need calculation. Therefore, if additional LMI households are currently living in old and overcrowded housing as a result of prior population growth, they will be captured in the current Present Need. To calculate a need attributable to those same households from a prior period, and then add that “need” to the Present Need, is a clear instance of double counting in the determination of need for the current period.
- In the second case, *(people are) obliged to pay more than 28 percent of their income for housing*, the Court established in *AMG Realty Co v Warren Tp* that cost-burden factors should not be included in the calculation of low- and moderate-income housing (207 N.J. Super. at 422-423). This point was also confirmed specifically by the Supreme Court’s 2015 ruling (221 N.J. at 33).¹⁰¹ More broadly, those LMI households that are living in sound housing units as of the beginning of the upcoming period do not represent an identifiable affordable housing need for that period, regardless of when they were added to the state’s population. Put another way, while these households have an *income* need, they do not have a *housing* need, and thus any remedy is outside of the fair share affordable housing framework.

Therefore, within the FHA framework for calculating the appropriate LMI housing need for the current cycle, any additions to the sum of Present Need and Prospective Need are unwarranted. **In other words, neither the Prior Round (1987-1999) nor the “gap period” (1999-2015) give rise to any current identifiable housing need on top of or in addition to the Present Need and Prospective Need.**

¹⁰¹ While the FHA discusses the issue of cost-burden in its “Findings” (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-329.11 a. & b), it makes no reference to or provision for the inclusion of cost-burden as a component of the definition of affordable housing need.

7.2 PRIOR ROUND VS. GAP PERIOD OBLIGATIONS

As established above, and by COAH's approach to Round 1, all previous population and housing activity relevant to the calculation of housing need as per the FHA is captured within the Present Need and Prospective Need calculation. However, the Supreme Court has distinguished between municipalities that have and have not satisfied their Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations, ruling as follows in March 2015:

...our decision today does not eradicate the prior round obligations; municipalities are expected to fulfill those obligations. As such, prior unfulfilled housing obligations should be the starting point for a determination of a municipality's fair share responsibility. Cf. In re Adoption of N.J.A.C. 5:96 & 5:97, supra, 416 N.J. Super. at 498-500 (approving, as starting point, imposition of "the same prior round obligations [COAH] had established as the second round obligations in 1993").

[221 N.J. 1 at 42]]

This passage specifically references the approval of the Appellate Court in 2010 of "the same Prior Round obligations [COAH] had established in 1993" (416 N.J. Super). In that case, appellants disputed COAH's decision to maintain Prior Round housing obligations as calculated in 1993, rather than re-calculating those obligations retrospectively based on updated data, as had been done in other iterations of the methodology. The Court found as follows with respect to that issue:

COAH's rationale of providing municipalities with **predictability** and the ability to rely upon COAH's substantive certification of their prior round compliance plans constitutes a reasonable basis...

[416 N.J. Super at 500 (emphasis added)]

The Court therefore has approved the maintenance of the Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations as calculated in 1993, rather than re-calculated for observed population and housing change. This approach is consistent with the notion that these Prior Round figures represent affordable housing *obligation* rather than identifiable affordable housing *need*. As previously discussed, from the standpoint of identifying affordable housing need for the current period, any unfulfilled Prior Round obligations are not additive to the sum of Present Need and Prospective Need. Therefore, a re-calculation of prior cycles is unnecessary to determine *need* – its result would provide no new information as to current and future affordable housing needs. Rather, these remaining obligations are relevant only as a representation of the degree to which municipalities have complied with the dictates legally assigned by COAH and the Courts. The appropriate standard for assessing compliance in this instance is therefore the obligation assigned to municipalities in Round 2 in 1993, as indicated by the Supreme Court decision.

The most accurate data source for these obligations is kept by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs and was provided to ESI for consideration in this analysis. This data set is

understood to represent the most accurate current understanding of municipal Round 1 and Round 2 obligations as originally assigned in 1993. Aggregate Round 1 and Round 2 obligations sum to 85,853 statewide, differing slightly from the total of 85,964 that had been utilized by COAH in 2008.¹⁰²

As described above, Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations are relevant in the current round not because they represent any unaccounted-for component of identifiable affordable housing need within the FHA framework. Instead, they are relevant because they represent an obligation legally determined by COAH, assigned to municipalities, and upheld by the Courts. No such obligation exists for the “gap” period of 1999-2015. COAH has, on multiple occasions, advanced methodologies for the calculation of such obligations for “Round 3” each of which has been rejected by the Courts or has remained un-adopted. Municipalities have therefore been assigned no legal obligations for this period against which their compliance can reasonably be judged.

Further, as described above, as of the start of the current period, all previous population and housing activity relevant to the calculation of housing need as per the FHA is captured within the upcoming Present Need calculation. Anticipated future growth over the period is captured in the Prospective Need calculation, while municipal compliance with legally assigned obligations is accounted for by using unfulfilled Prior Round obligations as the starting point for determining municipal obligations. Therefore, there is no identifiable housing need within the FHA framework that would be satisfied through the calculation of a retrospective “need” from the gap period, and the addition of any units emerging from a retrospective calculation attempting to capture “prospective need” from the gap period would improperly represent the affordable housing need that exists as of today.

In sum, no legal affordable housing obligation or identifiable additive affordable housing need emerges from the “gap” period. Therefore, none is calculated.

¹⁰² We understand from COAH that these differences are attributable both to rounding practices and to the failure to recognize urban aid status for two municipalities (Wildwood City in Cape May and Penns Grove in Salem) in previously reported data. In addition, there is one municipality (Harvey Cedars in Ocean County) with a seven unit difference in reported results for which DCA cannot identify the source of the discrepancy.

7.3 RECONCILING PRIOR ROUND (1987-1999) OBLIGATIONS

As previously discussed, the New Jersey Supreme Court has ruled that unfulfilled Prior Round obligations (i.e. those from Round 1 and Round 2, 1987-1999) are not eradicated by the upcoming round. How those Round 1 and Round 2 obligations relate to obligations arising from the upcoming calculation of Present Need and Prospective Need is not specified by the Court. Logically, the dictate that unfulfilled Prior Round obligations “should be the starting point” suggests that these obligations must serve at least as the minimum obligation for the current cycle for a municipality.

As discussed above, the retention of unfulfilled Prior Round obligations across cycles serves as a compliance mechanism, encouraging and rewarding the satisfaction of legally assigned obligations. However, because these obligations do not represent any identifiable current or future need above and beyond that already accounted for in the Present Need and Prospective Need calculations, retaining these obligations can lead to the assignment of aggregate affordable housing obligations greater than the identified need. Thus, there may be a tension between the competing objectives of encouraging compliance and allocating an aggregate obligation that aligns with the identified need for affordable housing in the current period (i.e. Present Need plus Prospective Need). An ideal methodology should strive to achieve both of these objectives simultaneously.

Within this section, we introduce such an approach, which we call the “Offset Method.” This system utilizes the unmet Prior Round obligation as part of the allocation method for the assignment of regional need, rather than as a separate and additive component of current obligations. In so doing, this approach fully recognizes the activity or inactivity of municipalities in response to Prior Round obligations, ensuring that compliance with those obligations is rewarded, while simultaneously aligning obligations for the current period with the identified need. This represents our preferred approach to reconciling total obligations, given sufficient information.

However, the Offset Method cannot be executed at this time given the current lack of uniform, reliable data on the extent to which Prior Round obligations have been satisfied. Therefore, we introduce and execute an alternative method (which we call the “Single Pool Method”) that does include Prior Round obligations as an additional, additive component above and beyond the calculated Present Need and Prospective Need. Due to the lack of available data, this report makes no attempt to quantify the extent to which those obligations have already been fulfilled by the municipalities. Instead, municipalities would receive appropriate recognition for prior adjustments, activities and credits in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans. This approach therefore successfully rewards municipal activity and thereby encourages compliance. However, unlike the preferred Offset Method, it does not align the aggregate housing obligations with the aggregate identified need.

7.3.1 OFFSET METHOD

Given perfect information on the level of applicable adjustments, housing activity and credits applicable to each municipality from the Prior Round, we believe such a system could be instituted that properly recognizes municipal activity and credits while aligning aggregate need and obligations. Assuming the availability of all necessary data, such a system (referred to herein as the “Offset Method”) would proceed as follows:

- First, applicable adjustments, housing activity and credits for each municipality would be set against the initially assigned Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations, yielding the unfulfilled Prior Round obligations for each municipality. A municipality that has not fully met its obligations would have a remaining obligation; a municipality that has fully met its obligations would have a zero, and a municipality that has more than satisfied their obligation would have credits towards its newly assigned obligation. These unfulfilled Prior Round obligations (or credits) would remain with each municipality and be used as part of the allocation process of Prospective Need for the current cycle.
- The aggregate total of unfulfilled Prior Round obligations would be calculated for each region. This sum would be deducted (or added) to the regional Prospective Need pool of units to be allocated for the current cycle, since those units would remain allocated to specific municipalities within the current cycle.
- The remaining pool of Prospective Need units in each region (which would sum with the aggregate unfulfilled Prior Round obligations to match the Prospective Need as calculated in Section 4 of this report) would be allocated through the municipal allocation formula (as described in Section 5 of this report).
- The sum of obligations for each municipality would be 1) their unfulfilled Prior Round (1987-1999) obligation, if any, 2) their portion of the remaining regional Prospective Need, and 3) their Present Need. Adjustments would be made for secondary sources and municipal allocation caps. When aggregated regionally, the sum of these obligations (prior to adjustments) aligns with the sum of identified Present Need and Prospective Need for the current cycle.
- This approach both rewards compliance and aligns aggregate obligations with aggregate need. Since unfulfilled obligations are carried over from cycle to cycle, rather than reset, municipalities are appropriately rewarded for activity undertaken to satisfy that obligation, and remain responsible for the unfulfilled portion. Concurrently, aggregate affordable housing obligations in each region are aligned with the identified housing need for the period.

Unfortunately, the Offset Method relies on a crucial data set: reliable, accurate and uniform statewide information on the applicable adjustments, housing activity and credits for each municipality. Such a data set is not available (as discussed below). A reliable calculation of the

“unfulfilled” portion of the Prior Round obligation for each municipality is therefore impossible at this time.

Historically, COAH has attempted to track information on adjustments, activity and credits for each municipality through its “CTM” online unit monitoring program. Results from this data set, updated through July 20, 2015, were provided to ESI by the Department of Community Affairs (as the successor custodian for this information) for consideration in this analysis. Unfortunately, this data source does not appear to be either comprehensive or reliable at this time. We understand from DCA that the data is self-reported by municipalities, and is not subject to any systematic auditing process. This understanding is confirmed by a publicly-released version of results from this program dated March 1, 2011,¹⁰³ which includes the disclaimer: “Inclusion of an affordable housing program or project in this report does not certify that the units exist and/or meet COAH’s criteria for credit.” In addition to the potential for incorrectly reported units, there is also the potential for unreported activity. The 2011 dataset, for example, omits roughly 100 municipalities entirely. The extent to which those values are an accurate reflection of municipalities that have not completed a single unit or are simply a result of the failure of those municipalities to report completions through the CTM system is unknowable at this time.

Despite these caveats, the data set provided by DCA does represent the best and most up to date source of information on municipal adjustments, activity and credits to date. Its use within the calculation could be justified if municipalities have the opportunity to offer corrections and amendments to the reported figures when submitting their housing plans at compliance hearings. While the direction of errors with respect to applicable adjustments, activity and credits in the DCA data set is not known (i.e. the “correct” total may be higher or lower than reported), it is likely that the municipal compliance process would result in an aggregate increase in reported adjustments, activity and credits, since municipalities would only have an incentive to challenge and correct a total that they believe to be under-reported, and many may not have participated in the CTM data base. This process would therefore be likely to reduce the aggregate unfulfilled Prior Round obligations recognized by the Courts below the unfulfilled Prior Round obligation initially calculated from currently available DCA data.

Unfortunately, this adjustment would create significant problems within the Offset Method outlined above. In that procedure, unfulfilled Prior Round obligations are deducted from the Prospective Need allocation pool for each region, aligning regional obligations with identifiable housing need as of the point the calculation is completed. If the aggregate unfulfilled Prior Round obligations for each region are (appropriately) reduced when further adjustments, activity and credits (above and beyond those currently known) are demonstrated in municipal proceedings, the alignment between aggregate obligations and identified need central to the methodology would be altered. Specifically, while known prior adjustments, activity and credits as of the time of the calculation would be properly accounted for in determining the regional Prospective Need allocation pool, no mechanism exists to provide for the addition of further “fulfilled” units to the regional pool (as

¹⁰³ Available from the Department of Community Affairs website at: (<http://www.nj.gov/dca/services/lps/hss/transinfo/reports/units.pdf>)

envisioned by the methodology) if they are demonstrated to the Courts by municipalities after the completion of the calculation. Thus, the Offset Method is conceptually problematic given imperfect information because the obligation for any municipality in part depends on the obligations of each of the other municipalities within its region.

This method, which represents the most conceptually sound approach to incorporating the unfulfilled Prior Round obligations “as a starting point” in the calculation of current cycle obligations, is therefore not employed in this analysis. In its place, a methodology is utilized that does not rely on a uniform tracking of applicable adjustments, activity and credits, but instead allows for municipalities to demonstrate those components on a case by case basis within the compliance process without disrupting the assigned obligations of other municipalities. We note, however, that if a uniform tracking system is implemented for the current round, it would be both possible and advisable to implement this procedure for future cycles.

7.3.2 SINGLE POOL METHOD

Given imperfect information on the degree to which Prior Round obligations have been satisfied, it is necessary to adopt a procedure for the assignment of total municipal obligations that is “adaptive” to the receipt of further information on municipal activities. In other words, the obligation of any given municipality must be severable from those of other municipalities, allowing its obligation to be updated to incorporate the best available information on the level of adjustments, activity and credits demonstrated to the Court within the compliance process.

The methodology employed to calculate initial summary obligations by municipality is referred to herein as the “Single Pool Method.” The steps employed are as follows:

- Calculate the Present Need and Prospective Need for each municipality through the procedures described in Sections 3-6 of this report.
- Applying the municipal allocation caps included in the Round 2 methodology and Fair Housing Act to those Present Need and Prospective Need obligations, yielding a Capped Present Need and Capped Prospective Need for each municipality.¹⁰⁴
- Sum the Initial Prior Round Obligations (as assigned by COAH in Round 2) with Capped Present Need and Capped Prospective Need to yield an Initial Summary Obligation for each municipality.

The result yielded by this process is referred to as *Initial* summary obligations. This is reflective of the fact that the entirety of assigned Prior Round obligations is included, and no estimate or

¹⁰⁴ Note that this figure will match the Present Need and Prospective Need described above for any municipality for which caps are not applicable.

determination of adjustments, activity and credits for each municipality is made. Given the lack of reliable and uniform statewide data, this component is best determined on a case by case basis within the municipal compliance process. Within that process, municipalities would have the opportunity to demonstrate adjustments, activity and credits which would reduce their initial summary obligation.¹⁰⁵

While not our preferred method, this method follows closely the Supreme Court's directive both in its adherence to the Round 2 methodology and in its use of Prior Round obligations as the starting point for municipal obligations in the current cycle. It also allows municipalities to receive appropriate recognition for prior adjustments, activities and credits in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans. Individual obligations will be "responsive" to the updated information introduced through those proceedings without adversely impacting the obligations of other municipalities. As a consequence, however, the aggregate identified housing need does not align with the aggregate obligation assigned to municipalities within this methodology.

7.4 MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION CAPS

The Round 2 methodology and Fair Housing Act require that allocation caps be applied to municipal affordable housing obligations. These caps serve different purposes articulated by the Legislature in the Fair Housing Act:

1. The 20% cap applies to "new construction" need (i.e. Prospective Need) and was included in both the Round 1 and Round 2 methodologies to implement the Legislature's desire to avoid fair share obligations resulting in "the established pattern of development in a community (being) drastically altered" (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-307 c.2(b)).
2. The 1,000 unit cap, by contrast, applies to a municipality's "fair share of housing units" (i.e. both Present and Prospective Need). This cap was enshrined legislatively to Section 307 e of the Fair Housing Act in 1993 after it was invalidated as part of the Round 1 rules by the Appellate Court in 1990 (244 N.J. Super., 438,453). This cap reflects the Legislature's recognition that it is impractical to assign affordable housing obligation beyond what could reasonably be achieved given market considerations. The Legislature gauged whether a municipality could create a "realistic opportunity" for more than 1,000 LMI units based on the volume of residential certificates of occupancy issued in the municipality over the previous ten years (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-307 e).

¹⁰⁵ The Round 2 methodology describes its adjustments for "Prior Cycle Activities" and "Prior Cycle Credits" as follows: "The reduction for prior-cycle activities is subtracted from Pre-Credited Need; it cannot reduce Pre-Credited Need below zero. Any unexpended reduction is carried over to the next cycle....Prior-Cycle credits cannot reduce an obligation below zero. Unexpended credits are carried over to the next affordable housing calculation." (26 N.J.R. 2350). Prior-Cycle credits include "low- and moderate-income housing of adequate standard constructed subsequent to April 1, 1980." (Ibid).

7.4.1 20% CAP

The Round 2 methodology limits the new construction obligation for any municipality to 20 percent of its current occupied housing stock. The rationale for this cap is described as follows in the Round 2 methodology:

The derivation of this limit reflects a desire by COAH not to overwhelm local communities....such that the community would experience 'drastic alteration' from these activities. 'Drastic alteration' has been defined as the doubling of a community's housing stock due to the presence of both inclusionary affordable housing and simultaneously delivered market units at a rate of 1:4.¹⁰⁶

[26 N.J.R. 2350]

We replicate this methodology after developing an estimate of occupied units as of June 30, 2015 (the start of the Prospective Need period). This estimate starts with occupied units by municipality as reported in the 2009-2013 American Community Survey. To this base, it adds certificates of occupancy and subtracts demolitions for a four-year period (as reported by DCA, by municipality) to update the estimate of occupied units to June 30, 2015.¹⁰⁷

This 2015 estimate is then multiplied by 20%, and the result is compared to the Prospective Need (adjusted for secondary sources as described in Section 6) for each municipality. The lower of the two figures is utilized as the municipal obligation, meaning that a municipality's Prospective Need obligation is either retained or capped at 20% of its occupied housing stock.

Table 7.1 shows the impact of the application of the 20% cap on the sum of municipal Prospective Need obligations by region and statewide. In total, 11 municipalities are impacted by this cap, reducing their aggregate obligation by approximately 600 units.

¹⁰⁶ It is worth noting that the referenced standard of four market rate units per one inclusionary unit is an assumption, rather than drawn from a specific data source. Data indicating a different ratio in practice would imply a different cap (for example a 5:1 ratio would imply a cap of (1/6), or 16.67%. Absent a defined data source with which to update and validate this assumption, the cap level is retained at 20% in this procedure.

¹⁰⁷ As described in Section 3, the midpoint of 2009-2013 is 2011, meaning that its results are best interpreted as representing occupied units "as of" 2011. Accordingly, 50% of annual CO's and demolitions for 2011 are applied, as well as all COs and demolitions from 2012, 2013, 2014 and January-June 2015.

TABLE 7.1: IMPACT OF 20% CAP BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Adjusted Prospective Need | Municipalities Impacted by 20% Cap | Capped Units (20% Cap) | Revised Prospective Need (20% Cap) |
|--------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | 18,822 | 6 | (571) | 18,251 |
| 2 | 6,056 | 0 | 0 | 6,056 |
| 3 | 8,307 | 1 | (15) | 8,292 |
| 4 | 4,577 | 1 | (3) | 4,574 |
| 5 | 6,593 | 3 | (53) | 6,540 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State | 44,355 | 11 | (642) | 43,713 |

7.4.2 1,000 UNIT CAP

Next, the 1,000 unit cap is applied to the sum of Present Need and Prospective Need. The legislative basis for the 1,000 unit cap is a 1993 amendment to the Fair Housing Act, which states:

No municipality shall be required to address a **fair share of housing units** affordable to households with a gross household income of less than 80% of the median gross household income beyond 1,000 units within ten years.

[N.J.S.A 52:27D-307 e. (emphasis added)]

The phrase “fair share” also appears earlier in Section 307 of the FHA, where COAH is given the duty to “adopt criteria and guidelines for: Municipal determination of its present and prospective fair share of the housing need in a given region...” (N.J.S.A 52:27D-307 c.1). This definition was incorporated by COAH into amendments to its Round 2 methodology,¹⁰⁸ which applied the 1,000 unit cap against the sum of all housing obligations.¹⁰⁹

The language setting forth the 1,000 unit cap in the FHA also specifies that the 1,000 unit cap does not apply to municipalities that have issued more than 5,000 certificates of occupancy in the

¹⁰⁸ See: N.J.A.C. 5:93-14.1, which begins “No municipality shall be required to address a fair share beyond 1,000 units...”

¹⁰⁹ COAH's Round 3 methodology deviated from this approach, applying the 1,000 unit cap against only Prospective Need obligations. This provision was challenged by Egg Harbor Township as part of the Appellate Court decision rejecting the “Growth Share” approach in 2010. The Appellate Court did not rule on the issue because it invalidated the regulations pursuant to which COAH defined the Round 3 obligation of the Township (this action eliminated the Round 3 obligation proposed by COAH, therefore reducing the Township's obligation below 1,000 units and rendering the applicability of the 1000 unit cap moot in the Court's opinion). (416 N.J. Super)

preceding ten-year period, since this activity demonstrates that “it is likely” that the municipality could “create a realistic opportunity” for more than 1,000 LMI units within the ten-year period.¹¹⁰ Pursuant to this standard, data on certificates of occupancy (as reported by DCA, by municipality) are aggregated from 2005 to 2014 to determine if any municipalities have exceeded 5,000 certificates of occupancy over the previous ten years, and are thus not eligible for application of the 1,000 unit cap. Both Jersey City¹¹¹ and Newark have issued more than 5,000 CO’s and are therefore not eligible for this cap.

For the remainder of municipalities, Present Need and Prospective Need obligations are summed. Those municipalities with less than 1,000 units of combined Present Need and Prospective Need maintain those figures unadjusted as their obligation. For those municipalities with more than 1,000 units of combined need, Prospective Need is reduced until the sum of Prospective Need and Present Need reaches 1,000 units. In cases where Present Need is greater than 1,000, this step reduces Prospective Need to zero. In those cases, Present Need is then reduced to 1,000 to yield a sum of Prospective and Present Need of 1,000 units.

Table 7.2 shows the impact of the application of the 1,000 unit cap on the sum of municipal Present and Prospective Need obligations by region and statewide. In total, 13 municipalities are impacted by this cap, reducing their aggregate obligation by approximately 11,900 units.

¹¹⁰ The full relevant passage from the FHA is as follows: “Unless it is demonstrated...that it is likely that the municipality through its zoning powers could create a realistic opportunity for more than 1,000 low and moderate income units within that ten-year period. For the purposes of this section, the facts and circumstances which shall determine whether a municipality’s fair share shall exceed 1,000 units, as provided above, shall be a finding that the municipality has issued more than 5,000 certificates of occupancy for a residential period in the ten-year period preceding...” (N.J.S.A 52:27D-307(e))

¹¹¹ While the sum of Newark’s Present Need and Prospective Need is less than 1,000 units, the sum of Jersey City’s Present Need and Prospective Need is 5,660 units, which remains uncapped due to this provision. It is unclear if a higher cap may apply to Jersey City based on its level of growth over 10 years (in which it issued 5,523 Certificates of Occupancy), rather than no cap at all. For example, the 5,000 certificate of occupancy threshold is the basis for a determination that more than 1,000 units are “realistic,” the same ratio of 5:1 would imply a cap of 1,105 ($5,523 / 5$).

TABLE 7.2: IMPACT OF 1,000 UNIT CAP BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Adjusted Present Need | Revised Prospective Need ¹¹² | Municipalities Impacted by 1,000 Unit Cap | Capped Units (1,000 Cap) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|---|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 23,292 | 18,251 | 7 | (7,683) | 16,369 | 17,491 |
| 2 | 9,190 | 6,056 | 1 | (3,303) | 5,887 | 6,056 |
| 3 | 5,188 | 8,292 | 3 | (736) | 4,851 | 7,893 |
| 4 | 4,409 | 4,574 | 2 | (205) | 4,409 | 4,369 |
| 5 | 2,309 | 6,540 | 0 | 0 | 2,309 | 6,540 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State | 44,388 | 43,713 | 13 | (11,927) | 33,825 | 42,349 |

7.4.3 MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION CAP RESULTS

Table 7.3 shows the impact of the successive application of the 20% and 1,000 unit municipal allocation caps, respectively, on the municipal obligations for Present Need and Prospective Need by region and statewide. Full results by municipality are shown in Appendix D.

TABLE 7.3: COMBINED IMPACT OF 20% AND 1,000 UNIT CAP BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Munis w/ 20% Cap | Capped Units (20% Cap) | Munis w/ 1,000 Unit Cap | Capped Units (1,000 Cap) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 23,292 | 18,822 | 6 | (571) | 7 | (7,683) | 16,369 | 17,491 |
| 2 | 9,190 | 6,056 | 0 | 0 | 1 | (3,303) | 5,887 | 6,056 |
| 3 | 5,188 | 8,307 | 1 | (15) | 3 | (736) | 4,851 | 7,893 |
| 4 | 4,409 | 4,577 | 1 | (3) | 2 | (205) | 4,409 | 4,369 |
| 5 | 2,309 | 6,593 | 3 | (53) | 0 | 0 | 2,309 | 6,540 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State | 44,388 | 44,355 | 11 | (642) | 13 | (11,927) | 33,825 | 42,349 |

¹¹² Note that this revised Prospective Need is reflective of the application of the 20% cap to municipal Prospective Need obligations. It is in theory possible for both caps to apply to a municipality.

7.5 INITIAL SUMMARY OBLIGATIONS

Capped Present Need and Capped Prospective Need represent two of the three components of the initial summary obligation within the Single Pool Method (as described in Section 7.3.2.). The third component is the Prior Round (1987-1999) obligation for each municipality, as initially assigned by COAH in 1993 (as described in Section 7.2). These three components are summed to produce the Initial Summary Obligation for each municipality. The results of this calculation are shown at the region and statewide level in Table 7.4 below. Full results by municipality are shown in Appendix D.

TABLE 7.4: INITIAL SUMMARY OBLIGATIONS BY REGION AND STATEWIDE

| Region | Prior Round (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation |
|--------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 12,469 | 16,369 | 17,491 | 46,329 |
| 2 | 9,382 | 5,887 | 6,056 | 21,325 |
| 3 | 13,323 | 4,851 | 7,893 | 26,067 |
| 4 | 27,367 | 4,409 | 4,369 | 36,145 |
| 5 | 14,055 | 2,309 | 6,540 | 22,904 |
| 6 | 9,257 | 0 | 0 | 9,257 |
| State | 85,853 | 33,825 | 42,349 | 162,027 |

The Initial Summary Obligation includes no estimate or determination of the level of adjustments, activity or credits applicable to each municipality. Each municipality would then have the opportunity to demonstrate this component to the Courts, thereby reducing their Initial Summary Obligation, on a case by case basis in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans. This approach builds in verification and incorporation of the most up to date and reliable information on municipal activities on a case by case basis.

APPENDIX A: PRESENT NEED BY MUNICIPALITY

TABLE A.1: UNIQUE DEFICIENT LMI HOUSING UNITS BY MUNICIPALITY (ACS 2009-2013)

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|---------------------------|--------|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Allendale borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 63.7% | 11 |
| Alpine borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 63.7% | 3 |
| Bergenfield borough | Bergen | 1 | 30 | 176 | 26 | 232 | 63.7% | 148 |
| Bogota borough | Bergen | 1 | 52 | 20 | 33 | 105 | 63.7% | 67 |
| Carlstadt borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 46 | 63.7% | 29 |
| Cliffside Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 12 | 195 | 34 | 241 | 63.7% | 154 |
| Closter borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Cresskill borough | Bergen | 1 | 12 | 16 | 30 | 58 | 63.7% | 37 |
| Demarest borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Dumont borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 49 | 6 | 55 | 63.7% | 35 |
| East Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 124 | 41 | 86 | 251 | 63.7% | 160 |
| Edgewater borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 63.7% | 3 |
| Elmwood Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 98 | 63.7% | 62 |
| Emerson borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 64 | 63.7% | 41 |
| Englewood city | Bergen | 1 | 81 | 367 | 82 | 530 | 63.7% | 338 |
| Englewood Cliffs borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 63.7% | 1 |
| Fair Lawn borough | Bergen | 1 | 87 | 69 | 54 | 210 | 63.7% | 134 |
| Fairview borough | Bergen | 1 | 77 | 271 | 48 | 396 | 63.7% | 252 |
| Fort Lee borough | Bergen | 1 | 49 | 248 | 71 | 368 | 63.7% | 234 |
| Franklin Lakes borough | Bergen | 1 | 23 | 2 | 14 | 39 | 63.7% | 25 |
| Garfield city | Bergen | 1 | 15 | 199 | 44 | 258 | 63.7% | 164 |
| Glen Rock borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 20 | 63.7% | 13 |
| Hackensack city | Bergen | 1 | 143 | 475 | 149 | 767 | 63.7% | 489 |
| Harrington Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 63.7% | 4 |
| Hasbrouck Heights borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 94 | 63.7% | 60 |
| Haworth borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Hillsdale borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 63.7% | 13 |
| Ho-Ho-Kus borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 63.7% | 7 |
| Leonia borough | Bergen | 1 | 10 | 104 | 0 | 114 | 63.7% | 73 |
| Little Ferry borough | Bergen | 1 | 52 | 107 | 38 | 197 | 63.7% | 125 |
| Lodi borough | Bergen | 1 | 50 | 129 | 86 | 265 | 63.7% | 169 |
| Lyndhurst township | Bergen | 1 | 95 | 95 | 75 | 265 | 63.7% | 169 |
| Mahwah township | Bergen | 1 | 41 | 24 | 26 | 91 | 63.7% | 58 |
| Maywood borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 29 | 11 | 40 | 63.7% | 25 |
| Midland Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 34 | 63.7% | 22 |
| Montvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 63.7% | 4 |
| Moonachie borough | Bergen | 1 | 14 | 14 | 9 | 37 | 63.7% | 24 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|----------------------------|--------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| New Milford borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 63 | 6 | 69 | 63.7% | 44 |
| North Arlington borough | Bergen | 1 | 78 | 62 | 66 | 206 | 63.7% | 131 |
| Northvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 63.7% | 5 |
| Norwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 63.7% | 2 |
| Oakland borough | Bergen | 1 | 9 | 0 | 26 | 35 | 63.7% | 22 |
| Old Tappan borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 15 | 63.7% | 10 |
| Oradell borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 63.7% | 11 |
| Palisades Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 197 | 33 | 230 | 63.7% | 147 |
| Paramus borough | Bergen | 1 | 15 | 72 | 92 | 179 | 63.7% | 114 |
| Park Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 22 | 76 | 46 | 144 | 63.7% | 92 |
| Ramsey borough | Bergen | 1 | 8 | 53 | 5 | 66 | 63.7% | 42 |
| Ridgefield borough | Bergen | 1 | 55 | 99 | 34 | 188 | 63.7% | 120 |
| Ridgefield Park village | Bergen | 1 | 57 | 128 | 36 | 221 | 63.7% | 141 |
| Ridgewood village | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 32 | 63.7% | 20 |
| River Edge borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 63.7% | 38 |
| River Vale township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 24 | 63.7% | 15 |
| Rochelle Park township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Rockleigh borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 48 | 146 | 30 | 224 | 63.7% | 143 |
| Saddle Brook township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 58 | 63.7% | 37 |
| Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 10 | 47 | 57 | 63.7% | 36 |
| South Hackensack township | Bergen | 1 | 36 | 16 | 23 | 75 | 63.7% | 48 |
| Teaneck township | Bergen | 1 | 18 | 122 | 53 | 193 | 63.7% | 123 |
| Tenaflly borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 47 | 63.7% | 30 |
| Teterboro borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Upper Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 63.7% | 6 |
| Waldwick borough | Bergen | 1 | 39 | 15 | 24 | 78 | 63.7% | 50 |
| Wallington borough | Bergen | 1 | 21 | 90 | 23 | 134 | 63.7% | 85 |
| Washington township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Westwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 15 | 35 | 24 | 74 | 63.7% | 47 |
| Woodcliff Lake borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 63.7% | 13 |
| Wood-Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63.7% | 0 |
| Wyckoff township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 48 | 63.7% | 31 |
| Bayonne city | Hudson | 1 | 57 | 870 | 91 | 1,018 | 65.6% | 668 |
| East Newark borough | Hudson | 1 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 21 | 65.6% | 14 |
| Guttenberg town | Hudson | 1 | 13 | 63 | 11 | 87 | 65.6% | 57 |
| Harrison town | Hudson | 1 | 72 | 212 | 43 | 327 | 65.6% | 215 |
| Hoboken city | Hudson | 1 | 120 | 255 | 58 | 433 | 65.6% | 284 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | 1,088 | 4,028 | 855 | 5,971 | 65.6% | 3,919 |
| Kearny town | Hudson | 1 | 29 | 301 | 36 | 366 | 65.6% | 240 |
| North Bergen township | Hudson | 1 | 205 | 747 | 155 | 1,107 | 65.6% | 727 |
| Secaucus town | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 69 | 8 | 77 | 65.6% | 51 |
| Union City | Hudson | 1 | 278 | 2,070 | 196 | 2,544 | 65.6% | 1,670 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|-----------------------|---------|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Weehawken township | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 236 | 34 | 270 | 65.6% | 177 |
| West New York town | Hudson | 1 | 27 | 1,143 | 117 | 1,287 | 65.6% | 845 |
| Bloomington borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 55 | 76.6% | 42 |
| Clifton city | Passaic | 1 | 56 | 1,933 | 81 | 2,070 | 76.6% | 1,587 |
| Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 13 | 85 | 0 | 98 | 76.6% | 75 |
| Hawthorne borough | Passaic | 1 | 12 | 74 | 14 | 100 | 76.6% | 77 |
| Little Falls township | Passaic | 1 | 43 | 59 | 36 | 138 | 76.6% | 106 |
| North Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76.6% | 0 |
| Passaic city | Passaic | 1 | 193 | 5,443 | 210 | 5,846 | 76.6% | 4,481 |
| Paterson city | Passaic | 1 | 157 | 4,240 | 153 | 4,550 | 76.6% | 3,487 |
| Pompton Lakes borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 58 | 76.6% | 44 |
| Prospect Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 55 | 76.6% | 42 |
| Ringwood borough | Passaic | 1 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 19 | 76.6% | 15 |
| Totowa borough | Passaic | 1 | 10 | 105 | 15 | 130 | 76.6% | 100 |
| Wanaque borough | Passaic | 1 | 35 | 39 | 0 | 74 | 76.6% | 57 |
| Wayne township | Passaic | 1 | 117 | 49 | 95 | 261 | 76.6% | 200 |
| West Milford township | Passaic | 1 | 41 | 22 | 24 | 87 | 76.6% | 67 |
| Woodland Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 195 | 25 | 220 | 76.6% | 169 |
| Andover borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.8% | 0 |
| Andover township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 49.8% | 4 |
| Branchville borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 49.8% | 1 |
| Byram township | Sussex | 1 | 5 | 12 | 25 | 42 | 49.8% | 21 |
| Frankford township | Sussex | 1 | 29 | 2 | 12 | 43 | 49.8% | 21 |
| Franklin borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 19 | 14 | 33 | 49.8% | 16 |
| Fredon township | Sussex | 1 | 7 | 0 | 23 | 30 | 49.8% | 15 |
| Green township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.8% | 0 |
| Hamburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 49.8% | 9 |
| Hampton township | Sussex | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 49.8% | 5 |
| Hardyston township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 28 | 49.8% | 14 |
| Hopatcong borough | Sussex | 1 | 30 | 18 | 29 | 77 | 49.8% | 38 |
| Lafayette township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.8% | 0 |
| Montague township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.8% | 0 |
| Newton town | Sussex | 1 | 59 | 87 | 86 | 232 | 49.8% | 116 |
| Ogdensburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 49.8% | 4 |
| Sandyston township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 49.8% | 4 |
| Sparta township | Sussex | 1 | 24 | 2 | 19 | 45 | 49.8% | 22 |
| Stanhope borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 49.8% | 4 |
| Stillwater township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.8% | 0 |
| Sussex borough | Sussex | 1 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 49.8% | 8 |
| Vernon township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 62 | 49.8% | 31 |
| Walpack township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.8% | 0 |
| Wantage township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 49.8% | 3 |
| Belleville township | Essex | 2 | 173 | 894 | 117 | 1,184 | 77.5% | 918 |



| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|----------------------------|--------|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Bloomfield township | Essex | 2 | 107 | 479 | 76 | 662 | 77.5% | 513 |
| Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 27 | 77.5% | 21 |
| Cedar Grove township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 77.5% | 16 |
| City of Orange township | Essex | 2 | 133 | 1,021 | 132 | 1,286 | 77.5% | 997 |
| East Orange city | Essex | 2 | 165 | 504 | 202 | 871 | 77.5% | 675 |
| Essex Fells borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77.5% | 0 |
| Fairfield township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 77.5% | 34 |
| Glen Ridge borough | Essex | 2 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 30 | 77.5% | 23 |
| Irvington township | Essex | 2 | 222 | 802 | 191 | 1,215 | 77.5% | 942 |
| Livingston township | Essex | 2 | 15 | 0 | 13 | 28 | 77.5% | 22 |
| Maplewood township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 106 | 35 | 141 | 77.5% | 109 |
| Millburn township | Essex | 2 | 60 | 68 | 17 | 145 | 77.5% | 112 |
| Montclair township | Essex | 2 | 17 | 94 | 44 | 155 | 77.5% | 120 |
| Newark city | Essex | 2 | 837 | 3,417 | 826 | 5,080 | 77.5% | 3,938 |
| North Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 33 | 77.5% | 26 |
| Nutley township | Essex | 2 | 9 | 386 | 5 | 400 | 77.5% | 310 |
| Roseland borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77.5% | 0 |
| S. Orange Village township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 77.5% | 5 |
| Verona township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 77.5% | 13 |
| West Caldwell township | Essex | 2 | 8 | 24 | 14 | 46 | 77.5% | 36 |
| West Orange township | Essex | 2 | 45 | 245 | 150 | 440 | 77.5% | 341 |
| Boonton town | Morris | 2 | 25 | 37 | 4 | 66 | 61.1% | 40 |
| Boonton township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 29 | 61.1% | 18 |
| Butler borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 45 | 5 | 50 | 61.1% | 31 |
| Chatham borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61.1% | 0 |
| Chatham township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 26 | 50 | 76 | 61.1% | 46 |
| Chester borough | Morris | 2 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 61.1% | 10 |
| Chester township | Morris | 2 | 23 | 0 | 13 | 36 | 61.1% | 22 |
| Denville township | Morris | 2 | 41 | 13 | 9 | 63 | 61.1% | 38 |
| Dover town | Morris | 2 | 115 | 255 | 71 | 441 | 61.1% | 269 |
| East Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 16 | 0 | 29 | 45 | 61.1% | 27 |
| Florham Park borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 4 | 97 | 101 | 61.1% | 62 |
| Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 21 | 19 | 40 | 61.1% | 24 |
| Harding township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61.1% | 0 |
| Jefferson township | Morris | 2 | 40 | 5 | 41 | 86 | 61.1% | 53 |
| Kinnelon borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 61.1% | 2 |
| Lincoln Park borough | Morris | 2 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 61.1% | 13 |
| Long Hill township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 17 | 61.1% | 10 |
| Madison borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 28 | 61.1% | 17 |
| Mendham borough | Morris | 2 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 61.1% | 9 |
| Mendham township | Morris | 2 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 61.1% | 18 |
| Mine Hill township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 61.1% | 3 |
| Montville township | Morris | 2 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 24 | 61.1% | 15 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|---------------------------|--------|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Morris township | Morris | 2 | 23 | 9 | 13 | 45 | 61.1% | 27 |
| Morris Plains borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 13 | 29 | 42 | 61.1% | 26 |
| Morristown town | Morris | 2 | 61 | 174 | 11 | 246 | 61.1% | 150 |
| Mountain Lakes borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 61.1% | 1 |
| Mount Arlington borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 21 | 61.1% | 13 |
| Mount Olive township | Morris | 2 | 62 | 19 | 109 | 190 | 61.1% | 116 |
| Netcong borough | Morris | 2 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 27 | 61.1% | 16 |
| Parsippany-Troy Hills twp | Morris | 2 | 89 | 116 | 98 | 303 | 61.1% | 185 |
| Pequanock township | Morris | 2 | 49 | 0 | 47 | 96 | 61.1% | 59 |
| Randolph township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 47 | 61.1% | 29 |
| Riverdale borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 61.1% | 2 |
| Rockaway borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 61.1% | 15 |
| Rockaway township | Morris | 2 | 6 | 32 | 3 | 41 | 61.1% | 25 |
| Roxbury township | Morris | 2 | 12 | 4 | 24 | 40 | 61.1% | 24 |
| Victory Gardens borough | Morris | 2 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 23 | 61.1% | 14 |
| Washington township | Morris | 2 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 61.1% | 8 |
| Wharton borough | Morris | 2 | 34 | 83 | 19 | 136 | 61.1% | 83 |
| Berkeley Heights township | Union | 2 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 18 | 65.2% | 12 |
| Clark township | Union | 2 | 6 | 26 | 8 | 40 | 65.2% | 26 |
| Cranford township | Union | 2 | 0 | 49 | 67 | 116 | 65.2% | 76 |
| Elizabeth city | Union | 2 | 750 | 5,466 | 491 | 6,707 | 65.2% | 4,374 |
| Fanwood borough | Union | 2 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 65.2% | 15 |
| Garwood borough | Union | 2 | 10 | 29 | 5 | 44 | 65.2% | 29 |
| Hillside township | Union | 2 | 66 | 241 | 33 | 340 | 65.2% | 222 |
| Kenilworth borough | Union | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 65.2% | 2 |
| Linden city | Union | 2 | 73 | 379 | 95 | 547 | 65.2% | 357 |
| Mountainside borough | Union | 2 | 80 | 0 | 65 | 145 | 65.2% | 95 |
| New Providence borough | Union | 2 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 70 | 65.2% | 46 |
| Plainfield city | Union | 2 | 114 | 1,084 | 91 | 1,289 | 65.2% | 841 |
| Rahway city | Union | 2 | 8 | 126 | 68 | 202 | 65.2% | 132 |
| Roselle borough | Union | 2 | 49 | 213 | 67 | 329 | 65.2% | 215 |
| Roselle Park borough | Union | 2 | 17 | 97 | 9 | 123 | 65.2% | 80 |
| Scotch Plains township | Union | 2 | 28 | 45 | 34 | 107 | 65.2% | 70 |
| Springfield township | Union | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 65.2% | 2 |
| Summit city | Union | 2 | 91 | 33 | 73 | 197 | 65.2% | 128 |
| Union township | Union | 2 | 26 | 424 | 25 | 475 | 65.2% | 310 |
| Westfield town | Union | 2 | 18 | 37 | 32 | 87 | 65.2% | 57 |
| Winfield township | Union | 2 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 65.2% | 18 |
| Allamuchy township | Warren | 2 | 40 | 0 | 13 | 53 | 75.7% | 40 |
| Alpha borough | Warren | 2 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 75.7% | 10 |
| Belvidere town | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 75.7% | 6 |
| Blairstown township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |
| Franklin township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|------------------------|-----------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Frelinghuysen township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |
| Greenwich township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |
| Hackettstown town | Warren | 2 | 0 | 148 | 0 | 148 | 75.7% | 112 |
| Hardwick township | Warren | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 75.7% | 2 |
| Harmony township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 75.7% | 1 |
| Hope township | Warren | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 75.7% | 4 |
| Independence township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |
| Knowlton township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 75.7% | 11 |
| Liberty township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |
| Lopatcong township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.7% | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 75.7% | 15 |
| Oxford township | Warren | 2 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 27 | 75.7% | 20 |
| Phillipsburg town | Warren | 2 | 45 | 107 | 48 | 200 | 75.7% | 151 |
| Pohatcong township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 75.7% | 6 |
| Washington borough | Warren | 2 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 75.7% | 16 |
| Washington township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 75.7% | 5 |
| White township | Warren | 2 | 15 | 0 | 42 | 57 | 75.7% | 43 |
| Alexandria township | Hunterdon | 3 | 20 | 0 | 13 | 33 | 50.4% | 17 |
| Bethlehem township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 50.4% | 2 |
| Bloomsbury borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 50.4% | 1 |
| Califon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.4% | 0 |
| Clinton town | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 50.4% | 9 |
| Clinton township | Hunterdon | 3 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 50.4% | 10 |
| Delaware township | Hunterdon | 3 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 50.4% | 11 |
| East Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 50.4% | 2 |
| Flemington borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 72 | 50.4% | 36 |
| Franklin township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.4% | 0 |
| Frenchtown borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 50.4% | 1 |
| Glen Gardner borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 50.4% | 4 |
| Hampton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 50.4% | 7 |
| High Bridge borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 50.4% | 21 |
| Holland township | Hunterdon | 3 | 59 | 0 | 31 | 90 | 50.4% | 45 |
| Kingwood township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 50.4% | 3 |
| Lambertville city | Hunterdon | 3 | 37 | 11 | 25 | 73 | 50.4% | 37 |
| Lebanon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 50.4% | 2 |
| Lebanon township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 50.4% | 2 |
| Milford borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 50.4% | 1 |
| Raritan township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 33 | 50.4% | 17 |
| Readington township | Hunterdon | 3 | 69 | 0 | 46 | 115 | 50.4% | 58 |
| Stockton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.4% | 0 |
| Tewksbury township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.4% | 0 |
| Union township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 50.4% | 1 |
| West Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.4% | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Carteret borough | Middlesex | 3 | 7 | 184 | 4 | 195 | 63.2% | 123 |
| Cranbury township | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 63.2% | 4 |
| Dunellen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 63.2% | 8 |
| East Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 16 | 48 | 45 | 109 | 63.2% | 69 |
| Edison township | Middlesex | 3 | 158 | 391 | 177 | 726 | 63.2% | 459 |
| Helmetta borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 63.2% | 5 |
| Highland Park borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 92 | 17 | 109 | 63.2% | 69 |
| Jamesburg borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 63.2% | 28 |
| Metuchen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 32 | 46 | 20 | 98 | 63.2% | 62 |
| Middlesex borough | Middlesex | 3 | 41 | 47 | 0 | 88 | 63.2% | 56 |
| Milltown borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 44 | 63.2% | 28 |
| Monroe township | Middlesex | 3 | 41 | 0 | 95 | 136 | 63.2% | 86 |
| New Brunswick city | Middlesex | 3 | 204 | 1,523 | 166 | 1,893 | 63.2% | 1,197 |
| North Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 29 | 188 | 36 | 253 | 63.2% | 160 |
| Old Bridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 74 | 148 | 41 | 263 | 63.2% | 166 |
| Perth Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 116 | 941 | 90 | 1,147 | 63.2% | 725 |
| Piscataway township | Middlesex | 3 | 96 | 222 | 58 | 376 | 63.2% | 238 |
| Plainsboro township | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 63.2% | 11 |
| Sayreville borough | Middlesex | 3 | 42 | 115 | 31 | 188 | 63.2% | 119 |
| South Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 63.2% | 32 |
| South Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 22 | 38 | 88 | 148 | 63.2% | 94 |
| South Plainfield borough | Middlesex | 3 | 34 | 48 | 12 | 94 | 63.2% | 59 |
| South River borough | Middlesex | 3 | 45 | 139 | 28 | 212 | 63.2% | 134 |
| Spotswood borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 63.2% | 13 |
| Woodbridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 38 | 452 | 47 | 537 | 63.2% | 339 |
| Bedminster township | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 59.5% | 1 |
| Bernards township | Somerset | 3 | 10 | 0 | 35 | 45 | 59.5% | 27 |
| Bernardsville borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 59.5% | 2 |
| Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 129 | 17 | 146 | 59.5% | 87 |
| Branchburg township | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 59.5% | 7 |
| Bridgewater township | Somerset | 3 | 7 | 53 | 119 | 179 | 59.5% | 107 |
| Far Hills borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 59.5% | 2 |
| Franklin township | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 86 | 54 | 140 | 59.5% | 83 |
| Green Brook township | Somerset | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 59.5% | 8 |
| Hillsborough township | Somerset | 3 | 15 | 10 | 54 | 79 | 59.5% | 47 |
| Manville borough | Somerset | 3 | 94 | 81 | 58 | 233 | 59.5% | 139 |
| Millstone borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59.5% | 0 |
| Montgomery township | Somerset | 3 | 56 | 2 | 36 | 94 | 59.5% | 56 |
| North Plainfield borough | Somerset | 3 | 58 | 362 | 72 | 492 | 59.5% | 293 |
| Peapack & Gladstone bor. | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 59.5% | 1 |
| Raritan borough | Somerset | 3 | 29 | 16 | 20 | 65 | 59.5% | 39 |
| Rocky Hill borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 59.5% | 1 |
| Somerville borough | Somerset | 3 | 33 | 86 | 39 | 158 | 59.5% | 94 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|----------------------------|----------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| South Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 50 | 19 | 43 | 112 | 59.5% | 67 |
| Warren township | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 17 | 58 | 75 | 59.5% | 45 |
| Watchung borough | Somerset | 3 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 27 | 59.5% | 16 |
| East Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 18 | 22 | 50 | 90 | 64.5% | 58 |
| Ewing township | Mercer | 4 | 26 | 103 | 29 | 158 | 64.5% | 102 |
| Hamilton township | Mercer | 4 | 193 | 342 | 114 | 649 | 64.5% | 419 |
| Hightstown borough | Mercer | 4 | 32 | 8 | 20 | 60 | 64.5% | 39 |
| Hopewell borough | Mercer | 4 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 18 | 64.5% | 12 |
| Hopewell township | Mercer | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64.5% | 0 |
| Lawrence township | Mercer | 4 | 8 | 49 | 19 | 76 | 64.5% | 49 |
| Pennington borough | Mercer | 4 | 29 | 8 | 42 | 79 | 64.5% | 51 |
| Princeton | Mercer | 4 | 20 | 78 | 37 | 135 | 64.5% | 87 |
| Robbinsville township | Mercer | 4 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 64.5% | 17 |
| Trenton city | Mercer | 4 | 186 | 1,132 | 198 | 1,516 | 64.5% | 978 |
| West Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 63 | 28 | 67 | 158 | 64.5% | 102 |
| Aberdeen township | Monmouth | 4 | 53 | 21 | 34 | 108 | 69.6% | 75 |
| Allenhurst borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 69.6% | 3 |
| Allentown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 69.6% | 8 |
| Asbury Park city | Monmouth | 4 | 60 | 333 | 38 | 431 | 69.6% | 300 |
| Atlantic Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 54 | 0 | 29 | 83 | 69.6% | 58 |
| Avon-by-the-Sea borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 69.6% | 3 |
| Belmar borough | Monmouth | 4 | 22 | 41 | 19 | 82 | 69.6% | 57 |
| Bradley Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 26 | 69.6% | 18 |
| Brielle borough | Monmouth | 4 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 69.6% | 8 |
| Colts Neck township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 69.6% | 10 |
| Deal borough | Monmouth | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 69.6% | 2 |
| Eatontown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 71 | 26 | 46 | 143 | 69.6% | 99 |
| Englishtown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 69.6% | 28 |
| Fair Haven borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Farmingdale borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 69.6% | 3 |
| Freehold borough | Monmouth | 4 | 50 | 222 | 81 | 353 | 69.6% | 246 |
| Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 46 | 2 | 59 | 107 | 69.6% | 74 |
| Hazlet township | Monmouth | 4 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 35 | 69.6% | 24 |
| Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 76 | 69.6% | 53 |
| Holmdel township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 69.6% | 31 |
| Howell township | Monmouth | 4 | 30 | 56 | 24 | 110 | 69.6% | 77 |
| Interlaken borough | Monmouth | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 69.6% | 2 |
| Keansburg borough | Monmouth | 4 | 32 | 82 | 51 | 165 | 69.6% | 115 |
| Keyport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 69.6% | 19 |
| Lake Como borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 69.6% | 8 |
| Little Silver borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 69.6% | 6 |
| Loch Arbour village | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Long Branch city | Monmouth | 4 | 38 | 364 | 70 | 472 | 69.6% | 328 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|----------------------------|----------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Manalapan township | Monmouth | 4 | 59 | 2 | 64 | 125 | 69.6% | 87 |
| Manasquan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 69.6% | 8 |
| Marlboro township | Monmouth | 4 | 52 | 0 | 78 | 130 | 69.6% | 90 |
| Matawan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 27 | 40 | 18 | 85 | 69.6% | 59 |
| Middletown township | Monmouth | 4 | 49 | 75 | 118 | 242 | 69.6% | 168 |
| Millstone township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 32 | 69.6% | 22 |
| Monmouth Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Neptune township | Monmouth | 4 | 56 | 50 | 54 | 160 | 69.6% | 111 |
| Neptune City borough | Monmouth | 4 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 69.6% | 13 |
| Ocean township | Monmouth | 4 | 27 | 62 | 22 | 111 | 69.6% | 77 |
| Oceanport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Red Bank borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 180 | 0 | 180 | 69.6% | 125 |
| Roosevelt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 69.6% | 6 |
| Rumson borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 69.6% | 21 |
| Sea Bright borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 21 | 69.6% | 15 |
| Sea Girt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Shrewsbury borough | Monmouth | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 69.6% | 8 |
| Shrewsbury township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 27 | 69.6% | 19 |
| Spring Lake borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 32 | 69.6% | 22 |
| Spring Lake Heights bor. | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 69.6% | 17 |
| Tinton Falls borough | Monmouth | 4 | 20 | 6 | 88 | 114 | 69.6% | 79 |
| Union Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 60 | 12 | 72 | 69.6% | 50 |
| Upper Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 27 | 8 | 18 | 53 | 69.6% | 37 |
| Wall township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 36 | 99 | 135 | 69.6% | 94 |
| West Long Branch borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 69.6% | 10 |
| Barnegat township | Ocean | 4 | 16 | 33 | 10 | 59 | 70.6% | 42 |
| Barnegat Light borough | Ocean | 4 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 70.6% | 10 |
| Bay Head borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 70.6% | 1 |
| Beach Haven borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 70.6% | 1 |
| Beachwood borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 70.6% | 7 |
| Berkeley township | Ocean | 4 | 57 | 10 | 42 | 109 | 70.6% | 77 |
| Brick township | Ocean | 4 | 75 | 78 | 178 | 331 | 70.6% | 234 |
| Eagleswood township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70.6% | 0 |
| Harvey Cedars borough | Ocean | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 70.6% | 1 |
| Island Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 70.6% | 2 |
| Jackson township | Ocean | 4 | 12 | 18 | 40 | 70 | 70.6% | 49 |
| Lacey township | Ocean | 4 | 35 | 18 | 29 | 82 | 70.6% | 58 |
| Lakehurst borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 20 | 70.6% | 14 |
| Lakewood township | Ocean | 4 | 123 | 387 | 168 | 678 | 70.6% | 478 |
| Lavallette borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70.6% | 0 |
| Little Egg Harbor township | Ocean | 4 | 120 | 29 | 28 | 177 | 70.6% | 125 |
| Long Beach township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 70.6% | 11 |
| Manchester township | Ocean | 4 | 100 | 2 | 56 | 158 | 70.6% | 111 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|---------------------------|------------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Mantoloking borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70.6% | 0 |
| Ocean township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 70.6% | 6 |
| Ocean Gate borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 70.6% | 9 |
| Pine Beach borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 70.6% | 2 |
| Plumsted township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 70.6% | 12 |
| Point Pleasant borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 70.6% | 11 |
| Point Pleasant Beach bor. | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 53 | 70.6% | 37 |
| Seaside Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 50 | 67 | 33 | 150 | 70.6% | 106 |
| Seaside Park borough | Ocean | 4 | 17 | 0 | 15 | 32 | 70.6% | 23 |
| Ship Bottom borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 70.6% | 2 |
| South Toms River borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 | 70.6% | 20 |
| Stafford township | Ocean | 4 | 91 | 20 | 46 | 157 | 70.6% | 111 |
| Surf City borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 70.6% | 3 |
| Toms River township | Ocean | 4 | 99 | 84 | 131 | 314 | 70.6% | 222 |
| Tuckerton borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 32 | 70.6% | 23 |
| Bass River township | Burlington | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 49.1% | 3 |
| Beverly city | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 49.1% | 3 |
| Bordentown city | Burlington | 5 | 40 | 0 | 20 | 60 | 49.1% | 29 |
| Bordentown township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 49.1% | 8 |
| Burlington city | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 63 | 2 | 65 | 49.1% | 32 |
| Burlington township | Burlington | 5 | 21 | 56 | 8 | 85 | 49.1% | 42 |
| Chesterfield township | Burlington | 5 | 24 | 0 | 12 | 36 | 49.1% | 18 |
| Cinnaminson township | Burlington | 5 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 20 | 49.1% | 10 |
| Delanco township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 49.1% | 2 |
| Delran township | Burlington | 5 | 10 | 34 | 4 | 48 | 49.1% | 24 |
| Eastampton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.1% | 0 |
| Edgewater Park township | Burlington | 5 | 46 | 8 | 18 | 72 | 49.1% | 35 |
| Evesham township | Burlington | 5 | 82 | 16 | 45 | 143 | 49.1% | 70 |
| Fieldsboro borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.1% | 0 |
| Florence township | Burlington | 5 | 81 | 28 | 38 | 147 | 49.1% | 72 |
| Hainesport township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 49.1% | 1 |
| Lumberton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 49.1% | 7 |
| Mansfield township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.1% | 0 |
| Maple Shade township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 58 | 49.1% | 28 |
| Medford township | Burlington | 5 | 12 | 1 | 21 | 34 | 49.1% | 17 |
| Medford Lakes borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.1% | 0 |
| Moorestown township | Burlington | 5 | 10 | 12 | 36 | 58 | 49.1% | 28 |
| Mount Holly township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 62 | 49.1% | 30 |
| Mount Laurel township | Burlington | 5 | 40 | 35 | 29 | 104 | 49.1% | 51 |
| New Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.1% | 0 |
| North Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 49.1% | 1 |
| Palmyra borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 17 | 3 | 20 | 49.1% | 10 |
| Pemberton borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 49.1% | 3 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|------------------------|------------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Pemberton township | Burlington | 5 | 11 | 29 | 14 | 54 | 49.1% | 27 |
| Riverside township | Burlington | 5 | 14 | 37 | 10 | 61 | 49.1% | 30 |
| Riverton borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49.1% | 0 |
| Shamong township | Burlington | 5 | 37 | 0 | 10 | 47 | 49.1% | 23 |
| Southampton township | Burlington | 5 | 34 | 0 | 14 | 48 | 49.1% | 24 |
| Springfield township | Burlington | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 49.1% | 4 |
| Tabernacle township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 49.1% | 1 |
| Washington township | Burlington | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 49.1% | 1 |
| Westampton township | Burlington | 5 | 31 | 1 | 12 | 44 | 49.1% | 22 |
| Willingboro township | Burlington | 5 | 72 | 52 | 39 | 163 | 49.1% | 80 |
| Woodland township | Burlington | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 49.1% | 3 |
| Wrightstown borough | Burlington | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 49.1% | 3 |
| Audubon borough | Camden | 5 | 33 | 10 | 27 | 70 | 60.8% | 43 |
| Audubon Park borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.8% | 0 |
| Barrington borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 60.8% | 13 |
| Bellmawr borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 60.8% | 30 |
| Berlin borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 55 | 60.8% | 33 |
| Berlin township | Camden | 5 | 23 | 27 | 0 | 50 | 60.8% | 30 |
| Brooklawn borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 60.8% | 2 |
| Camden city | Camden | 5 | 162 | 692 | 278 | 1,132 | 60.8% | 689 |
| Cherry Hill township | Camden | 5 | 12 | 95 | 294 | 401 | 60.8% | 244 |
| Chesilhurst borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 60.8% | 6 |
| Clementon borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 67 | 9 | 76 | 60.8% | 46 |
| Collingswood borough | Camden | 5 | 9 | 17 | 55 | 81 | 60.8% | 49 |
| Gibbsboro borough | Camden | 5 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 33 | 60.8% | 20 |
| Gloucester township | Camden | 5 | 56 | 52 | 50 | 158 | 60.8% | 96 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | 16 | 94 | 3 | 113 | 60.8% | 69 |
| Haddon township | Camden | 5 | 18 | 18 | 26 | 62 | 60.8% | 38 |
| Haddonfield borough | Camden | 5 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 20 | 60.8% | 12 |
| Haddon Heights borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 60.8% | 17 |
| Hi-Nella borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 60.8% | 5 |
| Laurel Springs borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 60.8% | 3 |
| Lawnside borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 60.8% | 1 |
| Lindenwold borough | Camden | 5 | 55 | 65 | 76 | 196 | 60.8% | 119 |
| Magnolia borough | Camden | 5 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 21 | 60.8% | 13 |
| Merchantville borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 60.8% | 1 |
| Mount Ephraim borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 60.8% | 2 |
| Oaklyn borough | Camden | 5 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 18 | 60.8% | 11 |
| Pennsauken township | Camden | 5 | 0 | 169 | 76 | 245 | 60.8% | 149 |
| Pine Hill borough | Camden | 5 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 25 | 60.8% | 15 |
| Pine Valley borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.8% | 0 |
| Runnemede borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 41 | 60.8% | 25 |
| Somerdale borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.8% | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/ adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|--------------------------|------------|------|---------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Stratford borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 60.8% | 15 |
| Tavistock borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.8% | 0 |
| Voorhees township | Camden | 5 | 0 | 6 | 281 | 287 | 60.8% | 175 |
| Waterford township | Camden | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 60.8% | 4 |
| Winslow township | Camden | 5 | 21 | 7 | 52 | 80 | 60.8% | 49 |
| Woodlynne borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 21 | 12 | 33 | 60.8% | 20 |
| Clayton borough | Gloucester | 5 | 39 | 5 | 21 | 65 | 69.6% | 45 |
| Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 26 | 23 | 52 | 101 | 69.6% | 70 |
| East Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 60 | 69.6% | 42 |
| Elk township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 69.6% | 6 |
| Franklin township | Gloucester | 5 | 5 | 64 | 0 | 69 | 69.6% | 48 |
| Glassboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 24 | 5 | 29 | 69.6% | 20 |
| Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 69.6% | 1 |
| Logan township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Mantua township | Gloucester | 5 | 41 | 0 | 22 | 63 | 69.6% | 44 |
| Monroe township | Gloucester | 5 | 51 | 10 | 51 | 112 | 69.6% | 78 |
| National Park borough | Gloucester | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 69.6% | 6 |
| Newfield borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 69.6% | 3 |
| Paulsboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 99 | 10 | 109 | 69.6% | 76 |
| Pitman borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 9 | 38 | 47 | 69.6% | 33 |
| South Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Swedesboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 69.6% | 18 |
| Washington township | Gloucester | 5 | 72 | 10 | 114 | 196 | 69.6% | 136 |
| Wenonah borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| West Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 5 | 24 | 3 | 32 | 69.6% | 22 |
| Westville borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 69.6% | 10 |
| Woodbury city | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 16 | 25 | 41 | 69.6% | 29 |
| Woodbury Heights borough | Gloucester | 5 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 69.6% | 8 |
| Woolwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69.6% | 0 |
| Absecon city | Atlantic | 6 | 31 | 15 | 14 | 60 | 72.5% | 43 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | 116 | 688 | 48 | 852 | 72.5% | 618 |
| Brigantine city | Atlantic | 6 | 22 | 11 | 8 | 41 | 72.5% | 30 |
| Buena borough | Atlantic | 6 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 17 | 72.5% | 12 |
| Buena Vista township | Atlantic | 6 | 47 | 8 | 17 | 72 | 72.5% | 52 |
| Corbin City | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 72.5% | 1 |
| Egg Harbor township | Atlantic | 6 | 88 | 6 | 31 | 125 | 72.5% | 91 |
| Egg Harbor City | Atlantic | 6 | 14 | 44 | 5 | 63 | 72.5% | 46 |
| Estell Manor city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72.5% | 0 |
| Folsom borough | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 72.5% | 2 |
| Galloway township | Atlantic | 6 | 124 | 18 | 50 | 192 | 72.5% | 139 |
| Hamilton township | Atlantic | 6 | 27 | 91 | 12 | 130 | 72.5% | 94 |
| Hammonton town | Atlantic | 6 | 104 | 98 | 48 | 250 | 72.5% | 181 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|--------------------------|------------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Linwood city | Atlantic | 6 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 22 | 72.5% | 16 |
| Longport borough | Atlantic | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 72.5% | 3 |
| Margate City | Atlantic | 6 | 31 | 9 | 11 | 51 | 72.5% | 37 |
| Mullica township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 72.5% | 2 |
| Northfield city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 72.5% | 7 |
| Pleasantville city | Atlantic | 6 | 56 | 196 | 35 | 287 | 72.5% | 208 |
| Port Republic city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72.5% | 0 |
| Somers Point city | Atlantic | 6 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 26 | 72.5% | 19 |
| Ventnor City | Atlantic | 6 | 12 | 33 | 17 | 62 | 72.5% | 45 |
| Weymouth township | Atlantic | 6 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 72.5% | 6 |
| Avalon borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.3% | 0 |
| Cape May city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 38.3% | 5 |
| Cape May Point borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.3% | 0 |
| Dennis township | Cape May | 6 | 35 | 2 | 82 | 119 | 38.3% | 46 |
| Lower township | Cape May | 6 | 13 | 36 | 70 | 119 | 38.3% | 46 |
| Middle township | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 2 | 124 | 126 | 38.3% | 48 |
| North Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 38.3% | 15 |
| Ocean City | Cape May | 6 | 42 | 38 | 101 | 181 | 38.3% | 69 |
| Sea Isle City | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 38.3% | 1 |
| Stone Harbor borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.3% | 0 |
| Upper township | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 38.3% | 11 |
| West Cape May borough | Cape May | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 38.3% | 2 |
| West Wildwood borough | Cape May | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 38.3% | 2 |
| Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 94 | 38.3% | 36 |
| Wildwood Crest borough | Cape May | 6 | 26 | 4 | 30 | 60 | 38.3% | 23 |
| Woodbine borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 38.3% | 3 |
| Bridgeton city | Cumberland | 6 | 53 | 344 | 91 | 488 | 65.5% | 319 |
| Commercial township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 13 | 65.5% | 9 |
| Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 65.5% | 2 |
| Downe township | Cumberland | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 65.5% | 10 |
| Fairfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 13 | 15 | 14 | 42 | 65.5% | 27 |
| Greenwich township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 65.5% | 7 |
| Hopewell township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65.5% | 0 |
| Lawrence township | Cumberland | 6 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 65.5% | 7 |
| Maurice River township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 65.5% | 5 |
| Millville city | Cumberland | 6 | 22 | 142 | 34 | 198 | 65.5% | 130 |
| Shiloh borough | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 65.5% | 2 |
| Stow Creek township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 65.5% | 1 |
| Upper Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 12 | 21 | 0 | 33 | 65.5% | 22 |
| Vineland city | Cumberland | 6 | 9 | 392 | 103 | 504 | 65.5% | 330 |
| Alloway township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53.6% | 0 |
| Carneys Point township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 26 | 36 | 62 | 53.6% | 33 |
| Elmer borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53.6% | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Inadequate Plumbing | Pre-1960 & Crowded (w/adequate plumbing) | Inadequate Kitchen (only) | Unique Deficient Units | Est. LMI Proportion | Unique Deficient LMI Units |
|---------------------------|--------|------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Elsinboro township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 53.6% | 7 |
| Lower Alloways Creek twp | Salem | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 53.6% | 4 |
| Mannington township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 53.6% | 3 |
| Oldmans township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53.6% | 0 |
| Penns Grove borough | Salem | 6 | 69 | 41 | 16 | 126 | 53.6% | 67 |
| Pennsville township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 34 | 26 | 60 | 53.6% | 32 |
| Pilesgrove township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 53.6% | 24 |
| Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 27 | 2 | 21 | 50 | 53.6% | 27 |
| Quinton township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53.6% | 0 |
| Salem city | Salem | 6 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 50 | 53.6% | 27 |
| Upper Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 53.6% | 7 |
| Woodstown borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 53.6% | 2 |



TABLE A.2: PRESENT NEED BY MUNICIPALITY

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|---------------------------|--------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Allendale borough | Bergen | 1 | 11 | 0.7 | 14 |
| Alpine borough | Bergen | 1 | 3 | 0.2 | 4 |
| Bergenfield borough | Bergen | 1 | 148 | 1.1 | 152 |
| Bogota borough | Bergen | 1 | 67 | 0.9 | 71 |
| Carlstadt borough | Bergen | 1 | 29 | 1.2 | 34 |
| Cliffside Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 154 | (2.6) | 143 |
| Closter borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | (1.6) | 0 |
| Cresskill borough | Bergen | 1 | 37 | 1.5 | 43 |
| Demarest borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Dumont borough | Bergen | 1 | 35 | 1.0 | 39 |
| East Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 160 | 6.8 | 187 |
| Edgewater borough | Bergen | 1 | 3 | (2.8) | 0 |
| Elmwood Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 62 | (4.5) | 44 |
| Emerson borough | Bergen | 1 | 41 | 3.7 | 56 |
| Englewood city | Bergen | 1 | 338 | 10.5 | 380 |
| Englewood Cliffs borough | Bergen | 1 | 1 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Fair Lawn borough | Bergen | 1 | 134 | 8.3 | 167 |
| Fairview borough | Bergen | 1 | 252 | (6.2) | 227 |
| Fort Lee borough | Bergen | 1 | 234 | 7.5 | 264 |
| Franklin Lakes borough | Bergen | 1 | 25 | 2.0 | 33 |
| Garfield city | Bergen | 1 | 164 | (8.0) | 132 |
| Glen Rock borough | Bergen | 1 | 13 | 0.5 | 15 |
| Hackensack city | Bergen | 1 | 489 | 7.7 | 520 |
| Harrington Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 4 | 0.1 | 4 |
| Hasbrouck Heights borough | Bergen | 1 | 60 | 1.9 | 68 |
| Haworth borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Hillsdale borough | Bergen | 1 | 13 | 0.3 | 14 |
| Ho-Ho-Kus borough | Bergen | 1 | 7 | 0.6 | 10 |
| Leonia borough | Bergen | 1 | 73 | 0.9 | 77 |
| Little Ferry borough | Bergen | 1 | 125 | 5.5 | 147 |
| Lodi borough | Bergen | 1 | 169 | 0.6 | 172 |
| Lyndhurst township | Bergen | 1 | 169 | 11.8 | 216 |
| Mahwah township | Bergen | 1 | 58 | 2.5 | 68 |
| Maywood borough | Bergen | 1 | 25 | 0.4 | 26 |
| Midland Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 22 | 0.9 | 26 |
| Montvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 4 | (0.5) | 2 |
| Moonachie borough | Bergen | 1 | 24 | 1.6 | 31 |
| New Milford borough | Bergen | 1 | 44 | (1.3) | 39 |
| North Arlington borough | Bergen | 1 | 131 | 8.4 | 164 |

¹¹³ As described in section 3.5, four years of annualized net change are applied to the 2009-2013 ACS calculation to extrapolate from its midpoint in 2011 to 2015.

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|----------------------------|---------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Northvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 5 | (0.5) | 3 |
| Norwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 2 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Oakland borough | Bergen | 1 | 22 | 0.8 | 25 |
| Old Tappan borough | Bergen | 1 | 10 | 0.0 | 10 |
| Oradell borough | Bergen | 1 | 11 | 0.7 | 14 |
| Palisades Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 147 | (2.8) | 136 |
| Paramus borough | Bergen | 1 | 114 | 6.7 | 141 |
| Park Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 92 | 5.8 | 115 |
| Ramsey borough | Bergen | 1 | 42 | 2.6 | 53 |
| Ridgefield borough | Bergen | 1 | 120 | 5.7 | 143 |
| Ridgefield Park village | Bergen | 1 | 141 | 3.3 | 154 |
| Ridgewood village | Bergen | 1 | 20 | (3.5) | 6 |
| River Edge borough | Bergen | 1 | 38 | 1.0 | 42 |
| River Vale township | Bergen | 1 | 15 | 1.4 | 20 |
| Rochelle Park township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | (2.1) | 0 |
| Rockleigh borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 143 | 6.7 | 170 |
| Saddle Brook township | Bergen | 1 | 37 | 0.4 | 38 |
| Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 36 | 2.4 | 45 |
| South Hackensack township | Bergen | 1 | 48 | 2.8 | 59 |
| Teaneck township | Bergen | 1 | 123 | (8.5) | 89 |
| Tenafly borough | Bergen | 1 | 30 | (1.5) | 24 |
| Teterboro borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Upper Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 6 | 0.5 | 8 |
| Waldwick borough | Bergen | 1 | 50 | 3.1 | 62 |
| Wallington borough | Bergen | 1 | 85 | 1.4 | 90 |
| Washington township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Westwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 47 | 1.4 | 52 |
| Woodcliff Lake borough | Bergen | 1 | 13 | 1.2 | 18 |
| Wood-Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | (3.7) | 0 |
| Wyckoff township | Bergen | 1 | 31 | 0.6 | 34 |
| Bayonne city | Hudson | 1 | 668 | 17.4 | 737 |
| East Newark borough | Hudson | 1 | 14 | (1.8) | 7 |
| Guttenberg town | Hudson | 1 | 57 | (2.4) | 48 |
| Harrison town | Hudson | 1 | 215 | (0.2) | 214 |
| Hoboken city | Hudson | 1 | 284 | (6.8) | 257 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | 3,919 | (45.4) | 3,738 |
| Kearny town | Hudson | 1 | 240 | (13.1) | 188 |
| North Bergen township | Hudson | 1 | 727 | (12.8) | 676 |
| Secaucus town | Hudson | 1 | 51 | (1.3) | 46 |
| Union City | Hudson | 1 | 1,670 | (54.5) | 1,452 |
| Weehawken township | Hudson | 1 | 177 | (3.5) | 163 |
| West New York town | Hudson | 1 | 845 | (52.7) | 634 |
| Bloomington borough | Passaic | 1 | 42 | 2.4 | 51 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|-------------------------|---------|------|--|---|----------------------|
| Clifton city | Passaic | 1 | 1,587 | 83.4 | 1,920 |
| Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 75 | 0.3 | 76 |
| Hawthorne borough | Passaic | 1 | 77 | 4.1 | 93 |
| Little Falls township | Passaic | 1 | 106 | 8.2 | 139 |
| North Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Passaic city | Passaic | 1 | 4,481 | 214.7 | 5,340 |
| Paterson city | Passaic | 1 | 3,487 | 40.7 | 3,650 |
| Pompton Lakes borough | Passaic | 1 | 44 | 1.3 | 49 |
| Prospect Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 42 | (1.8) | 35 |
| Ringwood borough | Passaic | 1 | 15 | (1.3) | 10 |
| Totowa borough | Passaic | 1 | 100 | 6.3 | 125 |
| Wanaque borough | Passaic | 1 | 57 | 2.6 | 68 |
| Wayne township | Passaic | 1 | 200 | 11.3 | 245 |
| West Milford township | Passaic | 1 | 67 | 0.7 | 70 |
| Woodland Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 169 | 13.7 | 224 |
| Andover borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Andover township | Sussex | 1 | 4 | 0.4 | 5 |
| Branchville borough | Sussex | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Byram township | Sussex | 1 | 21 | 0.8 | 24 |
| Frankford township | Sussex | 1 | 21 | 1.5 | 27 |
| Franklin borough | Sussex | 1 | 16 | 0.3 | 17 |
| Fredon township | Sussex | 1 | 15 | 1.4 | 20 |
| Green township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | (0.3) | 0 |
| Hamburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 9 | 0.5 | 11 |
| Hampton township | Sussex | 1 | 5 | 0.5 | 7 |
| Hardyston township | Sussex | 1 | 14 | 0.9 | 18 |
| Hopatcong borough | Sussex | 1 | 38 | 2.2 | 47 |
| Lafayette township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Montague township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | (0.6) | 0 |
| Newton town | Sussex | 1 | 116 | 8.6 | 151 |
| Ogdensburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 4 | 0.0 | 4 |
| Sandyston township | Sussex | 1 | 4 | 0.2 | 5 |
| Sparta township | Sussex | 1 | 22 | 1.3 | 27 |
| Stanhope borough | Sussex | 1 | 4 | 0.2 | 5 |
| Stillwater township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | (0.8) | 0 |
| Sussex borough | Sussex | 1 | 8 | (1.2) | 3 |
| Vernon township | Sussex | 1 | 31 | 1.5 | 37 |
| Walpack township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Wantage township | Sussex | 1 | 3 | 0.3 | 4 |
| Belleville township | Essex | 2 | 918 | 53.5 | 1,132 |
| Bloomfield township | Essex | 2 | 513 | 15.5 | 575 |
| Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 21 | (1.7) | 14 |
| Cedar Grove township | Essex | 2 | 16 | (0.4) | 15 |
| City of Orange township | Essex | 2 | 997 | 37.4 | 1,146 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|----------------------------|--------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| East Orange city | Essex | 2 | 675 | (46.7) | 488 |
| Essex Fells borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Fairfield township | Essex | 2 | 34 | 3.1 | 46 |
| Glen Ridge borough | Essex | 2 | 23 | 0.2 | 24 |
| Irvington township | Essex | 2 | 942 | (7.4) | 913 |
| Livingston township | Essex | 2 | 22 | (1.6) | 15 |
| Maplewood township | Essex | 2 | 109 | 0.0 | 109 |
| Millburn township | Essex | 2 | 112 | 6.9 | 140 |
| Montclair township | Essex | 2 | 120 | (19.0) | 44 |
| Newark city | Essex | 2 | 3,938 | (67.2) | 3,669 |
| North Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 26 | 2.4 | 35 |
| Nutley township | Essex | 2 | 310 | 22.6 | 401 |
| Roseland borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| S. Orange Village township | Essex | 2 | 5 | (3.9) | 0 |
| Verona township | Essex | 2 | 13 | (3.9) | 0 |
| West Caldwell township | Essex | 2 | 36 | 2.9 | 48 |
| West Orange township | Essex | 2 | 341 | 5.3 | 362 |
| Boonton town | Morris | 2 | 40 | 0.8 | 43 |
| Boonton township | Morris | 2 | 18 | 1.6 | 25 |
| Butler borough | Morris | 2 | 31 | 1.1 | 35 |
| Chatham borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | (1.0) | 0 |
| Chatham township | Morris | 2 | 46 | 3.3 | 59 |
| Chester borough | Morris | 2 | 10 | 0.4 | 11 |
| Chester township | Morris | 2 | 22 | 1.8 | 29 |
| Denville township | Morris | 2 | 38 | 2.1 | 46 |
| Dover town | Morris | 2 | 269 | 9.0 | 305 |
| East Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 27 | 2.5 | 37 |
| Florham Park borough | Morris | 2 | 62 | 2.6 | 73 |
| Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 24 | 1.3 | 29 |
| Harding township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Jefferson township | Morris | 2 | 53 | 4.2 | 70 |
| Kinnelon borough | Morris | 2 | 2 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Lincoln Park borough | Morris | 2 | 13 | (0.5) | 11 |
| Long Hill township | Morris | 2 | 10 | 0.9 | 14 |
| Madison borough | Morris | 2 | 17 | (2.6) | 6 |
| Mendham borough | Morris | 2 | 9 | 0.5 | 11 |
| Mendham township | Morris | 2 | 18 | 1.6 | 25 |
| Mine Hill township | Morris | 2 | 3 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Montville township | Morris | 2 | 15 | 0.8 | 18 |
| Morris township | Morris | 2 | 27 | 0.6 | 30 |
| Morris Plains borough | Morris | 2 | 26 | 2.2 | 35 |
| Morristown town | Morris | 2 | 150 | 0.0 | 150 |
| Mountain Lakes borough | Morris | 2 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Mount Arlington borough | Morris | 2 | 13 | 0.5 | 15 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|---------------------------|--------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Mount Olive township | Morris | 2 | 116 | 7.3 | 145 |
| Netcong borough | Morris | 2 | 16 | 1.0 | 20 |
| Parsippany-Troy Hills twp | Morris | 2 | 185 | 1.1 | 189 |
| Pequannock township | Morris | 2 | 59 | 5.4 | 80 |
| Randolph township | Morris | 2 | 29 | 1.0 | 33 |
| Riverdale borough | Morris | 2 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 |
| Rockaway borough | Morris | 2 | 15 | 0.7 | 18 |
| Rockaway township | Morris | 2 | 25 | 0.4 | 26 |
| Roxbury township | Morris | 2 | 24 | 0.5 | 26 |
| Victory Gardens borough | Morris | 2 | 14 | 0.2 | 15 |
| Washington township | Morris | 2 | 8 | 0.5 | 10 |
| Wharton borough | Morris | 2 | 83 | 6.2 | 108 |
| Berkeley Heights township | Union | 2 | 12 | (1.2) | 7 |
| Clark township | Union | 2 | 26 | 1.6 | 33 |
| Cranford township | Union | 2 | 76 | 2.5 | 86 |
| Elizabeth city | Union | 2 | 4,374 | 154.3 | 4,991 |
| Fanwood borough | Union | 2 | 15 | (0.2) | 14 |
| Garwood borough | Union | 2 | 29 | 1.7 | 36 |
| Hillside township | Union | 2 | 222 | 5.2 | 243 |
| Kenilworth borough | Union | 2 | 2 | (2.3) | 0 |
| Linden city | Union | 2 | 357 | 12.8 | 408 |
| Mountainside borough | Union | 2 | 95 | 6.9 | 123 |
| New Providence borough | Union | 2 | 46 | 2.5 | 56 |
| Plainfield city | Union | 2 | 841 | (6.3) | 816 |
| Rahway city | Union | 2 | 132 | (9.7) | 93 |
| Roselle borough | Union | 2 | 215 | 3.4 | 228 |
| Roselle Park borough | Union | 2 | 80 | (3.1) | 68 |
| Scotch Plains township | Union | 2 | 70 | 4.6 | 89 |
| Springfield township | Union | 2 | 2 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Summit city | Union | 2 | 128 | 5.2 | 149 |
| Union township | Union | 2 | 310 | 11.6 | 357 |
| Westfield town | Union | 2 | 57 | 2.4 | 66 |
| Winfield township | Union | 2 | 18 | 0.1 | 18 |
| Allamuchy township | Warren | 2 | 40 | 3.4 | 53 |
| Alpha borough | Warren | 2 | 10 | 0.8 | 13 |
| Belvidere town | Warren | 2 | 6 | (0.1) | 6 |
| Blairstown township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Franklin township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (0.6) | 0 |
| Frelinghuysen township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Greenwich township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (1.5) | 0 |
| Hackettstown town | Warren | 2 | 112 | 4.7 | 131 |
| Hardwick township | Warren | 2 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 |
| Harmony township | Warren | 2 | 1 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Hope township | Warren | 2 | 4 | (0.3) | 3 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|-------------------------|-----------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Independence township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (1.5) | 0 |
| Knowlton township | Warren | 2 | 11 | (0.2) | 10 |
| Liberty township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (0.7) | 0 |
| Lopatcong township | Warren | 2 | 0 | (1.0) | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Warren | 2 | 15 | 1.4 | 20 |
| Oxford township | Warren | 2 | 20 | 1.3 | 25 |
| Phillipsburg town | Warren | 2 | 151 | 6.9 | 179 |
| Pohatcong township | Warren | 2 | 6 | 0.5 | 8 |
| Washington borough | Warren | 2 | 16 | (1.8) | 9 |
| Washington township | Warren | 2 | 5 | 0.5 | 7 |
| White township | Warren | 2 | 43 | 3.9 | 59 |
| Alexandria township | Hunterdon | 3 | 17 | 1.0 | 21 |
| Bethlehem township | Hunterdon | 3 | 2 | (0.1) | 2 |
| Bloomsbury borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Califon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Clinton town | Hunterdon | 3 | 9 | 0.8 | 12 |
| Clinton township | Hunterdon | 3 | 10 | 0.1 | 10 |
| Delaware township | Hunterdon | 3 | 11 | 0.6 | 14 |
| East Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 2 | (0.3) | 1 |
| Flemington borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 36 | 2.4 | 45 |
| Franklin township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | (1.0) | 0 |
| Frenchtown borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 1 | (0.3) | 0 |
| Glen Gardner borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 4 | 0.1 | 4 |
| Hampton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 7 | 0.5 | 9 |
| High Bridge borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 21 | 1.9 | 29 |
| Holland township | Hunterdon | 3 | 45 | 2.8 | 56 |
| Kingwood township | Hunterdon | 3 | 3 | (0.3) | 2 |
| Lambertville city | Hunterdon | 3 | 37 | 1.2 | 42 |
| Lebanon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 |
| Lebanon township | Hunterdon | 3 | 2 | (0.8) | 0 |
| Milford borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 1 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Raritan township | Hunterdon | 3 | 17 | 0.7 | 20 |
| Readington township | Hunterdon | 3 | 58 | 5.3 | 79 |
| Stockton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Tewksbury township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Union township | Hunterdon | 3 | 1 | (0.1) | 1 |
| West Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Carteret borough | Middlesex | 3 | 123 | (6.9) | 95 |
| Cranbury township | Middlesex | 3 | 4 | (0.2) | 3 |
| Dunellen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 8 | (2.2) | 0 |
| East Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 69 | 2.5 | 79 |
| Edison township | Middlesex | 3 | 459 | 27.5 | 569 |
| Helmetta borough | Middlesex | 3 | 5 | 0.3 | 6 |
| Highland Park borough | Middlesex | 3 | 69 | (0.2) | 68 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|---------------------------|-----------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Jamesburg borough | Middlesex | 3 | 28 | 1.0 | 32 |
| Metuchen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 62 | 2.1 | 70 |
| Middlesex borough | Middlesex | 3 | 56 | 2.8 | 67 |
| Milltown borough | Middlesex | 3 | 28 | 1.6 | 35 |
| Monroe township | Middlesex | 3 | 86 | 1.3 | 91 |
| New Brunswick city | Middlesex | 3 | 1,197 | 35.1 | 1,337 |
| North Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 160 | 8.9 | 196 |
| Old Bridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 166 | 3.8 | 181 |
| Perth Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 725 | (25.0) | 625 |
| Piscataway township | Middlesex | 3 | 238 | 9.8 | 277 |
| Plainsboro township | Middlesex | 3 | 11 | (1.9) | 3 |
| Sayreville borough | Middlesex | 3 | 119 | 2.5 | 129 |
| South Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 32 | 0.8 | 35 |
| South Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 94 | 5.4 | 115 |
| South Plainfield borough | Middlesex | 3 | 59 | (3.5) | 45 |
| South River borough | Middlesex | 3 | 134 | 4.5 | 152 |
| Spotswood borough | Middlesex | 3 | 13 | (0.5) | 11 |
| Woodbridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 339 | 5.1 | 359 |
| Bedminster township | Somerset | 3 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Bernards township | Somerset | 3 | 27 | 1.5 | 33 |
| Bernardsville borough | Somerset | 3 | 2 | (1.1) | 0 |
| Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 87 | (7.5) | 57 |
| Branchburg township | Somerset | 3 | 7 | (1.4) | 2 |
| Bridgewater township | Somerset | 3 | 107 | 3.3 | 120 |
| Far Hills borough | Somerset | 3 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 |
| Franklin township | Somerset | 3 | 83 | (5.5) | 61 |
| Green Brook township | Somerset | 3 | 8 | 0.7 | 11 |
| Hillsborough township | Somerset | 3 | 47 | 3.0 | 59 |
| Manville borough | Somerset | 3 | 139 | 6.1 | 163 |
| Millstone borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Montgomery township | Somerset | 3 | 56 | 4.4 | 73 |
| North Plainfield borough | Somerset | 3 | 293 | 1.4 | 298 |
| Peapack & Gladstone bor. | Somerset | 3 | 1 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Raritan borough | Somerset | 3 | 39 | 0.3 | 40 |
| Rocky Hill borough | Somerset | 3 | 1 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Somerville borough | Somerset | 3 | 94 | 2.4 | 103 |
| South Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 67 | (0.3) | 66 |
| Warren township | Somerset | 3 | 45 | 3.2 | 58 |
| Watchung borough | Somerset | 3 | 16 | 0.5 | 18 |
| East Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 58 | (0.2) | 57 |
| Ewing township | Mercer | 4 | 102 | 3.2 | 115 |
| Hamilton township | Mercer | 4 | 419 | 16.4 | 484 |
| Hightstown borough | Mercer | 4 | 39 | (0.1) | 39 |
| Hopewell borough | Mercer | 4 | 12 | 1.1 | 16 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|----------------------------|----------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Hopewell township | Mercer | 4 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Lawrence township | Mercer | 4 | 49 | 1.0 | 53 |
| Pennington borough | Mercer | 4 | 51 | 4.6 | 70 |
| Princeton | Mercer | 4 | 87 | (1.7) | 80 |
| Robbinsville township | Mercer | 4 | 17 | 0.4 | 18 |
| Trenton city | Mercer | 4 | 978 | (9.5) | 940 |
| West Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 102 | 7.5 | 132 |
| Aberdeen township | Monmouth | 4 | 75 | 4.5 | 93 |
| Allenhurst borough | Monmouth | 4 | 3 | 0.2 | 4 |
| Allentown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | 0.2 | 9 |
| Asbury Park city | Monmouth | 4 | 300 | (3.2) | 287 |
| Atlantic Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 58 | 4.7 | 77 |
| Avon-by-the-Sea borough | Monmouth | 4 | 3 | (0.7) | 0 |
| Belmar borough | Monmouth | 4 | 57 | 0.6 | 60 |
| Bradley Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 18 | (0.9) | 14 |
| Brielle borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | 0.7 | 11 |
| Colts Neck township | Monmouth | 4 | 10 | 0.9 | 14 |
| Deal borough | Monmouth | 4 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 |
| Eatontown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 99 | 6.3 | 124 |
| Englishtown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 28 | (0.4) | 27 |
| Fair Haven borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | (0.3) | 0 |
| Farmingdale borough | Monmouth | 4 | 3 | (0.2) | 2 |
| Freehold borough | Monmouth | 4 | 246 | 10.2 | 287 |
| Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 74 | 4.5 | 92 |
| Hazlet township | Monmouth | 4 | 24 | 0.0 | 24 |
| Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 53 | 3.0 | 65 |
| Holmdel township | Monmouth | 4 | 31 | 1.5 | 37 |
| Howell township | Monmouth | 4 | 77 | 1.0 | 81 |
| Interlaken borough | Monmouth | 4 | 2 | 0.2 | 3 |
| Keansburg borough | Monmouth | 4 | 115 | 4.4 | 132 |
| Keyport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 19 | (0.2) | 18 |
| Lake Como borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | (1.0) | 4 |
| Little Silver borough | Monmouth | 4 | 6 | 0.5 | 8 |
| Loch Arbour village | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Long Branch city | Monmouth | 4 | 328 | 3.0 | 340 |
| Manalapan township | Monmouth | 4 | 87 | 4.9 | 107 |
| Manasquan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | (1.8) | 1 |
| Marlboro township | Monmouth | 4 | 90 | 5.5 | 112 |
| Matawan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 59 | 4.1 | 75 |
| Middletown township | Monmouth | 4 | 168 | 3.3 | 181 |
| Millstone township | Monmouth | 4 | 22 | 0.7 | 25 |
| Monmouth Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Neptune township | Monmouth | 4 | 111 | (3.9) | 95 |
| Neptune City borough | Monmouth | 4 | 13 | 0.4 | 14 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|----------------------------|----------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Ocean township | Monmouth | 4 | 77 | 2.6 | 88 |
| Oceanport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Red Bank borough | Monmouth | 4 | 125 | 4.3 | 142 |
| Roosevelt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 6 | 0.3 | 7 |
| Rumson borough | Monmouth | 4 | 21 | 1.9 | 29 |
| Sea Bright borough | Monmouth | 4 | 15 | (0.7) | 12 |
| Sea Girt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | (0.3) | 0 |
| Shrewsbury borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | 0.7 | 11 |
| Shrewsbury township | Monmouth | 4 | 19 | 1.6 | 26 |
| Spring Lake borough | Monmouth | 4 | 22 | (2.2) | 13 |
| Spring Lake Heights bor. | Monmouth | 4 | 17 | 1.1 | 21 |
| Tinton Falls borough | Monmouth | 4 | 79 | 3.7 | 94 |
| Union Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 50 | 2.7 | 61 |
| Upper Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 37 | 2.7 | 48 |
| Wall township | Monmouth | 4 | 94 | 4.7 | 113 |
| West Long Branch borough | Monmouth | 4 | 10 | 0.9 | 14 |
| Barnegat township | Ocean | 4 | 42 | 3.8 | 57 |
| Barnegat Light borough | Ocean | 4 | 10 | 0.5 | 12 |
| Bay Head borough | Ocean | 4 | 1 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Beach Haven borough | Ocean | 4 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Beachwood borough | Ocean | 4 | 7 | (1.2) | 2 |
| Berkeley township | Ocean | 4 | 77 | 1.6 | 84 |
| Brick township | Ocean | 4 | 234 | 13.4 | 287 |
| Eagleswood township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Harvey Cedars borough | Ocean | 4 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Island Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 2 | 0.2 | 3 |
| Jackson township | Ocean | 4 | 49 | 0.1 | 49 |
| Lacey township | Ocean | 4 | 58 | 3.1 | 70 |
| Lakehurst borough | Ocean | 4 | 14 | 1.1 | 18 |
| Lakewood township | Ocean | 4 | 478 | (1.6) | 471 |
| Lavallette borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Little Egg Harbor township | Ocean | 4 | 125 | 11.4 | 170 |
| Long Beach township | Ocean | 4 | 11 | 1.0 | 15 |
| Manchester township | Ocean | 4 | 111 | 7.2 | 140 |
| Mantoloking borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | (0.1) | 0 |
| Ocean township | Ocean | 4 | 6 | (0.3) | 5 |
| Ocean Gate borough | Ocean | 4 | 9 | 0.3 | 10 |
| Pine Beach borough | Ocean | 4 | 2 | 0.2 | 3 |
| Plumsted township | Ocean | 4 | 12 | 0.3 | 13 |
| Point Pleasant borough | Ocean | 4 | 11 | (0.5) | 9 |
| Point Pleasant Beach bor. | Ocean | 4 | 37 | (1.6) | 30 |
| Seaside Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 106 | 7.8 | 137 |
| Seaside Park borough | Ocean | 4 | 23 | 1.2 | 28 |
| Ship Bottom borough | Ocean | 4 | 2 | (0.5) | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|--------------------------|------------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| South Toms River borough | Ocean | 4 | 20 | 1.5 | 26 |
| Stafford township | Ocean | 4 | 111 | 8.2 | 144 |
| Surf City borough | Ocean | 4 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 |
| Toms River township | Ocean | 4 | 222 | 11.7 | 269 |
| Tuckerton borough | Ocean | 4 | 23 | 1.6 | 30 |
| Bass River township | Burlington | 5 | 3 | (0.9) | 0 |
| Beverly city | Burlington | 5 | 3 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Bordentown city | Burlington | 5 | 29 | 2.2 | 38 |
| Bordentown township | Burlington | 5 | 8 | (1.2) | 3 |
| Burlington city | Burlington | 5 | 32 | (2.8) | 21 |
| Burlington township | Burlington | 5 | 42 | (1.7) | 35 |
| Chesterfield township | Burlington | 5 | 18 | 1.6 | 25 |
| Cinnaminson township | Burlington | 5 | 10 | 0.5 | 12 |
| Delanco township | Burlington | 5 | 2 | (0.4) | 1 |
| Delran township | Burlington | 5 | 24 | 0.0 | 24 |
| Eastampton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | (1.5) | 0 |
| Edgewater Park township | Burlington | 5 | 35 | 2.1 | 43 |
| Evesham township | Burlington | 5 | 70 | 5.9 | 94 |
| Fieldsboro borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | (0.3) | 0 |
| Florence township | Burlington | 5 | 72 | 3.4 | 85 |
| Hainesport township | Burlington | 5 | 1 | (0.7) | 0 |
| Lumberton township | Burlington | 5 | 7 | (3.5) | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Maple Shade township | Burlington | 5 | 28 | (1.4) | 23 |
| Medford township | Burlington | 5 | 17 | 0.4 | 18 |
| Medford Lakes borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Moorestown township | Burlington | 5 | 28 | 1.0 | 32 |
| Mount Holly township | Burlington | 5 | 30 | (3.0) | 18 |
| Mount Laurel township | Burlington | 5 | 51 | 2.1 | 59 |
| New Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | (0.8) | 0 |
| North Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 1 | (1.4) | 0 |
| Palmyra borough | Burlington | 5 | 10 | (0.7) | 7 |
| Pemberton borough | Burlington | 5 | 3 | (0.9) | 0 |
| Pemberton township | Burlington | 5 | 27 | (4.6) | 8 |
| Riverside township | Burlington | 5 | 30 | (0.9) | 26 |
| Riverton borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | (1.5) | 0 |
| Shamong township | Burlington | 5 | 23 | 1.5 | 29 |
| Southampton township | Burlington | 5 | 24 | 1.7 | 31 |
| Springfield township | Burlington | 5 | 4 | 0.1 | 4 |
| Tabernacle township | Burlington | 5 | 1 | (0.7) | 0 |
| Washington township | Burlington | 5 | 1 | 0.1 | 1 |
| Westampton township | Burlington | 5 | 22 | 0.8 | 25 |
| Willingboro township | Burlington | 5 | 80 | 3.2 | 93 |
| Woodland township | Burlington | 5 | 3 | (0.3) | 2 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|-------------------------|------------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Wrightstown borough | Burlington | 5 | 3 | (0.1) | 3 |
| Audubon borough | Camden | 5 | 43 | 2.5 | 53 |
| Audubon Park borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Barrington borough | Camden | 5 | 13 | 1.0 | 17 |
| Bellmawr borough | Camden | 5 | 30 | (1.2) | 25 |
| Berlin borough | Camden | 5 | 33 | 0.9 | 37 |
| Berlin township | Camden | 5 | 30 | 2.4 | 39 |
| Brooklawn borough | Camden | 5 | 2 | (0.6) | 0 |
| Camden city | Camden | 5 | 689 | (91.0) | 325 |
| Cherry Hill township | Camden | 5 | 244 | 8.1 | 276 |
| Chesilhurst borough | Camden | 5 | 6 | 0.5 | 8 |
| Clementon borough | Camden | 5 | 46 | 1.3 | 51 |
| Collingswood borough | Camden | 5 | 49 | (2.3) | 40 |
| Gibbsboro borough | Camden | 5 | 20 | 0.2 | 21 |
| Gloucester township | Camden | 5 | 96 | 0.5 | 98 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | 69 | 0.9 | 73 |
| Haddon township | Camden | 5 | 38 | 0.2 | 39 |
| Haddonfield borough | Camden | 5 | 12 | (1.2) | 7 |
| Haddon Heights borough | Camden | 5 | 17 | (0.5) | 15 |
| Hi-Nella borough | Camden | 5 | 5 | 0.1 | 5 |
| Laurel Springs borough | Camden | 5 | 3 | (0.2) | 2 |
| Lawnside borough | Camden | 5 | 1 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Lindenwold borough | Camden | 5 | 119 | 4.8 | 138 |
| Magnolia borough | Camden | 5 | 13 | 0.5 | 15 |
| Merchantville borough | Camden | 5 | 1 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Mount Ephraim borough | Camden | 5 | 2 | (0.4) | 1 |
| Oaklyn borough | Camden | 5 | 11 | (0.3) | 10 |
| Pennsauken township | Camden | 5 | 149 | (3.1) | 137 |
| Pine Hill borough | Camden | 5 | 15 | (1.6) | 8 |
| Pine Valley borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Runnemede borough | Camden | 5 | 25 | 0.6 | 28 |
| Somerdale borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Stratford borough | Camden | 5 | 15 | (0.7) | 12 |
| Tavistock borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Voorhees township | Camden | 5 | 175 | 7.5 | 205 |
| Waterford township | Camden | 5 | 4 | (2.9) | 0 |
| Winslow township | Camden | 5 | 49 | (2.0) | 41 |
| Woodlynne borough | Camden | 5 | 20 | (0.9) | 16 |
| Clayton borough | Gloucester | 5 | 45 | (0.3) | 44 |
| Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 70 | 4.6 | 89 |
| East Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 42 | 2.9 | 54 |
| Elk township | Gloucester | 5 | 6 | (0.1) | 6 |
| Franklin township | Gloucester | 5 | 48 | 1.0 | 52 |
| Glassboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 20 | (1.8) | 13 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|--------------------------|------------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | (1.3) | 0 |
| Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 1 | (0.8) | 0 |
| Logan township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Mantua township | Gloucester | 5 | 44 | 3.3 | 57 |
| Monroe township | Gloucester | 5 | 78 | 3.4 | 91 |
| National Park borough | Gloucester | 5 | 6 | 0.0 | 6 |
| Newfield borough | Gloucester | 5 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 |
| Paulsboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 76 | 4.3 | 93 |
| Pitman borough | Gloucester | 5 | 33 | 1.1 | 37 |
| South Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Swedesboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 18 | 1.0 | 22 |
| Washington township | Gloucester | 5 | 136 | 9.8 | 175 |
| Wenonah borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| West Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 22 | (1.8) | 15 |
| Westville borough | Gloucester | 5 | 10 | (2.5) | 0 |
| Woodbury city | Gloucester | 5 | 29 | (2.9) | 17 |
| Woodbury Heights borough | Gloucester | 5 | 8 | 0.0 | 8 |
| Woolwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | (0.3) | 0 |
| Absecon city | Atlantic | 6 | 43 | 1.9 | 51 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | 618 | 3.9 | 634 |
| Brigantine city | Atlantic | 6 | 30 | 2.1 | 38 |
| Buena borough | Atlantic | 6 | 12 | (1.3) | 7 |
| Buena Vista township | Atlantic | 6 | 52 | 3.7 | 67 |
| Corbin City | Atlantic | 6 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 |
| Egg Harbor township | Atlantic | 6 | 91 | 2.5 | 101 |
| Egg Harbor City | Atlantic | 6 | 46 | 1.5 | 52 |
| Estell Manor city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Folsom borough | Atlantic | 6 | 2 | (0.2) | 1 |
| Galloway township | Atlantic | 6 | 139 | 9.7 | 178 |
| Hamilton township | Atlantic | 6 | 94 | 5.2 | 115 |
| Hammonton town | Atlantic | 6 | 181 | 10.5 | 223 |
| Linwood city | Atlantic | 6 | 16 | (2.3) | 7 |
| Longport borough | Atlantic | 6 | 3 | 0.1 | 3 |
| Margate City | Atlantic | 6 | 37 | 3.2 | 50 |
| Mullica township | Atlantic | 6 | 2 | (1.7) | 0 |
| Northfield city | Atlantic | 6 | 7 | (0.3) | 6 |
| Pleasantville city | Atlantic | 6 | 208 | 12.2 | 257 |
| Port Republic city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Somers Point city | Atlantic | 6 | 19 | 0.0 | 19 |
| Ventnor City | Atlantic | 6 | 45 | (4.7) | 26 |
| Weymouth township | Atlantic | 6 | 6 | 0.0 | 6 |
| Avalon borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Cape May city | Cape May | 6 | 5 | (0.1) | 5 |
| Cape May Point borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Unique Deficient LMI Units 2009-13 | Annualized Net Change ¹¹³ | Present Need 2015 |
|---------------------------|------------|------|--|--|----------------------|
| Dennis township | Cape May | 6 | 46 | 3.3 | 59 |
| Lower township | Cape May | 6 | 46 | (0.4) | 45 |
| Middle township | Cape May | 6 | 48 | 2.4 | 57 |
| North Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 15 | 0.2 | 16 |
| Ocean City | Cape May | 6 | 69 | (2.0) | 61 |
| Sea Isle City | Cape May | 6 | 1 | (0.2) | 0 |
| Stone Harbor borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Upper township | Cape May | 6 | 11 | 0.0 | 11 |
| West Cape May borough | Cape May | 6 | 2 | (0.5) | 0 |
| West Wildwood borough | Cape May | 6 | 2 | 0.2 | 3 |
| Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 36 | (4.0) | 20 |
| Wildwood Crest borough | Cape May | 6 | 23 | 1.9 | 31 |
| Woodbine borough | Cape May | 6 | 3 | (0.9) | 0 |
| Bridgeton city | Cumberland | 6 | 319 | 8.2 | 352 |
| Commercial township | Cumberland | 6 | 9 | 0.5 | 11 |
| Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 2 | (1.5) | 0 |
| Downe township | Cumberland | 6 | 10 | (0.1) | 10 |
| Fairfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 27 | 2.2 | 36 |
| Greenwich township | Cumberland | 6 | 7 | 0.6 | 10 |
| Hopewell township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| Lawrence township | Cumberland | 6 | 7 | 0.1 | 7 |
| Maurice River township | Cumberland | 6 | 5 | 0.0 | 5 |
| Millville city | Cumberland | 6 | 130 | 2.3 | 139 |
| Shiloh borough | Cumberland | 6 | 2 | 0.2 | 3 |
| Stow Creek township | Cumberland | 6 | 1 | (0.4) | 0 |
| Upper Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 22 | 0.5 | 24 |
| Vineland city | Cumberland | 6 | 330 | (3.8) | 315 |
| Alloway township | Salem | 6 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Carneys Point township | Salem | 6 | 33 | 1.6 | 40 |
| Elmer borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Elsinboro township | Salem | 6 | 7 | 0.6 | 10 |
| Lower Alloways Creek twp | Salem | 6 | 4 | (0.3) | 3 |
| Mannington township | Salem | 6 | 3 | (0.4) | 2 |
| Oldmans township | Salem | 6 | 0 | (0.5) | 0 |
| Penns Grove borough | Salem | 6 | 67 | 1.8 | 74 |
| Pennsville township | Salem | 6 | 32 | 1.8 | 39 |
| Pilesgrove township | Salem | 6 | 24 | 1.8 | 31 |
| Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 27 | 1.0 | 31 |
| Quinton township | Salem | 6 | 0 | (0.6) | 0 |
| Salem city | Salem | 6 | 27 | (1.8) | 20 |
| Upper Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 7 | 0.4 | 8 |
| Woodstown borough | Salem | 6 | 2 | (0.8) | 0 |

APPENDIX B: MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION OF REGIONAL PROSPECTIVE NEED

TABLE B.1: QUALIFICATION OF URBAN AID MUNICIPALITIES

| Municipality | County | Region | Housing Deficiency > Region | Pop Density 10,000+ per Sq Mile | Pop Density 6,000 – 10,000 & Vacant Land <5% | Qualifying |
|----------------------|------------|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|------------|
| Asbury Park City | Monmouth | 4 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Bayonne City | Hudson | 1 | N | Y | N | Y |
| Belleville Township | Essex | 2 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Bloomfield Township | Essex | 2 | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Brick Township | Ocean | 4 | N | N | N | N |
| Bridgeton City | Cumberland | 6 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Camden City | Camden | 5 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Carteret Borough | Middlesex | 3 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Clifton City | Passaic | 1 | Y | N | Y | Y |
| East Orange City | Essex | 2 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Elizabeth City | Union | 2 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Garfield City | Bergen | 1 | N | Y | N | Y |
| Glassboro Borough | Gloucester | 5 | N | N | N | N |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Gloucester Township | Camden | 5 | N | N | N | N |
| Hackensack City | Bergen | 1 | N | Y | N | Y |
| Hillside Township | Union | 2 | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Hoboken City | Hudson | 1 | N | Y | N | Y |
| Irvington Township | Essex | 2 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Kearny Town | Hudson | 1 | N | N | N | N |
| Lakewood Township | Ocean | 4 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Lindenwold Borough | Camden | 5 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Lodi Borough | Bergen | 1 | N | Y | N | Y |
| Long Branch City | Monmouth | 4 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Millville City | Cumberland | 6 | N | N | N | N |
| Monroe Township | Gloucester | 5 | N | N | N | N |
| Montclair Township | Essex | 2 | N | N | Y | Y |
| Mount Holly Township | Burlington | 5 | Y | N | N | Y |

| Municipality | County | Region | Housing Deficiency > Region | Pop Density 10,000+ per Sq Mile | Pop Density 6,000 – 10,000 & Vacant Land <5% | Qualifying |
|-----------------------|------------|--------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|------------|
| Neptune City Borough | Monmouth | 4 | N | N | N | N |
| Neptune Township | Monmouth | 4 | N | N | N | N |
| New Brunswick City | Middlesex | 3 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Newark City | Essex | 2 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| North Bergen Township | Hudson | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Old Bridge Township | Middlesex | 3 | N | N | N | N |
| Orange City | Essex | 2 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Passaic City | Passaic | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Paterson City | Passaic | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Pemberton Township | Burlington | 5 | N | N | N | N |
| Penns Grove Borough | Salem | 6 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Pennsauken Township | Camden | 5 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Perth Amboy City | Middlesex | 3 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Phillipsburg Town | Warren | 2 | N | N | N | N |
| Plainfield City | Union | 2 | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Pleasantville City | Atlantic | 6 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Rahway City | Union | 2 | N | N | Y | Y |
| Roselle Borough | Union | 2 | N | N | Y | Y |
| Salem City | Salem | 6 | N | N | N | N |
| Trenton City | Mercer | 4 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Union City | Hudson | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Vineland City | Cumberland | 6 | Y | N | N | Y |
| Weehawken Township | Hudson | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| West New York Town | Hudson | 1 | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Willingboro Township | Burlington | 5 | N | N | N | N |
| Winslow Township | Camden | 5 | N | N | N | N |
| Woodbridge Township | Middlesex | 3 | N | N | N | N |
| Woodbury City | Gloucester | 5 | N | N | N | N |

TABLE B.2: MUNICIPAL ALLOCATION OF REGIONAL PROSPECTIVE NEED

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Allendale borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.65% | 0.00% | 1.27% | 0.75% | 0.66% | 119 |
| Alpine borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.08% | 0.58% | 1.20% | 1.39% | 0.81% | 145 |
| Bergenfield borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.69% | 0.62% | 1.05% | 0.17% | 0.63% | 113 |
| Bogota borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.19% | 0.00% | 0.52% | 0.10% | 0.20% | 36 |
| Carlstadt borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 2.36% | 0.00% | 0.35% | 0.07% | 0.69% | 125 |
| Cliffside Park borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.45% | 0.00% | 0.74% | 0.14% | 0.33% | 59 |
| Closter borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.53% | 0.00% | 1.20% | 0.66% | 0.60% | 107 |
| Cresskill borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.66% | 4.87% | 1.08% | 0.41% | 1.76% | 315 |
| Demarest borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.13% | 0.01% | 1.31% | 0.42% | 0.47% | 84 |
| Dumont borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.38% | 1.33% | 0.96% | 0.08% | 0.69% | 123 |
| East Rutherford borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.52% | 0.00% | 0.46% | 0.63% | 0.65% | 117 |
| Edgewater borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.83% | 4.23% | 1.35% | 0.72% | 1.78% | 320 |
| Elmwood Park borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.53% | 2.21% | 0.52% | 0.43% | 1.17% | 210 |
| Emerson borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.40% | 0.00% | 0.82% | 1.43% | 0.66% | 119 |
| Englewood city | Bergen | 17,931 | 2.72% | 0.00% | 1.37% | 1.24% | 1.34% | 239 |
| Englewood Cliffs borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.60% | 2.12% | 1.13% | 0.94% | 1.45% | 260 |
| Fair Lawn borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 2.30% | 3.08% | 1.78% | 0.83% | 2.00% | 358 |
| Fairview borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.42% | 0.00% | 0.15% | 0.22% | 0.20% | 35 |
| Fort Lee borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 2.26% | 0.00% | 1.57% | 0.35% | 1.05% | 187 |
| Franklin Lakes borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.38% | 0.00% | 2.24% | 4.37% | 2.00% | 358 |
| Garfield city | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Glen Rock borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.60% | 0.00% | 2.12% | 0.36% | 0.77% | 138 |
| Hackensack city | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Harrington Park borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.21% | 0.58% | 1.17% | 1.07% | 0.76% | 136 |
| Hasbrouck Heights borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.19% | 6.45% | 0.84% | 0.23% | 2.18% | 391 |
| Haworth borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.13% | 0.00% | 1.09% | 0.43% | 0.41% | 74 |
| Hillsdale borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.38% | 0.00% | 1.15% | 1.40% | 0.73% | 131 |
| Ho-Ho-Kus borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.18% | 0.00% | 1.56% | 0.60% | 0.59% | 105 |
| Leonia borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.43% | 0.92% | 0.71% | 0.10% | 0.54% | 97 |
| Little Ferry borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.59% | 0.00% | 0.47% | 0.40% | 0.37% | 66 |
| Lodi borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Lyndhurst township | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.97% | 0.00% | 0.74% | 1.13% | 0.96% | 173 |
| Mahwah township | Bergen | 17,931 | 2.92% | 0.00% | 1.92% | 2.16% | 1.75% | 314 |
| Maywood borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.56% | 0.00% | 0.68% | 0.39% | 0.41% | 73 |
| Midland Park borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.60% | 0.00% | 0.65% | 0.12% | 0.34% | 61 |
| Montvale borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.93% | 2.40% | 1.03% | 2.37% | 1.93% | 346 |
| Moonachie borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.46% | 0.00% | 0.12% | 0.12% | 0.43% | 76 |
| New Milford borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.39% | 1.02% | 0.77% | 0.11% | 0.57% | 103 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| North Arlington borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.64% | 0.33% | 0.68% | 0.43% | 0.52% | 93 |
| Northvale borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.64% | 0.00% | 0.51% | 0.24% | 0.35% | 62 |
| Norwood borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.33% | 0.00% | 0.73% | 0.57% | 0.41% | 73 |
| Oakland borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.95% | 0.00% | 1.28% | 0.45% | 0.67% | 121 |
| Old Tappan borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.39% | 3.22% | 1.13% | 0.98% | 1.43% | 256 |
| Oradell borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.57% | 0.00% | 1.60% | 0.08% | 0.56% | 101 |
| Palisades Park borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.58% | 0.00% | 0.47% | 0.21% | 0.31% | 56 |
| Paramus borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 7.72% | 0.00% | 1.68% | 2.97% | 3.09% | 554 |
| Park Ridge borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.64% | 0.50% | 1.02% | 0.40% | 0.64% | 115 |
| Ramsey borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.87% | 0.00% | 1.81% | 1.28% | 1.24% | 222 |
| Ridgefield borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.84% | 0.00% | 0.44% | 0.78% | 0.51% | 92 |
| Ridgefield Park village | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.74% | 0.00% | 0.43% | 0.34% | 0.38% | 68 |
| Ridgewood village | Bergen | 17,931 | 2.14% | 1.12% | 3.30% | 1.16% | 1.93% | 346 |
| River Edge borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.66% | 1.90% | 0.99% | 0.11% | 0.92% | 164 |
| River Vale township | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.27% | 0.00% | 1.43% | 0.85% | 0.64% | 114 |
| Rochelle Park township | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.83% | 0.00% | 0.41% | 0.10% | 0.34% | 60 |
| Rockleigh borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.34% | 2.97% | 1.31% | 0.21% | 1.20% | 216 |
| Rutherford borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.29% | 3.21% | 1.07% | 0.12% | 1.42% | 255 |
| Saddle Brook township | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.69% | 0.00% | 0.69% | 0.60% | 0.74% | 133 |
| Saddle River borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.17% | 1.46% | 1.04% | 3.58% | 1.56% | 280 |
| South Hackensack township | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.93% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 0.15% | 0.34% | 60 |
| Teaneck township | Bergen | 17,931 | 3.15% | 14.83% | 2.04% | 0.38% | 5.10% | 915 |
| Tenafly borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.70% | 0.00% | 2.24% | 0.61% | 0.89% | 159 |
| Teterboro borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 1.28% | 0.95% | 0.37% | 0.01% | 0.65% | 117 |
| Upper Saddle River borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.85% | 2.66% | 2.19% | 0.85% | 1.64% | 293 |
| Waldwick borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.51% | 0.10% | 1.03% | 0.51% | 0.54% | 96 |
| Wallington borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.41% | 0.00% | 0.20% | 0.20% | 0.20% | 36 |
| Washington township | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.28% | 3.24% | 1.22% | 0.77% | 1.38% | 247 |
| Westwood borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.70% | 0.00% | 0.73% | 0.51% | 0.49% | 87 |
| Woodcliff Lake borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.92% | 2.35% | 1.25% | 1.76% | 1.57% | 281 |
| Wood-Ridge borough | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.39% | 0.00% | 0.75% | 0.06% | 0.30% | 54 |
| Wyckoff township | Bergen | 17,931 | 0.95% | 0.00% | 2.42% | 2.18% | 1.39% | 248 |
| Bayonne city | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| East Newark borough | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.10% | 0.07% | 0.05% | 9 |
| Guttenberg town | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.18% | 0.00% | 0.29% | 0.15% | 0.16% | 28 |
| Harrison town | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.83% | 3.09% | 0.20% | 0.17% | 1.07% | 192 |
| Hoboken city | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Kearny town | Hudson | 17,931 | 2.36% | 0.00% | 0.69% | 2.97% | 1.51% | 270 |
| North Bergen township | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|-------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Secaucus town | Hudson | 17,931 | 6.62% | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.07% | 1.92% | 345 |
| Union City | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Weehawken township | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| West New York town | Hudson | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Bloomingtondale borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.21% | 0.00% | 0.43% | 0.35% | 0.25% | 45 |
| Clifton city | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Haledon borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.24% | 0.00% | 0.26% | 0.52% | 0.25% | 46 |
| Hawthorne borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 1.09% | 0.00% | 0.89% | 1.10% | 0.77% | 138 |
| Little Falls township | Passaic | 17,931 | 1.14% | 0.00% | 0.59% | 1.89% | 0.91% | 162 |
| North Haledon borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.28% | 0.30% | 0.86% | 1.94% | 0.84% | 151 |
| Passaic city | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Paterson city | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Pompton Lakes borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.36% | 0.00% | 0.76% | 0.46% | 0.39% | 70 |
| Prospect Park borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.10% | 0.45% | 0.18% | 0.62% | 0.34% | 61 |
| Ringwood borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.37% | 0.00% | 0.99% | 0.00% | 0.34% | 61 |
| Totowa borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 2.28% | 0.00% | 0.61% | 2.39% | 1.32% | 236 |
| Wanaque borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.38% | 0.98% | 0.73% | 0.65% | 0.69% | 123 |
| Wayne township | Passaic | 17,931 | 6.65% | 0.00% | 3.07% | 10.94% | 5.17% | 926 |
| West Milford township | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.70% | 0.00% | 1.39% | 0.00% | 0.52% | 94 |
| Woodland Park borough | Passaic | 17,931 | 0.82% | 0.58% | 0.62% | 2.10% | 1.03% | 185 |
| Andover borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.03% | 0.03% | 0.37% | 0.00% | 0.11% | 19 |
| Andover township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.57% | 6.02% | 0.84% | 0.00% | 1.86% | 333 |
| Branchville borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.27% | 4.30% | 0.23% | 0.00% | 1.20% | 215 |
| Byram township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.23% | 1.57% | 0.89% | 0.00% | 0.67% | 121 |
| Frankford township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.26% | 0.00% | 0.71% | 0.00% | 0.24% | 44 |
| Franklin borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.19% | 0.13% | 0.23% | 2.23% | 0.69% | 125 |
| Fredon township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.13% | 1.83% | 0.73% | 0.00% | 0.67% | 121 |
| Green township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.83% | 0.46% | 0.34% | 61 |
| Hamburg borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.13% | 0.00% | 0.26% | 1.31% | 0.42% | 76 |
| Hampton township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.37% | 0.00% | 0.49% | 0.00% | 0.22% | 39 |
| Hardyston township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.46% | 3.61% | 0.68% | 9.34% | 3.52% | 631 |
| Hopatcong borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.22% | 0.85% | 0.91% | 1.09% | 0.77% | 138 |
| Lafayette township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.22% | 1.46% | 0.59% | 0.00% | 0.57% | 102 |
| Montague township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.12% | 1.37% | 0.23% | 0.00% | 0.43% | 77 |
| Newton town | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.63% | 0.00% | 0.12% | 0.00% | 0.19% | 34 |
| Ogdensburg borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 0.04% | 0.11% | 20 |
| Sandyston township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.08% | 0.64% | 0.35% | 0.00% | 0.27% | 48 |
| Sparta township | Sussex | 17,931 | 1.02% | 0.00% | 1.95% | 4.63% | 1.90% | 340 |
| Stanhope borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.23% | 0.00% | 0.50% | 0.15% | 0.22% | 40 |
| Stillwater township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.11% | 0.81% | 0.47% | 0.00% | 0.35% | 62 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Sussex borough | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.08% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.02% | 4 |
| Vernon township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.62% | 2.70% | 1.00% | 4.55% | 2.22% | 398 |
| Walpack township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.00% | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1 |
| Wantage township | Sussex | 17,931 | 0.33% | 0.00% | 0.78% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 50 |
| Belleville township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Bloomfield township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Caldwell borough | Essex | 12,353 | 0.38% | 0.00% | 0.51% | 0.04% | 0.23% | 29 |
| Cedar Grove township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.88% | 0.00% | 1.00% | 1.56% | 0.86% | 106 |
| City of Orange township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| East Orange city | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Essex Fells borough | Essex | 12,353 | 0.04% | 0.05% | 1.44% | 0.17% | 0.43% | 53 |
| Fairfield township | Essex | 12,353 | 3.71% | 0.00% | 0.82% | 1.41% | 1.48% | 183 |
| Glen Ridge borough | Essex | 12,353 | 0.19% | 0.07% | 1.83% | 0.02% | 0.53% | 65 |
| Irvington township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Livingston township | Essex | 12,353 | 3.98% | 0.00% | 2.80% | 2.03% | 2.20% | 272 |
| Maplewood township | Essex | 12,353 | 1.08% | 0.35% | 1.92% | 0.13% | 0.87% | 107 |
| Millburn township | Essex | 12,353 | 2.85% | 6.52% | 3.38% | 0.47% | 3.30% | 408 |
| Montclair township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Newark city | Essex | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| North Caldwell borough | Essex | 12,353 | 0.19% | 0.99% | 2.13% | 0.42% | 0.93% | 115 |
| Nutley township | Essex | 12,353 | 1.17% | 0.00% | 1.18% | 0.48% | 0.71% | 87 |
| Roseland borough | Essex | 12,353 | 1.91% | 0.00% | 0.98% | 0.39% | 0.82% | 101 |
| S. Orange Village township | Essex | 12,353 | 1.17% | 10.50% | 1.63% | 0.22% | 3.38% | 418 |
| Verona township | Essex | 12,353 | 0.69% | 0.00% | 1.20% | 0.46% | 0.59% | 73 |
| West Caldwell township | Essex | 12,353 | 1.57% | 1.05% | 0.95% | 0.51% | 1.02% | 126 |
| West Orange township | Essex | 12,353 | 2.46% | 0.00% | 2.15% | 5.93% | 2.63% | 325 |
| Boonton town | Morris | 12,353 | 0.52% | 0.00% | 0.68% | 0.36% | 0.39% | 48 |
| Boonton township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.14% | 0.12% | 0.94% | 0.99% | 0.55% | 68 |
| Butler borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.59% | 0.71% | 0.58% | 0.49% | 0.59% | 73 |
| Chatham borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.67% | 0.00% | 1.70% | 0.58% | 0.74% | 91 |
| Chatham township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.67% | 5.84% | 1.94% | 1.53% | 2.50% | 308 |
| Chester borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.32% | 1.43% | 0.63% | 0.28% | 0.66% | 82 |
| Chester township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.32% | 0.00% | 1.92% | 0.20% | 0.61% | 75 |
| Denville township | Morris | 12,353 | 1.59% | 0.54% | 1.40% | 1.71% | 1.31% | 162 |
| Dover town | Morris | 12,353 | 1.01% | 0.00% | 0.25% | 0.28% | 0.38% | 47 |
| East Hanover township | Morris | 12,353 | 2.90% | 0.08% | 1.10% | 1.35% | 1.36% | 168 |
| Florham Park borough | Morris | 12,353 | 3.54% | 16.57% | 1.24% | 4.97% | 6.58% | 813 |
| Hanover township | Morris | 12,353 | 2.78% | 0.00% | 1.19% | 3.69% | 1.92% | 237 |
| Harding township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.33% | 2.15% | 1.78% | 0.68% | 1.24% | 153 |
| Jefferson township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.69% | 2.84% | 1.14% | 0.05% | 1.18% | 146 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Kinnelon borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.27% | 1.21% | 1.46% | 0.00% | 0.74% | 91 |
| Lincoln Park borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.57% | 0.46% | 0.63% | 3.18% | 1.21% | 149 |
| Long Hill township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.49% | 0.00% | 1.05% | 0.02% | 0.39% | 48 |
| Madison borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.84% | 0.00% | 1.62% | 0.79% | 0.81% | 100 |
| Mendham borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.28% | 0.00% | 1.09% | 1.11% | 0.62% | 76 |
| Mendham township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.17% | 0.86% | 1.85% | 0.77% | 0.92% | 113 |
| Mine Hill township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.11% | 0.72% | 0.57% | 0.87% | 0.57% | 70 |
| Montville township | Morris | 12,353 | 1.63% | 0.00% | 1.90% | 1.62% | 1.29% | 159 |
| Morris township | Morris | 12,353 | 2.36% | 8.26% | 2.45% | 4.95% | 4.50% | 556 |
| Morris Plains borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.63% | 0.00% | 0.89% | 0.57% | 0.52% | 65 |
| Morristown town | Morris | 12,353 | 3.22% | 0.00% | 0.77% | 0.75% | 1.18% | 146 |
| Mountain Lakes borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.41% | 0.00% | 1.60% | 0.11% | 0.53% | 65 |
| Mount Arlington borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.28% | 1.19% | 0.54% | 0.20% | 0.55% | 68 |
| Mount Olive township | Morris | 12,353 | 1.96% | 5.64% | 1.27% | 3.51% | 3.10% | 382 |
| Netcong borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.27% | 0.00% | 0.10% | 0.16% | 0.13% | 16 |
| Parsippany-Troy Hills twp | Morris | 12,353 | 9.64% | 0.00% | 2.06% | 6.17% | 4.47% | 552 |
| Pequannock township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.88% | 0.00% | 0.92% | 1.09% | 0.72% | 89 |
| Randolph township | Morris | 12,353 | 1.38% | 1.17% | 2.30% | 1.84% | 1.67% | 206 |
| Riverdale borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.62% | 2.47% | 0.52% | 1.32% | 1.23% | 152 |
| Rockaway borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.69% | 1.56% | 0.50% | 0.24% | 0.75% | 92 |
| Rockaway township | Morris | 12,353 | 1.79% | 2.90% | 1.54% | 2.43% | 2.17% | 268 |
| Roxbury township | Morris | 12,353 | 1.37% | 0.00% | 1.37% | 2.95% | 1.42% | 176 |
| Victory Gardens borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.05% | 0.06% | 0.04% | 4 |
| Washington township | Morris | 12,353 | 0.66% | 1.16% | 1.75% | 0.19% | 0.94% | 116 |
| Wharton borough | Morris | 12,353 | 0.48% | 1.92% | 0.37% | 0.42% | 0.80% | 99 |
| Berkeley Heights township | Union | 12,353 | 1.37% | 5.89% | 1.76% | 1.71% | 2.68% | 332 |
| Clark township | Union | 12,353 | 1.48% | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.86% | 0.83% | 103 |
| Cranford township | Union | 12,353 | 2.36% | 0.00% | 1.71% | 0.37% | 1.11% | 137 |
| Elizabeth city | Union | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Fanwood borough | Union | 12,353 | 0.19% | 0.00% | 1.12% | 0.22% | 0.38% | 47 |
| Garwood borough | Union | 12,353 | 0.38% | 0.00% | 0.49% | 0.04% | 0.23% | 28 |
| Hillside township | Union | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Kenilworth borough | Union | 12,353 | 1.27% | 0.00% | 0.65% | 0.35% | 0.57% | 70 |
| Linden city | Union | 12,353 | 2.99% | 0.00% | 0.61% | 5.39% | 2.25% | 278 |
| Mountainside borough | Union | 12,353 | 0.94% | 0.00% | 1.33% | 0.48% | 0.69% | 85 |
| New Providence borough | Union | 12,353 | 1.47% | 0.00% | 1.55% | 0.64% | 0.91% | 113 |
| Plainfield city | Union | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Rahway city | Union | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Roselle borough | Union | 12,353 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Roselle Park borough | Union | 12,353 | 0.34% | 0.00% | 0.35% | 0.13% | 0.21% | 25 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Scotch Plains township | Union | 12,353 | 0.96% | 0.00% | 1.86% | 1.40% | 1.05% | 130 |
| Springfield township | Union | 12,353 | 1.75% | 0.00% | 1.08% | 0.26% | 0.77% | 95 |
| Summit city | Union | 12,353 | 2.80% | 2.82% | 2.77% | 0.67% | 2.27% | 280 |
| Union township | Union | 12,353 | 5.21% | 0.00% | 1.51% | 0.93% | 1.91% | 236 |
| Westfield town | Union | 12,353 | 1.68% | 0.00% | 3.13% | 0.63% | 1.36% | 168 |
| Winfield township | Union | 12,353 | 0.02% | 0.08% | 0.14% | 0.67% | 0.23% | 28 |
| Allamuchy township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.16% | 1.31% | 0.54% | 1.17% | 0.80% | 98 |
| Alpha borough | Warren | 12,353 | 0.15% | 0.65% | 0.15% | 0.28% | 0.31% | 38 |
| Belvidere town | Warren | 12,353 | 0.10% | 0.00% | 0.19% | 1.40% | 0.42% | 52 |
| Blairstown township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.26% | 0.00% | 0.53% | 0.00% | 0.20% | 25 |
| Franklin township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.12% | 0.46% | 0.63% | 0.10% | 0.33% | 41 |
| Frelinghuysen township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.06% | 0.42% | 0.61% | 3.03% | 1.03% | 127 |
| Greenwich township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.17% | 0.86% | 0.87% | 1.79% | 0.92% | 114 |
| Hackettstown town | Warren | 12,353 | 1.00% | 0.00% | 0.40% | 0.74% | 0.54% | 66 |
| Hardwick township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.04% | 0.25% | 0.62% | 0.00% | 0.23% | 28 |
| Harmony township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.10% | 0.12% | 0.42% | 0.20% | 0.21% | 26 |
| Hope township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.08% | 0.25% | 0.51% | 0.00% | 0.21% | 26 |
| Independence township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.14% | 0.04% | 0.47% | 0.28% | 0.23% | 28 |
| Knowlton township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.47% | 0.00% | 0.14% | 17 |
| Liberty township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.06% | 0.55% | 0.51% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 34 |
| Lopatcong township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.34% | 0.00% | 0.49% | 0.48% | 0.33% | 41 |
| Mansfield township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.28% | 2.35% | 0.35% | 1.03% | 1.00% | 124 |
| Oxford township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.18% | 0.98% | 0.27% | 0.53% | 0.49% | 60 |
| Phillipsburg town | Warren | 12,353 | 0.90% | 0.00% | 0.01% | 0.52% | 0.36% | 44 |
| Pohatcong township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.43% | 1.84% | 0.36% | 0.72% | 0.84% | 103 |
| Washington borough | Warren | 12,353 | 0.27% | 0.00% | 0.20% | 0.41% | 0.22% | 27 |
| Washington township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.28% | 1.79% | 0.62% | 1.90% | 1.15% | 142 |
| White township | Warren | 12,353 | 0.20% | 0.00% | 0.14% | 3.94% | 1.07% | 132 |
| Alexandria township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.15% | 0.10% | 1.58% | 0.13% | 0.49% | 43 |
| Bethlehem township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.10% | 0.55% | 1.49% | 0.00% | 0.54% | 47 |
| Bloomsbury borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.18% | 1.82% | 0.68% | 0.00% | 0.67% | 59 |
| Califon borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.05% | 0.18% | 1.17% | 0.00% | 0.35% | 31 |
| Clinton town | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.27% | 0.00% | 0.87% | 0.29% | 0.36% | 31 |
| Clinton township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 1.01% | 1.70% | 2.01% | 1.19% | 1.48% | 130 |
| Delaware township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.10% | 0.03% | 1.33% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 32 |
| East Amwell township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.14% | 0.38% | 1.09% | 0.00% | 0.40% | 35 |
| Flemington borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.73% | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.05% | 0.21% | 19 |
| Franklin township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.14% | 0.00% | 0.74% | 0.00% | 0.22% | 19 |
| Frenchtown borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.09% | 0.45% | 0.34% | 0.00% | 0.22% | 19 |
| Glen Gardner borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 0.39% | 0.00% | 0.10% | 9 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Hampton borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.05% | 0.28% | 0.31% | 0.03% | 0.17% | 15 |
| High Bridge borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.16% | 0.36% | 0.86% | 0.15% | 0.38% | 34 |
| Holland township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.11% | 0.00% | 0.94% | 0.03% | 0.27% | 24 |
| Kingwood township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.13% | 0.22% | 1.09% | 0.00% | 0.36% | 32 |
| Lambertville city | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.24% | 0.17% | 0.65% | 0.00% | 0.26% | 23 |
| Lebanon borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.20% | 0.93% | 0.62% | 0.15% | 0.48% | 42 |
| Lebanon township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.16% | 0.00% | 1.33% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 33 |
| Milford borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.51% | 0.24% | 0.20% | 18 |
| Raritan township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 2.06% | 2.85% | 2.46% | 3.24% | 2.65% | 233 |
| Readington township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 1.81% | 7.71% | 2.47% | 7.96% | 4.99% | 438 |
| Stockton borough | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.03% | 0.11% | 0.54% | 0.00% | 0.17% | 15 |
| Tewksbury township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.32% | 0.34% | 2.89% | 0.09% | 0.91% | 80 |
| Union township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.30% | 0.00% | 1.26% | 0.09% | 0.41% | 36 |
| West Amwell township | Hunterdon | 8,785 | 0.13% | 0.00% | 1.00% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 25 |
| Carteret borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Cranbury township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 1.26% | 0.00% | 1.95% | 1.99% | 1.30% | 114 |
| Dunellen borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.15% | 0.00% | 0.55% | 0.02% | 0.18% | 16 |
| East Brunswick township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 4.31% | 1.12% | 2.88% | 3.35% | 2.91% | 256 |
| Edison township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 12.56% | 0.00% | 4.57% | 4.23% | 5.34% | 469 |
| Helmetta borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.03% | 0.02% | 0.50% | 0.07% | 0.16% | 14 |
| Highland Park borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.44% | 0.00% | 0.81% | 0.12% | 0.34% | 30 |
| Jamesburg borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.41% | 1.96% | 0.09% | 0.27% | 0.68% | 60 |
| Metuchen borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 1.04% | 1.96% | 1.63% | 0.09% | 1.18% | 104 |
| Middlesex borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.89% | 0.00% | 0.80% | 0.24% | 0.48% | 42 |
| Milltown borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.33% | 0.00% | 0.96% | 0.11% | 0.35% | 31 |
| Monroe township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 1.90% | 9.11% | 1.92% | 11.08% | 6.00% | 527 |
| New Brunswick city | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| North Brunswick township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 3.81% | 2.37% | 1.61% | 1.97% | 2.44% | 214 |
| Old Bridge township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 2.05% | 0.83% | 2.63% | 6.86% | 3.09% | 271 |
| Perth Amboy city | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Piscataway township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 6.55% | 0.00% | 2.25% | 2.42% | 2.80% | 246 |
| Plainsboro township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 2.75% | 2.80% | 1.96% | 3.87% | 2.84% | 250 |
| Sayreville borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 1.67% | 1.66% | 1.46% | 2.17% | 1.74% | 153 |
| South Amboy city | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.33% | 0.03% | 0.60% | 0.46% | 0.35% | 31 |
| South Brunswick township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 4.41% | 0.00% | 3.18% | 9.99% | 4.39% | 386 |
| South Plainfield borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 3.82% | 3.42% | 1.35% | 0.53% | 2.28% | 200 |
| South River borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.42% | 0.00% | 0.40% | 0.24% | 0.27% | 23 |
| Spotswood borough | Middlesex | 8,785 | 0.38% | 0.00% | 0.58% | 0.23% | 0.30% | 26 |
| Woodbridge township | Middlesex | 8,785 | 9.58% | 3.93% | 2.40% | 2.70% | 4.65% | 409 |
| Bedminster township | Somerset | 8,785 | 1.74% | 0.84% | 1.33% | 0.42% | 1.08% | 95 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Bernards township | Somerset | 8,785 | 2.86% | 17.47% | 4.15% | 2.07% | 6.64% | 583 |
| Bernardsville borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.48% | 0.00% | 1.71% | 0.56% | 0.69% | 60 |
| Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.41% | 0.00% | 0.31% | 0.06% | 0.19% | 17 |
| Branchburg township | Somerset | 8,785 | 2.23% | 4.93% | 2.22% | 2.82% | 3.05% | 268 |
| Bridgewater township | Somerset | 8,785 | 6.26% | 0.00% | 3.75% | 4.00% | 3.50% | 308 |
| Far Hills borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.05% | 0.00% | 1.05% | 0.21% | 0.32% | 29 |
| Franklin township | Somerset | 8,785 | 5.84% | 8.20% | 2.90% | 5.44% | 5.59% | 491 |
| Green Brook township | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.61% | 2.41% | 1.70% | 0.65% | 1.34% | 118 |
| Hillsborough township | Somerset | 8,785 | 1.95% | 9.23% | 3.21% | 8.71% | 5.78% | 507 |
| Manville borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.33% | 0.00% | 0.27% | 0.04% | 0.16% | 14 |
| Millstone borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.02% | 0.22% | 0.50% | 0.08% | 0.21% | 18 |
| Montgomery township | Somerset | 8,785 | 2.22% | 4.54% | 3.85% | 2.59% | 3.30% | 290 |
| North Plainfield borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.53% | 0.19% | 0.42% | 0.04% | 0.29% | 26 |
| Peapack & Gladstone bor. | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.52% | 3.09% | 1.83% | 0.43% | 1.47% | 129 |
| Raritan borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 1.59% | 0.00% | 0.57% | 0.15% | 0.57% | 51 |
| Rocky Hill borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.68% | 0.06% | 0.20% | 18 |
| Somerville borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 1.28% | 0.00% | 0.50% | 0.10% | 0.47% | 41 |
| South Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.42% | 0.01% | 0.12% | 11 |
| Warren township | Somerset | 8,785 | 2.22% | 0.19% | 3.35% | 3.77% | 2.38% | 209 |
| Watchung borough | Somerset | 8,785 | 0.89% | 1.23% | 1.59% | 1.17% | 1.22% | 107 |
| East Windsor township | Mercer | 7,426 | 1.54% | 2.79% | 1.45% | 3.28% | 2.26% | 168 |
| Ewing township | Mercer | 7,426 | 6.55% | 16.46% | 1.35% | 1.23% | 6.40% | 475 |
| Hamilton township | Mercer | 7,426 | 6.93% | 11.25% | 2.80% | 3.90% | 6.22% | 462 |
| Hightstown borough | Mercer | 7,426 | 0.49% | 0.00% | 0.61% | 0.06% | 0.29% | 22 |
| Hopewell borough | Mercer | 7,426 | 0.13% | 0.00% | 0.75% | 0.00% | 0.22% | 16 |
| Hopewell township | Mercer | 7,426 | 2.44% | 12.56% | 2.49% | 5.09% | 5.64% | 419 |
| Lawrence township | Mercer | 7,426 | 3.91% | 1.56% | 1.81% | 1.87% | 2.29% | 170 |
| Pennington borough | Mercer | 7,426 | 0.39% | 0.00% | 0.97% | 0.03% | 0.35% | 26 |
| Princeton | Mercer | 7,426 | 5.64% | 5.97% | 2.69% | 1.91% | 4.05% | 301 |
| Robbinsville township | Mercer | 7,426 | 1.33% | 2.98% | 1.55% | 2.46% | 2.08% | 154 |
| Trenton city | Mercer | 7,426 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| West Windsor township | Mercer | 7,426 | 4.83% | 0.00% | 3.20% | 4.24% | 3.07% | 228 |
| Aberdeen township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.72% | 0.43% | 1.17% | 0.44% | 0.69% | 51 |
| Allenhurst borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.55% | 0.01% | 0.15% | 11 |
| Allentown borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.12% | 0.00% | 0.79% | 0.00% | 0.23% | 17 |
| Asbury Park city | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Atlantic Highlands borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.19% | 0.00% | 0.76% | 0.08% | 0.26% | 19 |
| Avon-by-the-Sea borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.48% | 0.01% | 0.14% | 10 |
| Belmar borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.21% | 0.04% | 0.45% | 0.06% | 0.19% | 14 |
| Bradley Beach borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.13% | 0.13% | 0.50% | 0.03% | 0.20% | 15 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Brielle borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.26% | 0.35% | 1.05% | 0.21% | 0.47% | 35 |
| Colts Neck township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.48% | 0.30% | 1.79% | 0.00% | 0.64% | 48 |
| Deal borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.57% | 0.12% | 0.19% | 14 |
| Eatontown borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 2.36% | 1.05% | 0.68% | 0.50% | 1.15% | 85 |
| Englishtown borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.13% | 0.00% | 0.60% | 0.03% | 0.19% | 14 |
| Fair Haven borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.15% | 0.00% | 1.52% | 0.03% | 0.42% | 31 |
| Farmingdale borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.11% | 0.00% | 0.30% | 0.04% | 0.11% | 8 |
| Freehold borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.84% | 0.00% | 0.44% | 0.17% | 0.36% | 27 |
| Freehold township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 4.59% | 3.06% | 2.18% | 3.52% | 3.34% | 248 |
| Hazlet township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 1.19% | 0.00% | 1.17% | 0.37% | 0.68% | 51 |
| Highlands borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.13% | 0.00% | 0.56% | 0.07% | 0.19% | 14 |
| Holmdel township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 1.50% | 0.00% | 2.14% | 0.41% | 1.01% | 75 |
| Howell township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 2.75% | 3.88% | 2.39% | 1.74% | 2.69% | 200 |
| Interlaken borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.01% | 0.00% | 1.01% | 0.00% | 0.26% | 19 |
| Keansburg borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.31% | 0.49% | 0.28% | 0.08% | 0.29% | 22 |
| Keyport borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.36% | 0.00% | 0.41% | 0.06% | 0.21% | 15 |
| Lake Como borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.34% | 0.02% | 0.10% | 8 |
| Little Silver borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.42% | 0.00% | 1.42% | 0.12% | 0.49% | 37 |
| Loch Arbour village | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.81% | 0.01% | 0.21% | 15 |
| Long Branch city | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Manalapan township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 1.71% | 0.21% | 2.55% | 2.39% | 1.71% | 127 |
| Manasquan borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.31% | 0.00% | 0.82% | 0.05% | 0.29% | 22 |
| Marlboro township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 2.03% | 3.13% | 3.38% | 3.81% | 3.09% | 229 |
| Matawan borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.55% | 0.00% | 0.91% | 0.04% | 0.37% | 28 |
| Middletown township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 3.90% | 1.69% | 3.74% | 2.74% | 3.02% | 224 |
| Millstone township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.39% | 0.97% | 1.63% | 0.00% | 0.75% | 55 |
| Monmouth Beach borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.07% | 0.00% | 0.75% | 0.09% | 0.23% | 17 |
| Neptune township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 2.67% | 1.15% | 1.05% | 0.05% | 1.23% | 91 |
| Neptune City borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.47% | 1.40% | 0.52% | 0.03% | 0.61% | 45 |
| Ocean township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 1.80% | 0.18% | 1.49% | 1.22% | 1.17% | 87 |
| Oceanport borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.76% | 1.42% | 0.90% | 0.15% | 0.81% | 60 |
| Red Bank borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 2.20% | 0.00% | 0.66% | 0.16% | 0.76% | 56 |
| Roosevelt borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 0.49% | 0.00% | 0.13% | 10 |
| Rumson borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.34% | 0.47% | 1.61% | 0.23% | 0.66% | 49 |
| Sea Bright borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.08% | 0.00% | 0.61% | 0.00% | 0.17% | 13 |
| Sea Girt borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.16% | 0.55% | 0.93% | 0.02% | 0.41% | 31 |
| Shrewsbury borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 1.14% | 0.06% | 1.03% | 0.04% | 0.57% | 42 |
| Shrewsbury township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.14% | 0.84% | 0.24% | 0.00% | 0.30% | 23 |
| Spring Lake borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.18% | 0.00% | 1.05% | 0.04% | 0.32% | 24 |
| Spring Lake Heights bor. | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.19% | 0.00% | 0.53% | 0.03% | 0.19% | 14 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Tinton Falls borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 2.20% | 4.46% | 1.06% | 1.66% | 2.35% | 174 |
| Union Beach borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.20% | 0.51% | 0.59% | 0.14% | 0.36% | 27 |
| Upper Freehold township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 0.35% | 0.18% | 1.27% | 0.00% | 0.45% | 34 |
| Wall township | Monmouth | 7,426 | 3.36% | 1.47% | 1.81% | 6.36% | 3.25% | 241 |
| West Long Branch borough | Monmouth | 7,426 | 1.04% | 0.00% | 0.80% | 0.18% | 0.51% | 38 |
| Barnegat township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.50% | 0.96% | 0.77% | 3.95% | 1.54% | 115 |
| Barnegat Light borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.03% | 0.09% | 0.50% | 0.00% | 0.16% | 12 |
| Bay Head borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.57% | 0.02% | 0.16% | 12 |
| Beach Haven borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.12% | 0.21% | 0.50% | 0.00% | 0.21% | 15 |
| Beachwood borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.17% | 0.00% | 0.79% | 0.11% | 0.27% | 20 |
| Berkeley township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.99% | 1.18% | 0.87% | 4.58% | 1.90% | 141 |
| Brick township | Ocean | 7,426 | 3.96% | 5.92% | 2.45% | 1.63% | 3.49% | 259 |
| Eagleswood township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.11% | 0.25% | 0.42% | 1.65% | 0.61% | 45 |
| Harvey Cedars borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 0.60% | 0.00% | 0.15% | 11 |
| Island Heights borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.06% | 0.04% | 0.53% | 0.06% | 0.17% | 13 |
| Jackson township | Ocean | 7,426 | 2.07% | 3.28% | 2.45% | 10.94% | 4.68% | 348 |
| Lacey township | Ocean | 7,426 | 1.09% | 1.13% | 1.14% | 1.94% | 1.32% | 98 |
| Lakehurst borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.11% | 0.00% | 0.35% | 0.03% | 0.12% | 9 |
| Lakewood township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Lavallette borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.43% | 0.00% | 0.12% | 9 |
| Little Egg Harbor township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.45% | 0.00% | 0.69% | 5.30% | 1.61% | 120 |
| Long Beach township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.18% | 0.15% | 0.68% | 0.00% | 0.25% | 19 |
| Manchester township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.99% | 1.61% | 0.65% | 7.51% | 2.69% | 200 |
| Mantoloking borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.10% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 20 |
| Ocean township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.25% | 0.54% | 0.68% | 2.67% | 1.03% | 77 |
| Ocean Gate borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 0.02% | 0.10% | 8 |
| Pine Beach borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.05% | 0.03% | 0.63% | 0.01% | 0.18% | 13 |
| Plumsted township | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.25% | 0.45% | 0.64% | 0.01% | 0.34% | 25 |
| Point Pleasant borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.75% | 0.00% | 1.10% | 0.23% | 0.52% | 39 |
| Point Pleasant Beach bor. | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.59% | 0.74% | 0.54% | 0.24% | 0.53% | 39 |
| Seaside Heights borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.10% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.02% | 2 |
| Seaside Park borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.03% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 0.00% | 0.08% | 6 |
| Ship Bottom borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.09% | 0.00% | 0.32% | 0.00% | 0.10% | 8 |
| South Toms River borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.08% | 0.00% | 0.39% | 0.09% | 0.14% | 10 |
| Stafford township | Ocean | 7,426 | 1.56% | 0.62% | 1.13% | 2.11% | 1.35% | 101 |
| Surf City borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.09% | 0.12% | 0.39% | 0.00% | 0.15% | 11 |
| Toms River township | Ocean | 7,426 | 7.35% | 0.07% | 3.20% | 4.64% | 3.81% | 283 |
| Tuckerton borough | Ocean | 7,426 | 0.20% | 0.63% | 0.36% | 0.62% | 0.45% | 34 |
| Bass River township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.39% | 0.00% | 0.11% | 8 |
| Beverly city | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.06% | 0.00% | 0.27% | 0.04% | 0.10% | 7 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Bordentown city | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.28% | 0.00% | 0.61% | 0.03% | 0.23% | 17 |
| Bordentown township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.83% | 0.00% | 1.29% | 1.79% | 0.98% | 71 |
| Burlington city | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.90% | 0.00% | 0.38% | 0.15% | 0.36% | 26 |
| Burlington township | Burlington | 7,244 | 3.01% | 3.38% | 1.59% | 3.80% | 2.94% | 213 |
| Chesterfield township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.28% | 0.00% | 1.59% | 0.00% | 0.47% | 34 |
| Cinnaminson township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.81% | 0.00% | 1.77% | 0.80% | 1.10% | 79 |
| Delanco township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.24% | 0.00% | 0.72% | 0.76% | 0.43% | 31 |
| Delran township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.34% | 4.10% | 1.49% | 0.79% | 1.93% | 140 |
| Eastampton township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.59% | 3.58% | 0.65% | 0.30% | 1.28% | 93 |
| Edgewater Park township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.51% | 2.11% | 0.51% | 0.73% | 0.97% | 70 |
| Evesham township | Burlington | 7,244 | 6.00% | 11.05% | 3.62% | 1.68% | 5.59% | 405 |
| Fieldsboro borough | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.44% | 0.04% | 0.12% | 9 |
| Florence township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.62% | 0.72% | 1.16% | 1.17% | 0.92% | 66 |
| Hainesport township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.83% | 1.59% | 1.03% | 1.00% | 1.11% | 80 |
| Lumberton township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.26% | 5.69% | 1.37% | 1.13% | 2.36% | 171 |
| Mansfield township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.50% | 1.49% | 1.18% | 1.83% | 1.25% | 91 |
| Maple Shade township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.31% | 1.35% | 0.71% | 0.16% | 0.88% | 64 |
| Medford township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.92% | 0.55% | 2.91% | 2.12% | 1.87% | 136 |
| Medford Lakes borough | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.08% | 0.00% | 1.36% | 0.01% | 0.36% | 26 |
| Moorestown township | Burlington | 7,244 | 6.26% | 2.49% | 3.63% | 1.46% | 3.46% | 251 |
| Mount Holly township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Mount Laurel township | Burlington | 7,244 | 8.47% | 5.04% | 3.56% | 3.20% | 5.07% | 367 |
| New Hanover township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.47% | 2.45% | 0.78% | 0.00% | 0.92% | 67 |
| North Hanover township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.22% | 0.00% | 0.50% | 0.00% | 0.18% | 13 |
| Palmyra borough | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.40% | 0.00% | 0.63% | 0.48% | 0.38% | 27 |
| Pemberton borough | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.44% | 0.00% | 0.12% | 9 |
| Pemberton township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.41% | 0.00% | 0.93% | 0.93% | 0.82% | 59 |
| Riverside township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.19% | 0.00% | 0.43% | 0.11% | 0.18% | 13 |
| Riverton borough | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.14% | 0.27% | 1.00% | 0.02% | 0.36% | 26 |
| Shamong township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.19% | 0.09% | 1.32% | 0.12% | 0.43% | 31 |
| Southampton township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.55% | 0.00% | 0.60% | 0.18% | 0.33% | 24 |
| Springfield township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.31% | 1.37% | 1.06% | 0.00% | 0.69% | 50 |
| Tabernacle township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.25% | 0.37% | 1.26% | 0.38% | 0.56% | 41 |
| Washington township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.53% | 0.00% | 0.14% | 10 |
| Westampton township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.34% | 2.20% | 1.48% | 3.48% | 2.12% | 154 |
| Willingboro township | Burlington | 7,244 | 1.49% | 0.00% | 1.30% | 0.62% | 0.85% | 62 |
| Woodland township | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.26% | 1.25% | 0.71% | 0.00% | 0.55% | 40 |
| Wrightstown borough | Burlington | 7,244 | 0.19% | 0.85% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.26% | 19 |
| Audubon borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.44% | 0.00% | 0.89% | 0.02% | 0.34% | 25 |
| Audubon Park borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.07% | 0.36% | 0.12% | 0.00% | 0.14% | 10 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Barrington borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.32% | 0.00% | 0.65% | 0.07% | 0.26% | 19 |
| Bellmawr borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.89% | 0.00% | 0.40% | 0.27% | 0.39% | 28 |
| Berlin borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.91% | 0.00% | 0.98% | 0.79% | 0.67% | 49 |
| Berlin township | Camden | 7,244 | 1.06% | 1.42% | 0.53% | 1.11% | 1.03% | 75 |
| Brooklawn borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.12% | 0.43% | 0.33% | 0.02% | 0.23% | 16 |
| Camden city | Camden | 7,244 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Cherry Hill township | Camden | 7,244 | 12.67% | 11.28% | 5.49% | 1.44% | 7.72% | 559 |
| Chesilhurst borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.04% | 0.12% | 0.35% | 0.26% | 0.19% | 14 |
| Clementon borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.29% | 0.73% | 0.10% | 0.14% | 0.31% | 23 |
| Collingswood borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.81% | 0.00% | 0.73% | 0.02% | 0.39% | 28 |
| Gibbsboro borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.33% | 0.00% | 0.76% | 0.51% | 0.40% | 29 |
| Gloucester township | Camden | 7,244 | 3.57% | 5.40% | 2.68% | 4.75% | 4.10% | 297 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 7,244 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Haddon township | Camden | 7,244 | 0.54% | 0.81% | 1.28% | 0.09% | 0.68% | 49 |
| Haddonfield borough | Camden | 7,244 | 1.07% | 0.59% | 2.47% | 0.07% | 1.05% | 76 |
| Haddon Heights borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.45% | 0.03% | 1.22% | 0.01% | 0.43% | 31 |
| Hi-Nella borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.06% | 0.03% | 0.03% | 2 |
| Laurel Springs borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.05% | 0.02% | 0.84% | 0.02% | 0.23% | 17 |
| Lawnside borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.54% | 0.00% | 0.31% | 0.43% | 0.32% | 23 |
| Lindenwold borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Magnolia borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.20% | 0.34% | 0.36% | 0.06% | 0.24% | 17 |
| Merchantville borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.14% | 0.00% | 0.41% | 0.01% | 0.14% | 10 |
| Mount Ephraim borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.20% | 0.00% | 0.58% | 0.04% | 0.20% | 15 |
| Oaklyn borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.29% | 0.94% | 0.52% | 0.01% | 0.44% | 32 |
| Pennsauken township | Camden | 7,244 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Pine Hill borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.30% | 0.00% | 0.44% | 0.99% | 0.43% | 31 |
| Pine Valley borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.73% | 0.18% | 13 |
| Runnemede borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.58% | 0.09% | 0.42% | 0.21% | 0.32% | 23 |
| Somerdale borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.39% | 0.40% | 0.29% | 0.08% | 0.29% | 21 |
| Stratford borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.42% | 0.00% | 0.61% | 0.04% | 0.27% | 20 |
| Tavistock borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.03% | 0.25% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.07% | 5 |
| Voorhees township | Camden | 7,244 | 4.08% | 1.78% | 2.58% | 1.80% | 2.56% | 186 |
| Waterford township | Camden | 7,244 | 0.39% | 0.00% | 0.86% | 0.67% | 0.48% | 35 |
| Winslow township | Camden | 7,244 | 1.56% | 1.39% | 1.86% | 5.77% | 2.64% | 192 |
| Woodlynne borough | Camden | 7,244 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.04% | 0.02% | 0.03% | 2 |
| Clayton borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.27% | 0.16% | 0.55% | 1.25% | 0.56% | 40 |
| Deptford township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 3.19% | 0.00% | 1.43% | 5.76% | 2.60% | 188 |
| East Greenwich township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.41% | 0.41% | 1.67% | 3.34% | 1.46% | 106 |
| Elk township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.15% | 0.00% | 0.79% | 4.04% | 1.25% | 90 |
| Franklin township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.79% | 0.10% | 1.27% | 3.61% | 1.44% | 104 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Glassboro borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 1.96% | 3.30% | 0.78% | 1.88% | 1.98% | 143 |
| Greenwich township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.37% | 0.26% | 0.58% | 1.19% | 0.60% | 43 |
| Harrison township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.62% | 1.79% | 2.25% | 3.77% | 2.11% | 153 |
| Logan township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 2.04% | 5.65% | 0.94% | 4.02% | 3.16% | 229 |
| Mantua township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.99% | 1.92% | 1.33% | 2.89% | 1.78% | 129 |
| Monroe township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 1.48% | 0.42% | 1.67% | 5.26% | 2.21% | 160 |
| National Park borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.05% | 0.00% | 0.43% | 0.06% | 0.14% | 10 |
| Newfield borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.40% | 0.00% | 0.11% | 8 |
| Paulsboro borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.38% | 1.21% | 0.06% | 0.17% | 0.46% | 33 |
| Pitman borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.44% | 0.00% | 0.83% | 0.07% | 0.34% | 24 |
| South Harrison township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.13% | 0.04% | 1.34% | 0.01% | 0.38% | 27 |
| Swedesboro borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.24% | 0.46% | 0.54% | 0.08% | 0.33% | 24 |
| Washington township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 3.43% | 3.61% | 2.95% | 4.23% | 3.56% | 258 |
| Wenonah borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.06% | 0.05% | 1.11% | 0.04% | 0.32% | 23 |
| West Deptford township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 2.52% | 0.00% | 1.20% | 3.76% | 1.87% | 136 |
| Westville borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.34% | 0.00% | 0.32% | 0.06% | 0.18% | 13 |
| Woodbury city | Gloucester | 7,244 | 1.90% | 1.94% | 0.51% | 0.24% | 1.15% | 83 |
| Woodbury Heights borough | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.32% | 0.29% | 0.85% | 0.19% | 0.41% | 30 |
| Woolwich township | Gloucester | 7,244 | 0.46% | 0.00% | 1.83% | 4.28% | 1.64% | 119 |
| Absecon city | Atlantic | 397 | 1.81% | 0.00% | 1.73% | 0.85% | 1.10% | 4 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 397 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Brigantine city | Atlantic | 397 | 1.05% | 0.00% | 2.36% | 0.00% | 0.85% | 3 |
| Buena borough | Atlantic | 397 | 0.44% | 0.00% | 0.86% | 0.20% | 0.38% | 1 |
| Buena Vista township | Atlantic | 397 | 1.21% | 0.06% | 1.07% | 0.19% | 0.63% | 3 |
| Corbin City | Atlantic | 397 | 0.04% | 0.00% | 0.95% | 0.00% | 0.25% | 1 |
| Egg Harbor township | Atlantic | 397 | 9.99% | 17.92% | 6.45% | 10.74% | 11.28% | 45 |
| Egg Harbor City | Atlantic | 397 | 1.02% | 0.00% | 0.56% | 0.36% | 0.48% | 2 |
| Estell Manor city | Atlantic | 397 | 0.14% | 0.08% | 1.21% | 0.00% | 0.36% | 1 |
| Folsom borough | Atlantic | 397 | 0.45% | 0.00% | 1.03% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 1 |
| Galloway township | Atlantic | 397 | 8.03% | 17.36% | 4.57% | 9.60% | 9.89% | 39 |
| Hamilton township | Atlantic | 397 | 7.70% | 7.26% | 3.26% | 5.39% | 5.90% | 23 |
| Hammonton town | Atlantic | 397 | 4.79% | 0.00% | 2.33% | 3.62% | 2.69% | 11 |
| Linwood city | Atlantic | 397 | 2.04% | 0.00% | 3.07% | 0.33% | 1.36% | 5 |
| Longport borough | Atlantic | 397 | 0.06% | 0.10% | 1.47% | 0.03% | 0.41% | 2 |
| Margate City | Atlantic | 397 | 1.11% | 1.43% | 2.76% | 0.07% | 1.34% | 5 |
| Mullica township | Atlantic | 397 | 0.72% | 1.80% | 1.66% | 0.31% | 1.12% | 4 |
| Northfield city | Atlantic | 397 | 2.69% | 0.00% | 2.07% | 0.62% | 1.34% | 5 |
| Pleasantville city | Atlantic | 397 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Port Republic city | Atlantic | 397 | 0.09% | 0.30% | 1.46% | 0.01% | 0.47% | 2 |
| Somers Point city | Atlantic | 397 | 4.36% | 0.00% | 1.31% | 0.17% | 1.46% | 6 |



| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ventnor City | Atlantic | 397 | 1.07% | 0.00% | 2.02% | 0.04% | 0.78% | 3 |
| Weymouth township | Atlantic | 397 | 0.17% | 0.20% | 0.91% | 0.00% | 0.32% | 1 |
| Avalon borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.59% | 0.47% | 2.09% | 0.00% | 0.79% | 3 |
| Cape May city | Cape May | 397 | 1.69% | 5.88% | 0.83% | 0.00% | 2.10% | 8 |
| Cape May Point borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.90% | 0.00% | 0.23% | 1 |
| Dennis township | Cape May | 397 | 1.15% | 1.63% | 1.86% | 2.15% | 1.70% | 7 |
| Lower township | Cape May | 397 | 2.90% | 0.00% | 2.78% | 1.20% | 1.72% | 7 |
| Middle township | Cape May | 397 | 6.91% | 2.77% | 2.86% | 3.26% | 3.95% | 16 |
| North Wildwood city | Cape May | 397 | 0.52% | 0.11% | 0.87% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 1 |
| Ocean City | Cape May | 397 | 3.23% | 0.00% | 2.81% | 0.00% | 1.51% | 6 |
| Sea Isle City | Cape May | 397 | 0.47% | 0.00% | 1.02% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 1 |
| Stone Harbor borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.37% | 0.00% | 1.10% | 0.00% | 0.37% | 1 |
| Upper township | Cape May | 397 | 2.31% | 0.00% | 3.13% | 5.07% | 2.63% | 10 |
| West Cape May borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.15% | 0.06% | 0.55% | 0.00% | 0.19% | 1 |
| West Wildwood borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.02% | 0.02% | 0.54% | 0.00% | 0.14% | 1 |
| Wildwood city | Cape May | 397 | 1.51% | 0.00% | 0.24% | 0.00% | 0.44% | 2 |
| Wildwood Crest borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.41% | 0.00% | 1.54% | 0.00% | 0.49% | 2 |
| Woodbine borough | Cape May | 397 | 0.35% | 1.60% | 0.28% | 1.59% | 0.96% | 4 |
| Bridgeton city | Cumberland | 397 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Commercial township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.30% | 0.00% | 0.77% | 0.00% | 0.27% | 1 |
| Deerfield township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.98% | 3.09% | 1.34% | 0.00% | 1.35% | 5 |
| Downe township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.14% | 0.29% | 0.56% | 0.00% | 0.25% | 1 |
| Fairfield township | Cumberland | 397 | 1.32% | 4.13% | 0.73% | 4.78% | 2.74% | 11 |
| Greenwich township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 1.11% | 0.00% | 0.28% | 1 |
| Hopewell township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.83% | 0.00% | 1.28% | 7.15% | 2.31% | 9 |
| Lawrence township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.28% | 0.00% | 1.35% | 0.00% | 0.41% | 2 |
| Maurice River township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.58% | 2.00% | 1.22% | 0.00% | 0.95% | 4 |
| Millville city | Cumberland | 397 | 6.64% | 0.00% | 2.33% | 7.17% | 4.04% | 16 |
| Shiloh borough | Cumberland | 397 | 0.02% | 0.00% | 1.29% | 0.00% | 0.33% | 1 |
| Stow Creek township | Cumberland | 397 | 0.11% | 0.00% | 1.16% | 0.00% | 0.32% | 1 |
| Upper Deerfield township | Cumberland | 397 | 2.55% | 7.41% | 1.33% | 6.30% | 4.40% | 17 |
| Vineland city | Cumberland | 397 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |
| Alloway township | Salem | 397 | 0.49% | 0.51% | 1.73% | 0.00% | 0.68% | 3 |
| Carneys Point township | Salem | 397 | 2.37% | 5.54% | 1.22% | 9.87% | 4.75% | 19 |
| Elmer borough | Salem | 397 | 0.60% | 2.80% | 1.00% | 0.00% | 1.10% | 4 |
| Elsinboro township | Salem | 397 | 0.06% | 0.16% | 1.02% | 0.00% | 0.31% | 1 |
| Lower Alloways Creek twp | Salem | 397 | 1.94% | 6.77% | 1.12% | 0.00% | 2.46% | 10 |
| Mannington township | Salem | 397 | 1.02% | 1.64% | 1.08% | 0.00% | 0.94% | 4 |
| Oldmans township | Salem | 397 | 0.57% | 0.92% | 1.32% | 12.60% | 3.85% | 15 |
| Penns Grove borough | Salem | 397 | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Regional Prospective Need | Employ Level Share | Employ Change Share | Income Diff Share | Develop- able Land Share | Averaged Share | Allocated Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Pennsville township | Salem | 397 | 2.37% | 0.00% | 2.16% | 5.16% | 2.42% | 10 |
| Pilesgrove township | Salem | 397 | 1.28% | 5.70% | 1.90% | 1.15% | 2.51% | 10 |
| Pittsgrove township | Salem | 397 | 1.33% | 0.00% | 2.43% | 0.00% | 0.94% | 4 |
| Quinton township | Salem | 397 | 0.22% | 0.00% | 1.05% | 0.00% | 0.32% | 1 |
| Salem city | Salem | 397 | 1.05% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.26% | 1 |
| Upper Pittsgrove township | Salem | 397 | 0.72% | 0.00% | 1.43% | 0.00% | 0.54% | 2 |
| Woodstown borough | Salem | 397 | 0.62% | 0.00% | 1.51% | 0.00% | 0.53% | 2 |



APPENDIX C: SECONDARY SOURCE ADJUSTMENTS TO MUNICIPAL ALLOCATIONS

TABLE C.1: SECONDARY SOURCE ADJUSTMENTS TO MUNICIPAL ALLOCATIONS

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Allendale borough | Bergen | 1 | (5) | 1 | 9 | 5 | (3) | 14 | 111 |
| Alpine borough | Bergen | 1 | (21) | 0 | 0 | (21) | (4) | 4 | 162 |
| Bergenfield borough | Bergen | 1 | (37) | 17 | 85 | 65 | (4) | 152 | 44 |
| Bogota borough | Bergen | 1 | (2) | 6 | 79 | 83 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Carlstadt borough | Bergen | 1 | (19) | 12 | (18) | (25) | (4) | 34 | 146 |
| Cliffside Park borough | Bergen | 1 | (108) | 29 | 65 | (14) | (4) | 143 | 69 |
| Closter borough | Bergen | 1 | (66) | 2 | 9 | (55) | (3) | 0 | 159 |
| Cresskill borough | Bergen | 1 | (29) | 1 | 4 | (24) | (8) | 43 | 331 |
| Demarest borough | Bergen | 1 | (38) | 1 | 0 | (37) | (3) | 0 | 118 |
| Dumont borough | Bergen | 1 | (38) | 9 | 87 | 58 | (2) | 39 | 63 |
| East Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | (11) | 17 | 11 | 17 | (6) | 187 | 94 |
| Edgewater borough | Bergen | 1 | (40) | 6 | 29 | (5) | (7) | 0 | 318 |
| Elmwood Park borough | Bergen | 1 | (12) | 32 | 21 | 41 | (4) | 44 | 165 |
| Emerson borough | Bergen | 1 | (14) | 1 | 22 | 9 | (3) | 56 | 107 |
| Englewood city | Bergen | 1 | (39) | 21 | 160 | 142 | (10) | 380 | 87 |
| Englewood Cliffs borough | Bergen | 1 | (70) | 0 | 0 | (70) | (7) | 0 | 323 |
| Fair Lawn borough | Bergen | 1 | (26) | 16 | 196 | 186 | (7) | 167 | 165 |
| Fairview borough | Bergen | 1 | (45) | 26 | 28 | 9 | (5) | 227 | 21 |
| Fort Lee borough | Bergen | 1 | (99) | 22 | (5) | (82) | (11) | 264 | 258 |
| Franklin Lakes borough | Bergen | 1 | (71) | 0 | 0 | (71) | (10) | 33 | 419 |
| Garfield city | Bergen | 1 | (30) | 75 | (100) | (55) | (4) | 132 | 51 |
| Glen Rock borough | Bergen | 1 | (6) | 1 | 31 | 26 | (3) | 15 | 109 |
| Hackensack city | Bergen | 1 | (65) | 40 | 423 | 398 | (3) | 119 | 0 |
| Harrington Park borough | Bergen | 1 | (17) | 1 | 10 | (6) | (3) | 4 | 139 |
| Hasbrouck Heights borough | Bergen | 1 | (22) | 7 | 38 | 23 | (9) | 68 | 359 |
| Haworth borough | Bergen | 1 | (14) | 0 | 14 | 0 | (2) | 0 | 72 |
| Hillsdale borough | Bergen | 1 | (16) | 2 | 16 | 2 | (3) | 14 | 126 |
| Ho-Ho-Kus borough | Bergen | 1 | (13) | 1 | 1 | (11) | (3) | 10 | 113 |
| Leonia borough | Bergen | 1 | (61) | 5 | (6) | (62) | (5) | 77 | 154 |
| Little Ferry borough | Bergen | 1 | (5) | 12 | 86 | 93 | (2) | 118 | 0 |
| Lodi borough | Bergen | 1 | (28) | 51 | (128) | (105) | (6) | 172 | 99 |
| Lyndhurst township | Bergen | 1 | (15) | 38 | 26 | 49 | (7) | 216 | 117 |
| Mahwah township | Bergen | 1 | (26) | 5 | 93 | 72 | (6) | 68 | 236 |
| Maywood borough | Bergen | 1 | (26) | 9 | 25 | 8 | (2) | 26 | 63 |
| Midland Park borough | Bergen | 1 | (7) | 4 | 3 | 0 | (2) | 26 | 59 |
| Montvale borough | Bergen | 1 | (15) | 3 | 2 | (10) | (7) | 2 | 349 |
| Moonachie borough | Bergen | 1 | (5) | 1 | 15 | 11 | (2) | 31 | 63 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| New Milford borough | Bergen | 1 | (21) | 13 | 20 | 12 | (3) | 39 | 88 |
| North Arlington borough | Bergen | 1 | (7) | 27 | 30 | 50 | (4) | 164 | 39 |
| Northvale borough | Bergen | 1 | (12) | 2 | (1) | (11) | (2) | 3 | 71 |
| Norwood borough | Bergen | 1 | (20) | 2 | 1 | (17) | (2) | 0 | 88 |
| Oakland borough | Bergen | 1 | (16) | 1 | 43 | 28 | (2) | 25 | 91 |
| Old Tappan borough | Bergen | 1 | (40) | 1 | 1 | (38) | (6) | 10 | 288 |
| Oradell borough | Bergen | 1 | (10) | 1 | 35 | 26 | (2) | 14 | 73 |
| Palisades Park borough | Bergen | 1 | (142) | 29 | (4) | (117) | (6) | 136 | 167 |
| Paramus borough | Bergen | 1 | (83) | 5 | 3 | (75) | (16) | 141 | 613 |
| Park Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | (27) | 4 | 17 | (6) | (5) | 115 | 116 |
| Ramsey borough | Bergen | 1 | (21) | 5 | 49 | 33 | (5) | 53 | 184 |
| Ridgefield borough | Bergen | 1 | (41) | 17 | (18) | (42) | (6) | 143 | 128 |
| Ridgefield Park village | Bergen | 1 | (1) | 16 | 62 | 77 | (3) | 142 | 0 |
| Ridgewood village | Bergen | 1 | (31) | 9 | 20 | (2) | (7) | 6 | 341 |
| River Edge borough | Bergen | 1 | (6) | 5 | 76 | 75 | (3) | 42 | 86 |
| River Vale township | Bergen | 1 | (25) | 1 | 16 | (8) | (3) | 20 | 119 |
| Rochelle Park township | Bergen | 1 | (2) | 4 | 4 | 6 | (1) | 0 | 53 |
| Rockleigh borough | Bergen | 1 | (1) | 0 | 0 | (1) | (5) | 0 | 212 |
| Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | (22) | 15 | 30 | 23 | (8) | 170 | 224 |
| Saddle Brook township | Bergen | 1 | (20) | 13 | 34 | 27 | (3) | 38 | 103 |
| Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | (37) | 1 | 0 | (36) | (8) | 45 | 308 |
| South Hackensack township | Bergen | 1 | (4) | 5 | (11) | (10) | (3) | 59 | 67 |
| Teaneck township | Bergen | 1 | (54) | 10 | 278 | 234 | (16) | 89 | 665 |
| Tenaflly borough | Bergen | 1 | (91) | 5 | 1 | (85) | (6) | 24 | 238 |
| Teterboro borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (2) | 0 | 115 |
| Upper Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | (66) | 1 | 3 | (62) | (8) | 8 | 347 |
| Waldwick borough | Bergen | 1 | (10) | 2 | 50 | 42 | (2) | 62 | 52 |
| Wallington borough | Bergen | 1 | (8) | 24 | 31 | 47 | (2) | 77 | 0 |
| Washington township | Bergen | 1 | (10) | 0 | 32 | 22 | (5) | 0 | 220 |
| Westwood borough | Bergen | 1 | (11) | 6 | 11 | 6 | (3) | 52 | 78 |
| Woodcliff Lake borough | Bergen | 1 | (18) | 0 | 2 | (16) | (7) | 18 | 290 |
| Wood-Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | (13) | 6 | 92 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyckoff township | Bergen | 1 | (38) | 1 | 7 | (30) | (6) | 34 | 272 |
| Bayonne city | Hudson | 1 | (14) | 212 | (1,160) | (962) | (35) | 737 | 927 |
| East Newark borough | Hudson | 1 | (1) | 9 | (37) | (29) | (1) | 7 | 37 |
| Guttenberg town | Hudson | 1 | (33) | 27 | 174 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harrison town | Hudson | 1 | (41) | 50 | (288) | (279) | (14) | 214 | 457 |
| Hoboken city | Hudson | 1 | (47) | 78 | 36 | 67 | (4) | 186 | 0 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | (551) | 615 | (2,106) | (2,042) | (120) | 3,738 | 1,922 |
| Kearny town | Hudson | 1 | (34) | 109 | (466) | (391) | (18) | 188 | 643 |
| North Bergen township | Hudson | 1 | (37) | 146 | (499) | (390) | (22) | 676 | 368 |
| Secaucus town | Hudson | 1 | (22) | 33 | (109) | (98) | (10) | 46 | 433 |
| Union City | Hudson | 1 | (103) | 149 | (20) | 26 | (30) | 1,396 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|-----------------------|---------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Weehawken township | Hudson | 1 | (5) | 39 | (1) | 33 | (3) | 127 | 0 |
| West New York town | Hudson | 1 | (30) | 80 | 69 | 119 | (11) | 504 | 0 |
| Bloomington borough | Passaic | 1 | (6) | 5 | 20 | 19 | (2) | 51 | 24 |
| Clifton city | Passaic | 1 | (28) | 155 | 245 | 372 | (32) | 1,516 | 0 |
| Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | (4) | 20 | 51 | 67 | (1) | 54 | 0 |
| Hawthorne borough | Passaic | 1 | (7) | 37 | 46 | 76 | (3) | 93 | 59 |
| Little Falls township | Passaic | 1 | (25) | 14 | 49 | 38 | (5) | 139 | 119 |
| North Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | (7) | 4 | 7 | 4 | (3) | 0 | 144 |
| Passaic city | Passaic | 1 | (44) | 121 | 69 | 146 | (108) | 5,086 | 0 |
| Paterson city | Passaic | 1 | (432) | 414 | 681 | 663 | (62) | 2,925 | 0 |
| Pompton Lakes borough | Passaic | 1 | (22) | 7 | 175 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prospect Park borough | Passaic | 1 | (1) | 22 | 135 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ringwood borough | Passaic | 1 | (9) | 1 | 102 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totowa borough | Passaic | 1 | (1) | 13 | 6 | 18 | (7) | 125 | 211 |
| Wanaque borough | Passaic | 1 | (6) | 6 | 124 | 124 | (1) | 66 | 0 |
| Wayne township | Passaic | 1 | (55) | 13 | 139 | 97 | (22) | 245 | 807 |
| West Milford township | Passaic | 1 | (2) | 4 | 316 | 318 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodland Park borough | Passaic | 1 | (6) | 19 | (14) | (1) | (9) | 224 | 177 |
| Andover borough | Sussex | 1 | (1) | 1 | 237 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Andover township | Sussex | 1 | (10) | 1 | 116 | 107 | (5) | 5 | 221 |
| Branchville borough | Sussex | 1 | (1) | 1 | 2 | 2 | (4) | 1 | 209 |
| Byram township | Sussex | 1 | (5) | 1 | 76 | 72 | (2) | 24 | 47 |
| Frankford township | Sussex | 1 | (20) | 1 | 1 | (18) | (2) | 27 | 60 |
| Franklin borough | Sussex | 1 | (8) | 2 | 151 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fredon township | Sussex | 1 | (2) | 0 | 5 | 3 | (3) | 20 | 115 |
| Green township | Sussex | 1 | (1) | 0 | 50 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Hamburg borough | Sussex | 1 | (2) | 1 | 131 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hampton township | Sussex | 1 | (2) | 0 | (6) | (8) | (1) | 7 | 46 |
| Hardyston township | Sussex | 1 | (10) | 2 | 169 | 161 | (10) | 18 | 460 |
| Hopatcong borough | Sussex | 1 | (18) | 2 | 238 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lafayette township | Sussex | 1 | (3) | 0 | 1 | (2) | (2) | 0 | 102 |
| Montague township | Sussex | 1 | (2) | 3 | 70 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Newton town | Sussex | 1 | (1) | 5 | (139) | (135) | (7) | 151 | 162 |
| Ogdensburg borough | Sussex | 1 | (1) | 1 | 52 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sandyston township | Sussex | 1 | (1) | 0 | 55 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sparta township | Sussex | 1 | (19) | 2 | 343 | 326 | (1) | 27 | 13 |
| Stanhope borough | Sussex | 1 | (3) | 2 | 170 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stillwater township | Sussex | 1 | (2) | 1 | 27 | 26 | (1) | 0 | 35 |
| Sussex borough | Sussex | 1 | (4) | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Vernon township | Sussex | 1 | (22) | 2 | 426 | 406 | (1) | 28 | 0 |
| Walpack township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Wantage township | Sussex | 1 | (8) | 2 | 99 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belleville township | Essex | 2 | (19) | 86 | 677 | 744 | (105) | 283 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Bloomfield township | Essex | 2 | (15) | 114 | 642 | 741 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | (6) | 17 | (6) | 5 | (10) | 14 | 14 |
| Cedar Grove township | Essex | 2 | (6) | 9 | 26 | 29 | (25) | 15 | 52 |
| City of Orange township | Essex | 2 | (186) | 84 | 1,150 | 1,048 | (27) | 71 | 0 |
| East Orange city | Essex | 2 | (289) | 172 | 2,101 | 1,984 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Essex Fells borough | Essex | 2 | (7) | 0 | 0 | (7) | (16) | 0 | 44 |
| Fairfield township | Essex | 2 | (11) | 2 | 27 | 18 | (57) | 46 | 108 |
| Glen Ridge borough | Essex | 2 | (1) | 2 | 41 | 42 | (13) | 24 | 10 |
| Irvington township | Essex | 2 | (78) | 189 | 2,374 | 2,485 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Livingston township | Essex | 2 | (38) | 2 | 75 | 39 | (67) | 15 | 166 |
| Maplewood township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 26 | 175 | 201 | (4) | 11 | 0 |
| Millburn township | Essex | 2 | (120) | 11 | 0 | (109) | (178) | 140 | 339 |
| Montclair township | Essex | 2 | (20) | 67 | 56 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newark city | Essex | 2 | (1,026) | 935 | 4,658 | 4,567 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | (8) | 1 | 31 | 24 | (34) | 35 | 57 |
| Nutley township | Essex | 2 | (31) | 42 | 138 | 149 | (92) | 247 | 0 |
| Roseland borough | Essex | 2 | (5) | 2 | 11 | 8 | (25) | 0 | 68 |
| S. Orange Village township | Essex | 2 | (1) | 6 | 36 | 41 | (102) | 0 | 275 |
| Verona township | Essex | 2 | (15) | 12 | 49 | 46 | (7) | 0 | 20 |
| West Caldwell township | Essex | 2 | (5) | 1 | 8 | 4 | (46) | 48 | 76 |
| West Orange township | Essex | 2 | (5) | 64 | 284 | 343 | (93) | 251 | 0 |
| Boonton town | Morris | 2 | (6) | 8 | 52 | 54 | (10) | 27 | 0 |
| Boonton township | Morris | 2 | (5) | 0 | 21 | 16 | (21) | 25 | 31 |
| Butler borough | Morris | 2 | (3) | 5 | 118 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chatham borough | Morris | 2 | (24) | 2 | 5 | (17) | (29) | 0 | 79 |
| Chatham township | Morris | 2 | (57) | 1 | 0 | (56) | (115) | 59 | 249 |
| Chester borough | Morris | 2 | (2) | 0 | 0 | (2) | (26) | 11 | 58 |
| Chester township | Morris | 2 | (6) | 0 | 22 | 16 | (24) | 29 | 35 |
| Denville township | Morris | 2 | (35) | 1 | 182 | 148 | (16) | 44 | 0 |
| Dover town | Morris | 2 | (8) | 14 | 155 | 161 | (52) | 139 | 0 |
| East Hanover township | Morris | 2 | (37) | 2 | 11 | (24) | (62) | 37 | 130 |
| Florham Park borough | Morris | 2 | (46) | 2 | 6 | (38) | (251) | 73 | 600 |
| Hanover township | Morris | 2 | (24) | 2 | 49 | 27 | (65) | 29 | 145 |
| Harding township | Morris | 2 | (17) | 0 | 0 | (17) | (46) | 0 | 124 |
| Jefferson township | Morris | 2 | (41) | 2 | 323 | 284 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kinnelon borough | Morris | 2 | (8) | 1 | 25 | 18 | (20) | 0 | 53 |
| Lincoln Park borough | Morris | 2 | (6) | 4 | 86 | 84 | (21) | 11 | 44 |
| Long Hill township | Morris | 2 | (13) | 1 | 13 | 1 | (17) | 14 | 30 |
| Madison borough | Morris | 2 | (46) | 7 | 7 | (32) | (37) | 6 | 95 |
| Mendham borough | Morris | 2 | (6) | 2 | 9 | 5 | (22) | 11 | 49 |
| Mendham township | Morris | 2 | (10) | 0 | 1 | (9) | (40) | 25 | 82 |
| Mine Hill township | Morris | 2 | (12) | 0 | 114 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montville township | Morris | 2 | (39) | 2 | 53 | 16 | (44) | 18 | 99 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Morris township | Morris | 2 | (23) | 3 | 40 | 20 | (154) | 30 | 382 |
| Morris Plains borough | Morris | 2 | (7) | 1 | 20 | 14 | (23) | 35 | 28 |
| Morristown town | Morris | 2 | (19) | 16 | 9 | 6 | (79) | 150 | 61 |
| Mountain Lakes borough | Morris | 2 | (12) | 0 | 1 | (11) | (21) | 1 | 55 |
| Mount Arlington borough | Morris | 2 | (9) | 2 | 68 | 61 | (6) | 15 | 1 |
| Mount Olive township | Morris | 2 | (16) | 9 | 631 | 624 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netcong borough | Morris | 2 | (3) | 2 | 99 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parsippany-Troy Hills twp | Morris | 2 | (78) | 8 | 562 | 492 | (68) | 181 | 0 |
| Pequannock township | Morris | 2 | (38) | 2 | 55 | 19 | (41) | 80 | 29 |
| Randolph township | Morris | 2 | (25) | 4 | 211 | 190 | (13) | 33 | 3 |
| Riverdale borough | Morris | 2 | (6) | 1 | 215 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rockaway borough | Morris | 2 | (3) | 3 | 26 | 26 | (23) | 18 | 43 |
| Rockaway township | Morris | 2 | (28) | 3 | 362 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roxbury township | Morris | 2 | (26) | 4 | 521 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Victory Gardens borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 1 | 161 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington township | Morris | 2 | (4) | 1 | 62 | 59 | (18) | 10 | 39 |
| Wharton borough | Morris | 2 | (15) | 4 | 70 | 59 | (40) | 108 | 0 |
| Berkeley Heights township | Union | 2 | (23) | 3 | 23 | 3 | (91) | 7 | 238 |
| Clark township | Union | 2 | (17) | 4 | (48) | (61) | (54) | 33 | 110 |
| Cranford township | Union | 2 | (10) | 15 | (6) | (1) | (61) | 86 | 77 |
| Elizabeth city | Union | 2 | (435) | 349 | (830) | (916) | (1,604) | 4,303 | 0 |
| Fanwood borough | Union | 2 | (8) | 0 | 11 | 3 | (16) | 14 | 28 |
| Garwood borough | Union | 2 | (2) | 10 | (53) | (45) | (30) | 36 | 43 |
| Hillside township | Union | 2 | (19) | 37 | (36) | (18) | (71) | 190 | 0 |
| Kenilworth borough | Union | 2 | (16) | 7 | 0 | (9) | (21) | 0 | 58 |
| Linden city | Union | 2 | (57) | 86 | (174) | (145) | (226) | 408 | 197 |
| Mountainside borough | Union | 2 | (15) | 1 | 5 | (9) | (59) | 123 | 35 |
| New Providence borough | Union | 2 | (10) | 11 | 13 | 14 | (42) | 56 | 57 |
| Plainfield city | Union | 2 | (39) | 75 | 347 | 383 | (118) | 315 | 0 |
| Rahway city | Union | 2 | (65) | 38 | (132) | (159) | (68) | 93 | 91 |
| Roselle borough | Union | 2 | (3) | 34 | 78 | 109 | (32) | 87 | 0 |
| Roselle Park borough | Union | 2 | (9) | 19 | (120) | (110) | (55) | 68 | 80 |
| Scotch Plains township | Union | 2 | (81) | 8 | 11 | (62) | (76) | 89 | 116 |
| Springfield township | Union | 2 | (8) | 14 | (11) | (5) | (27) | 0 | 73 |
| Summit city | Union | 2 | (45) | 17 | 1 | (27) | (124) | 149 | 183 |
| Union township | Union | 2 | (10) | 61 | (246) | (195) | (214) | 357 | 217 |
| Westfield town | Union | 2 | (134) | 17 | 7 | (110) | (93) | 66 | 185 |
| Winfield township | Union | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | (11) | 18 | 12 |
| Allamuchy township | Warren | 2 | (1) | 1 | 35 | 35 | (32) | 53 | 31 |
| Alpha borough | Warren | 2 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 37 | (4) | 10 | 0 |
| Belvidere town | Warren | 2 | (1) | 3 | 56 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blairstown township | Warren | 2 | (6) | 1 | 14 | 9 | (4) | 0 | 12 |
| Franklin township | Warren | 2 | (3) | 0 | 30 | 27 | (4) | 0 | 10 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|------------------------|-----------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Frelinghuysen township | Warren | 2 | (1) | 0 | 42 | 41 | (23) | 0 | 63 |
| Greenwich township | Warren | 2 | (4) | 2 | 68 | 66 | (13) | 0 | 35 |
| Hackettstown town | Warren | 2 | (3) | 8 | (167) | (162) | (97) | 131 | 131 |
| Hardwick township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harmony township | Warren | 2 | (13) | 0 | 49 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hope township | Warren | 2 | (1) | 0 | 30 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Independence township | Warren | 2 | (2) | 1 | 51 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Knowlton township | Warren | 2 | (4) | 0 | 50 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Liberty township | Warren | 2 | (13) | 0 | 98 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lopatcong township | Warren | 2 | (2) | 2 | 172 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Warren | 2 | (8) | 5 | (48) | (51) | (53) | 20 | 122 |
| Oxford township | Warren | 2 | (1) | 1 | 164 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Phillipsburg town | Warren | 2 | (14) | 21 | 563 | 570 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pohatcong township | Warren | 2 | (7) | 1 | 121 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington borough | Warren | 2 | (4) | 9 | 36 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington township | Warren | 2 | (6) | 0 | 169 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White township | Warren | 2 | (16) | 1 | 16 | 1 | (52) | 59 | 79 |
| Alexandria township | Hunterdon | 3 | (4) | 2 | 25 | 23 | (5) | 21 | 15 |
| Bethlehem township | Hunterdon | 3 | (5) | 0 | 87 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bloomsbury borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 1 | 267 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Califon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (1) | 0 | 100 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinton town | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 6 | 65 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinton township | Hunterdon | 3 | (10) | 10 | 151 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delaware township | Hunterdon | 3 | (4) | 3 | 13 | 12 | (4) | 14 | 16 |
| East Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | (4) | 1 | 25 | 22 | (2) | 1 | 11 |
| Flemington borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (2) | 26 | (89) | (65) | (14) | 45 | 70 |
| Franklin township | Hunterdon | 3 | (3) | 2 | (27) | (28) | (5) | 0 | 42 |
| Frenchtown borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (1) | 6 | 104 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Glen Gardner borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (2) | 5 | 185 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hampton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (2) | 4 | 115 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High Bridge borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (2) | 5 | 161 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Holland township | Hunterdon | 3 | (2) | 3 | 40 | 41 | (4) | 35 | 0 |
| Kingwood township | Hunterdon | 3 | (5) | 4 | 77 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lambertville city | Hunterdon | 3 | (10) | 19 | 3 | 12 | (6) | 42 | 5 |
| Lebanon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (2) | 5 | 118 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lebanon township | Hunterdon | 3 | (7) | 4 | 61 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Milford borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (1) | 3 | 276 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Raritan township | Hunterdon | 3 | (24) | 7 | 114 | 97 | (17) | 20 | 119 |
| Readington township | Hunterdon | 3 | (24) | 6 | 128 | 110 | (45) | 79 | 283 |
| Stockton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | (1) | 2 | 111 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tewksbury township | Hunterdon | 3 | (5) | 1 | 11 | 7 | (8) | 0 | 65 |
| Union township | Hunterdon | 3 | (6) | 3 | (212) | (215) | (28) | 1 | 223 |
| West Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | (7) | 2 | 1 | (4) | (3) | 0 | 26 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Carteret borough | Middlesex | 3 | (19) | 98 | (249) | (170) | (29) | 95 | 141 |
| Cranbury township | Middlesex | 3 | (10) | 5 | 6 | 1 | (13) | 3 | 100 |
| Dunellen borough | Middlesex | 3 | (11) | 38 | (48) | (21) | (4) | 0 | 33 |
| East Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | (4) | 29 | (163) | (138) | (52) | 79 | 342 |
| Edison township | Middlesex | 3 | (104) | 127 | (171) | (148) | (131) | 569 | 486 |
| Helmetta borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highland Park borough | Middlesex | 3 | (12) | 96 | (396) | (312) | (45) | 68 | 297 |
| Jamesburg borough | Middlesex | 3 | (8) | 26 | (67) | (49) | (16) | 32 | 93 |
| Metuchen borough | Middlesex | 3 | (41) | 27 | (7) | (21) | (22) | 70 | 103 |
| Middlesex borough | Middlesex | 3 | (22) | 22 | (117) | (117) | (25) | 67 | 134 |
| Milltown borough | Middlesex | 3 | (1) | 24 | (10) | 13 | (6) | 35 | 12 |
| Monroe township | Middlesex | 3 | (17) | 47 | (892) | (862) | (164) | 91 | 1,225 |
| New Brunswick city | Middlesex | 3 | (166) | 262 | (294) | (198) | (170) | 1,337 | 28 |
| North Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | (20) | 86 | (80) | (14) | (47) | 196 | 181 |
| Old Bridge township | Middlesex | 3 | (37) | 123 | (281) | (195) | (72) | 181 | 394 |
| Perth Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | (35) | 361 | (44) | 282 | (38) | 305 | 0 |
| Piscataway township | Middlesex | 3 | (32) | 92 | (87) | (27) | (61) | 277 | 212 |
| Plainsboro township | Middlesex | 3 | (6) | 52 | (235) | (189) | (49) | 3 | 390 |
| Sayreville borough | Middlesex | 3 | (21) | 57 | (143) | (107) | (43) | 129 | 217 |
| South Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | (7) | 34 | 8 | 35 | (3) | 28 | 0 |
| South Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | (25) | 44 | 54 | 73 | (47) | 115 | 266 |
| South Plainfield borough | Middlesex | 3 | (23) | 23 | (102) | (102) | (38) | 45 | 264 |
| South River borough | Middlesex | 3 | (8) | 58 | (192) | (142) | (35) | 152 | 130 |
| Spotswood borough | Middlesex | 3 | (5) | 9 | (67) | (63) | (11) | 11 | 78 |
| Woodbridge township | Middlesex | 3 | (85) | 154 | (411) | (342) | (123) | 359 | 628 |
| Bedminster township | Somerset | 3 | (7) | 11 | (31) | (27) | (14) | 1 | 108 |
| Bernards township | Somerset | 3 | (37) | 18 | 35 | 16 | (66) | 33 | 501 |
| Bernardsville borough | Somerset | 3 | (21) | 9 | (7) | (19) | (9) | 0 | 70 |
| Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | (8) | 47 | 78 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Branchburg township | Somerset | 3 | (13) | 4 | 213 | 204 | (7) | 2 | 57 |
| Bridgewater township | Somerset | 3 | (53) | 30 | 179 | 156 | (30) | 120 | 122 |
| Far Hills borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | (3) | 2 | 25 |
| Franklin township | Somerset | 3 | (62) | 73 | 752 | 763 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Green Brook township | Somerset | 3 | (5) | 2 | 105 | 102 | (3) | 11 | 13 |
| Hillsborough township | Somerset | 3 | (10) | 14 | 434 | 438 | (14) | 59 | 55 |
| Manville borough | Somerset | 3 | (21) | 41 | (34) | (14) | (21) | 163 | 7 |
| Millstone borough | Somerset | 3 | (1) | 0 | (33) | (34) | (6) | 0 | 46 |
| Montgomery township | Somerset | 3 | (22) | 5 | 47 | 30 | (37) | 73 | 223 |
| North Plainfield borough | Somerset | 3 | (2) | 70 | 269 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peapack & Gladstone bor. | Somerset | 3 | (5) | 4 | 108 | 107 | (2) | 0 | 20 |
| Raritan borough | Somerset | 3 | (4) | 32 | (77) | (49) | (15) | 40 | 85 |
| Rocky Hill borough | Somerset | 3 | (1) | 1 | (2) | (2) | (2) | 0 | 18 |
| Somerville borough | Somerset | 3 | (5) | 47 | (27) | 15 | (14) | 103 | 12 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|----------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| South Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | (4) | 15 | 100 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Warren township | Somerset | 3 | (33) | 2 | 5 | (26) | (32) | 58 | 203 |
| Watchung borough | Somerset | 3 | (22) | 1 | (1) | (22) | (16) | 18 | 113 |
| East Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | (9) | 23 | (29) | (15) | (93) | 57 | 90 |
| Ewing township | Mercer | 4 | (14) | 38 | (49) | (25) | (238) | 115 | 262 |
| Hamilton township | Mercer | 4 | (68) | 121 | (1,062) | (1,009) | (757) | 484 | 714 |
| Hightstown borough | Mercer | 4 | (7) | 12 | (5) | 0 | (24) | 37 | 0 |
| Hopewell borough | Mercer | 4 | (6) | 4 | (27) | (29) | (24) | 16 | 21 |
| Hopewell township | Mercer | 4 | (18) | 8 | 101 | 91 | (127) | 0 | 201 |
| Lawrence township | Mercer | 4 | (16) | 30 | (86) | (72) | (114) | 53 | 128 |
| Pennington borough | Mercer | 4 | (2) | 3 | (1) | 0 | (37) | 59 | 0 |
| Princeton | Mercer | 4 | (65) | 55 | 1 | (9) | (151) | 80 | 159 |
| Robbinsville township | Mercer | 4 | (11) | 2 | (13) | (22) | (75) | 18 | 101 |
| Trenton city | Mercer | 4 | (215) | 280 | 1,030 | 1,095 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | (22) | 15 | 71 | 64 | (115) | 132 | 49 |
| Aberdeen township | Monmouth | 4 | (24) | 10 | 636 | 622 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Allenhurst borough | Monmouth | 4 | (6) | 2 | 0 | (4) | (7) | 4 | 8 |
| Allentown borough | Monmouth | 4 | (1) | 2 | 110 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asbury Park city | Monmouth | 4 | (49) | 64 | (313) | (298) | (227) | 287 | 71 |
| Atlantic Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | (3) | 5 | (21) | (19) | (45) | 70 | 0 |
| Avon-by-the-Sea borough | Monmouth | 4 | (33) | 6 | (1) | (28) | (15) | 0 | 23 |
| Belmar borough | Monmouth | 4 | (59) | 25 | (109) | (143) | (84) | 60 | 73 |
| Bradley Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | (23) | 25 | (50) | (48) | (30) | 14 | 33 |
| Brielle borough | Monmouth | 4 | (34) | 7 | 18 | (9) | (21) | 11 | 23 |
| Colts Neck township | Monmouth | 4 | (21) | 5 | 6 | (10) | (28) | 14 | 30 |
| Deal borough | Monmouth | 4 | (17) | 1 | 0 | (16) | (12) | 2 | 18 |
| Eatontown borough | Monmouth | 4 | (28) | 31 | (82) | (79) | (112) | 124 | 52 |
| Englishtown borough | Monmouth | 4 | (2) | 3 | 138 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fair Haven borough | Monmouth | 4 | (35) | 1 | 4 | (30) | (24) | 0 | 37 |
| Farmingdale borough | Monmouth | 4 | (2) | 2 | (14) | (14) | (9) | 2 | 13 |
| Freehold borough | Monmouth | 4 | (2) | 16 | 117 | 131 | (71) | 112 | 0 |
| Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | (9) | 12 | 224 | 227 | (44) | 69 | 0 |
| Hazlet township | Monmouth | 4 | (17) | 3 | 119 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | (23) | 12 | 305 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Holmdel township | Monmouth | 4 | (9) | 1 | 31 | 23 | (34) | 37 | 18 |
| Howell township | Monmouth | 4 | (38) | 14 | 563 | 539 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Interlaken borough | Monmouth | 4 | (1) | 0 | 0 | (1) | (9) | 3 | 11 |
| Keansburg borough | Monmouth | 4 | (35) | 20 | 750 | 735 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Keyport borough | Monmouth | 4 | (12) | 17 | 7 | 12 | (8) | 13 | 0 |
| Lake Como borough | Monmouth | 4 | (23) | 4 | (52) | (71) | (32) | 4 | 47 |
| Little Silver borough | Monmouth | 4 | (19) | 0 | 11 | (8) | (21) | 8 | 24 |
| Loch Arbour village | Monmouth | 4 | (2) | 0 | 0 | (2) | (7) | 0 | 10 |
| Long Branch city | Monmouth | 4 | (54) | 90 | (669) | (633) | (377) | 340 | 256 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|----------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Manalapan township | Monmouth | 4 | (25) | 12 | 196 | 183 | (20) | 31 | 0 |
| Manasquan borough | Monmouth | 4 | (100) | 17 | (2) | (85) | (42) | 1 | 65 |
| Marlboro township | Monmouth | 4 | (26) | 8 | 398 | 380 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Matawan borough | Monmouth | 4 | (6) | 9 | 101 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middletown township | Monmouth | 4 | (106) | 23 | 636 | 553 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Millstone township | Monmouth | 4 | (20) | 0 | 46 | 26 | (21) | 25 | 8 |
| Monmouth Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | (25) | 2 | (10) | (33) | (19) | 0 | 31 |
| Neptune township | Monmouth | 4 | (34) | 43 | (2) | 7 | (69) | 95 | 15 |
| Neptune City borough | Monmouth | 4 | (6) | 8 | (34) | (32) | (35) | 14 | 42 |
| Ocean township | Monmouth | 4 | (30) | 22 | (12) | (20) | (76) | 88 | 31 |
| Oceanport borough | Monmouth | 4 | (15) | 4 | 13 | 2 | (22) | 0 | 36 |
| Red Bank borough | Monmouth | 4 | (20) | 44 | (55) | (31) | (89) | 140 | 0 |
| Roosevelt borough | Monmouth | 4 | (2) | 1 | 382 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rumson borough | Monmouth | 4 | (102) | 1 | 0 | (101) | (69) | 29 | 81 |
| Sea Bright borough | Monmouth | 4 | (10) | 6 | (22) | (26) | (20) | 12 | 19 |
| Sea Girt borough | Monmouth | 4 | (57) | 1 | 0 | (56) | (34) | 0 | 53 |
| Shrewsbury borough | Monmouth | 4 | (4) | 0 | (2) | (6) | (23) | 11 | 25 |
| Shrewsbury township | Monmouth | 4 | (10) | 2 | 282 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spring Lake borough | Monmouth | 4 | (65) | 2 | 0 | (63) | (39) | 13 | 48 |
| Spring Lake Heights bor. | Monmouth | 4 | (33) | 9 | (58) | (82) | (45) | 21 | 51 |
| Tinton Falls borough | Monmouth | 4 | (21) | 5 | 175 | 159 | (42) | 67 | 0 |
| Union Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | (25) | 5 | 360 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | (13) | 0 | 18 | 5 | (30) | 47 | 0 |
| Wall township | Monmouth | 4 | (78) | 14 | 16 | (48) | (156) | 113 | 133 |
| West Long Branch borough | Monmouth | 4 | (10) | 7 | (6) | (9) | (24) | 14 | 23 |
| Barnegat township | Ocean | 4 | (13) | 7 | 23 | 17 | (60) | 57 | 38 |
| Barnegat Light borough | Ocean | 4 | (6) | 8 | 0 | 2 | (9) | 12 | 1 |
| Bay Head borough | Ocean | 4 | (15) | 2 | 0 | (13) | (10) | 0 | 15 |
| Beach Haven borough | Ocean | 4 | (66) | 31 | (1) | (36) | (20) | 1 | 31 |
| Beachwood borough | Ocean | 4 | (18) | 4 | 143 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Berkeley township | Ocean | 4 | (76) | 15 | 1,954 | 1,893 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brick township | Ocean | 4 | (226) | 39 | 330 | 143 | (156) | 247 | 0 |
| Eagleswood township | Ocean | 4 | (6) | 1 | 31 | 26 | (7) | 0 | 12 |
| Harvey Cedars borough | Ocean | 4 | (9) | 8 | 0 | (1) | (5) | 1 | 7 |
| Island Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | (8) | 1 | (20) | (27) | (17) | 3 | 23 |
| Jackson township | Ocean | 4 | (17) | 20 | 92 | 95 | (117) | 49 | 136 |
| Lacey township | Ocean | 4 | (66) | 5 | 147 | 86 | (32) | 50 | 0 |
| Lakehurst borough | Ocean | 4 | (1) | 5 | 91 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood township | Ocean | 4 | (228) | 123 | (1,068) | (1,173) | (637) | 471 | 536 |
| Lavallette borough | Ocean | 4 | (81) | 34 | (1) | (48) | (22) | 0 | 35 |
| Little Egg Harbor township | Ocean | 4 | (99) | 14 | 443 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Long Beach township | Ocean | 4 | (198) | 84 | 0 | (114) | (57) | 15 | 76 |
| Manchester township | Ocean | 4 | (54) | 136 | 724 | 806 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mantoloking borough | Ocean | 4 | (18) | 0 | 0 | (18) | (15) | 0 | 23 |
| Ocean township | Ocean | 4 | (37) | 1 | (31) | (67) | (58) | 5 | 86 |
| Ocean Gate borough | Ocean | 4 | (7) | 4 | 98 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pine Beach borough | Ocean | 4 | (1) | 0 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Plumsted township | Ocean | 4 | (11) | 7 | (51) | (55) | (36) | 13 | 44 |
| Point Pleasant borough | Ocean | 4 | (99) | 26 | (16) | (89) | (53) | 9 | 75 |
| Point Pleasant Beach bor. | Ocean | 4 | (68) | 27 | (41) | (82) | (58) | 30 | 63 |
| Seaside Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | (56) | 68 | 2 | 14 | (48) | 77 | 0 |
| Seaside Park borough | Ocean | 4 | (54) | 25 | (11) | (40) | (29) | 28 | 17 |
| Ship Bottom borough | Ocean | 4 | (63) | 27 | (38) | (74) | (32) | 0 | 50 |
| South Toms River borough | Ocean | 4 | (1) | 1 | 243 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stafford township | Ocean | 4 | (136) | 11 | 170 | 45 | (77) | 123 | 0 |
| Surf City borough | Ocean | 4 | (55) | 26 | (1) | (30) | (17) | 3 | 24 |
| Toms River township | Ocean | 4 | (486) | 48 | 302 | (136) | (267) | 269 | 152 |
| Tuckerton borough | Ocean | 4 | (12) | 3 | 143 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bass River township | Burlington | 5 | (4) | 0 | 1 | (3) | (2) | 0 | 9 |
| Beverly city | Burlington | 5 | (5) | 0 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bordentown city | Burlington | 5 | (8) | 1 | 27 | 20 | (7) | 28 | 0 |
| Bordentown township | Burlington | 5 | (6) | 1 | 104 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burlington city | Burlington | 5 | (20) | 1 | 119 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burlington township | Burlington | 5 | (6) | 1 | 66 | 61 | (39) | 35 | 113 |
| Chesterfield township | Burlington | 5 | (20) | 0 | 39 | 19 | (8) | 25 | 7 |
| Cinnaminson township | Burlington | 5 | (13) | 0 | 52 | 39 | (11) | 12 | 29 |
| Delanco township | Burlington | 5 | (3) | 0 | 58 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delran township | Burlington | 5 | (8) | 1 | 216 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eastampton township | Burlington | 5 | (8) | 0 | (77) | (85) | (37) | 0 | 141 |
| Edgewater Park township | Burlington | 5 | (1) | 1 | 100 | 100 | (3) | 10 | 0 |
| Evesham township | Burlington | 5 | (13) | 1 | 276 | 264 | (49) | 94 | 92 |
| Fieldsboro borough | Burlington | 5 | (2) | 0 | 114 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Florence township | Burlington | 5 | (18) | 1 | 83 | 66 | (18) | 67 | 0 |
| Hainesport township | Burlington | 5 | (9) | 0 | (2) | (11) | (19) | 0 | 72 |
| Lumberton township | Burlington | 5 | (5) | 0 | 258 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Burlington | 5 | (11) | 0 | 113 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maple Shade township | Burlington | 5 | (25) | 3 | 250 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Medford township | Burlington | 5 | (6) | 0 | (12) | (18) | (36) | 18 | 118 |
| Medford Lakes borough | Burlington | 5 | (6) | 0 | 99 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moorestown township | Burlington | 5 | (29) | 1 | 58 | 30 | (53) | 32 | 168 |
| Mount Holly township | Burlington | 5 | (93) | 2 | 99 | 8 | (2) | 8 | 0 |
| Mount Laurel township | Burlington | 5 | (26) | 2 | 236 | 212 | (45) | 59 | 110 |
| New Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | (1) | 0 | (171) | (172) | (50) | 0 | 189 |
| North Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | (15) | 0 | (241) | (256) | (56) | 0 | 213 |
| Palmyra borough | Burlington | 5 | (5) | 1 | 132 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pemberton borough | Burlington | 5 | (4) | 0 | (43) | (47) | (12) | 0 | 44 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|------------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Pemberton township | Burlington | 5 | (34) | 1 | 168 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside township | Burlington | 5 | (5) | 1 | 151 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverton borough | Burlington | 5 | (1) | 0 | 9 | 8 | (4) | 0 | 14 |
| Shamong township | Burlington | 5 | (4) | 0 | (22) | (26) | (18) | 29 | 39 |
| Southampton township | Burlington | 5 | (25) | 0 | (1) | (26) | (17) | 31 | 33 |
| Springfield township | Burlington | 5 | (3) | 0 | 30 | 27 | (6) | 4 | 17 |
| Tabernacle township | Burlington | 5 | (6) | 0 | 6 | 0 | (9) | 0 | 32 |
| Washington township | Burlington | 5 | (6) | 0 | 44 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Westampton township | Burlington | 5 | (8) | 0 | 210 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Willingboro township | Burlington | 5 | (9) | 0 | 484 | 475 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodland township | Burlington | 5 | (4) | 0 | (11) | (15) | (12) | 2 | 43 |
| Wrightstown borough | Burlington | 5 | (2) | 0 | 120 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Audubon borough | Camden | 5 | (3) | 2 | (77) | (78) | (33) | 53 | 70 |
| Audubon Park borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (2) | 0 | 8 |
| Barrington borough | Camden | 5 | (29) | 1 | (125) | (153) | (40) | 17 | 132 |
| Bellmawr borough | Camden | 5 | (8) | 1 | (137) | (144) | (41) | 25 | 131 |
| Berlin borough | Camden | 5 | (6) | 1 | (82) | (87) | (36) | 37 | 100 |
| Berlin township | Camden | 5 | (24) | 1 | (90) | (113) | (48) | 39 | 140 |
| Brooklawn borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Camden city | Camden | 5 | (689) | 16 | 1,098 | 425 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cherry Hill township | Camden | 5 | (46) | 4 | (118) | (160) | (208) | 276 | 511 |
| Chesilhurst borough | Camden | 5 | (11) | 0 | 23 | 12 | (2) | 8 | 0 |
| Clementon borough | Camden | 5 | (6) | 1 | (8) | (13) | (18) | 51 | 18 |
| Collingswood borough | Camden | 5 | (12) | 5 | (429) | (436) | (105) | 40 | 359 |
| Gibbsboro borough | Camden | 5 | (3) | 0 | 1 | (2) | (11) | 21 | 20 |
| Gloucester township | Camden | 5 | (8) | 6 | 127 | 125 | (57) | 98 | 115 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | (39) | 2 | 231 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Haddon township | Camden | 5 | (12) | 2 | (196) | (206) | (62) | 39 | 193 |
| Haddonfield borough | Camden | 5 | (18) | 1 | (3) | (20) | (22) | 7 | 74 |
| Haddon Heights borough | Camden | 5 | (5) | 1 | (76) | (80) | (26) | 15 | 85 |
| Hi-Nella borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Laurel Springs borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lawnside borough | Camden | 5 | (10) | 0 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lindenwold borough | Camden | 5 | (12) | 3 | 286 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Magnolia borough | Camden | 5 | (8) | 0 | (16) | (24) | (12) | 15 | 29 |
| Merchantville borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 2 | (87) | (85) | (20) | 0 | 75 |
| Mount Ephraim borough | Camden | 5 | (9) | 0 | 42 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oaklyn borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 1 | (31) | (30) | (15) | 10 | 47 |
| Pennsauken township | Camden | 5 | (27) | 5 | (71) | (93) | (48) | 137 | 45 |
| Pine Hill borough | Camden | 5 | (13) | 1 | (5) | (17) | (12) | 8 | 36 |
| Pine Valley borough | Camden | 5 | (2) | 0 | 0 | (2) | (3) | 0 | 12 |
| Runnemede borough | Camden | 5 | (5) | 1 | (105) | (109) | (33) | 28 | 99 |
| Somerdale borough | Camden | 5 | (3) | 1 | (282) | (284) | (64) | 0 | 241 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Stratford borough | Camden | 5 | (13) | 1 | (35) | (47) | (17) | 12 | 50 |
| Tavistock borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (1) | 0 | 4 |
| Voorhees township | Camden | 5 | (17) | 2 | (200) | (215) | (127) | 205 | 274 |
| Waterford township | Camden | 5 | (11) | 0 | (142) | (153) | (39) | 0 | 149 |
| Winslow township | Camden | 5 | (83) | 2 | (67) | (148) | (80) | 41 | 260 |
| Woodlynne borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 1 | 126 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clayton borough | Gloucester | 5 | (15) | 1 | (102) | (116) | (42) | 44 | 114 |
| Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | (49) | 2 | (77) | (124) | (84) | 89 | 228 |
| East Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | (3) | 1 | 151 | 149 | (2) | 9 | 0 |
| Elk township | Gloucester | 5 | (3) | 0 | 24 | 21 | (16) | 6 | 53 |
| Franklin township | Gloucester | 5 | (36) | 1 | (10) | (45) | (42) | 52 | 107 |
| Glassboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | (59) | 1 | (268) | (326) | (101) | 13 | 368 |
| Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | (5) | 0 | 2 | (3) | (10) | 0 | 36 |
| Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | (24) | 0 | 95 | 71 | (17) | 0 | 65 |
| Logan township | Gloucester | 5 | (6) | 0 | 4 | (2) | (48) | 0 | 183 |
| Mantua township | Gloucester | 5 | (9) | 0 | (12) | (21) | (43) | 57 | 107 |
| Monroe township | Gloucester | 5 | (45) | 1 | (59) | (103) | (74) | 91 | 189 |
| National Park borough | Gloucester | 5 | (3) | 0 | 1 | (2) | (4) | 6 | 8 |
| Newfield borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Paulsboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | (11) | 2 | 85 | 76 | (10) | 40 | 0 |
| Pitman borough | Gloucester | 5 | (3) | 1 | 16 | 14 | (10) | 37 | 0 |
| South Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | (4) | 0 | (2) | (6) | (7) | 0 | 26 |
| Swedesboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | (3) | 0 | 8 | 5 | (9) | 22 | 10 |
| Washington township | Gloucester | 5 | (19) | 2 | 134 | 117 | (66) | 175 | 75 |
| Wenonah borough | Gloucester | 5 | (2) | 0 | 32 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | (12) | 1 | (153) | (164) | (66) | 15 | 234 |
| Westville borough | Gloucester | 5 | (2) | 1 | 87 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodbury city | Gloucester | 5 | (12) | 2 | 51 | 41 | (12) | 17 | 30 |
| Woodbury Heights borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woolwich township | Gloucester | 5 | (3) | 0 | 519 | 516 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Absecon city | Atlantic | 6 | (4) | 5 | 124 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | (231) | 117 | 971 | 857 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigantine city | Atlantic | 6 | (169) | 47 | (516) | (638) | (705) | 0 | 0 |
| Buena borough | Atlantic | 6 | (17) | 10 | 104 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buena Vista township | Atlantic | 6 | (8) | 7 | 110 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corbin City | Atlantic | 6 | (8) | 0 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Egg Harbor township | Atlantic | 6 | (120) | 18 | 465 | 363 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Egg Harbor City | Atlantic | 6 | (3) | 10 | 127 | 134 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estell Manor city | Atlantic | 6 | (4) | 0 | 3 | (1) | (2) | 0 | 0 |
| Folsom borough | Atlantic | 6 | (3) | 0 | 93 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Galloway township | Atlantic | 6 | (65) | 21 | 594 | 550 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hamilton township | Atlantic | 6 | (22) | 17 | 96 | 91 | (49) | 0 | 0 |
| Hammonton town | Atlantic | 6 | (21) | 22 | 228 | 229 | (5) | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Linwood city | Atlantic | 6 | (17) | 2 | 138 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Longport borough | Atlantic | 6 | (51) | 3 | 0 | (48) | (55) | 0 | 0 |
| Margate City | Atlantic | 6 | (144) | 23 | (107) | (228) | (294) | 0 | 0 |
| Mullica township | Atlantic | 6 | (15) | 1 | 57 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northfield city | Atlantic | 6 | (10) | 2 | 141 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pleasantville city | Atlantic | 6 | (38) | 22 | 1,040 | 1,024 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Port Republic city | Atlantic | 6 | (1) | 0 | (15) | (16) | (19) | 0 | 0 |
| Somers Point city | Atlantic | 6 | (12) | 16 | (81) | (77) | (106) | 0 | 0 |
| Ventnor City | Atlantic | 6 | (8) | 44 | (165) | (129) | (164) | 0 | 0 |
| Weymouth township | Atlantic | 6 | (4) | 2 | 44 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Avalon borough | Cape May | 6 | (313) | 19 | 0 | (294) | (308) | 0 | 0 |
| Cape May city | Cape May | 6 | (29) | 26 | (13) | (16) | (30) | 0 | 0 |
| Cape May Point borough | Cape May | 6 | (13) | 1 | 0 | (12) | (13) | 0 | 0 |
| Dennis township | Cape May | 6 | (15) | 0 | 259 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower township | Cape May | 6 | (85) | 12 | 963 | 890 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middle township | Cape May | 6 | (66) | 18 | 615 | 567 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | (109) | 73 | 204 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ocean City | Cape May | 6 | (915) | 130 | (41) | (826) | (927) | 0 | 0 |
| Sea Isle City | Cape May | 6 | (356) | 38 | 0 | (318) | (331) | 0 | 0 |
| Stone Harbor borough | Cape May | 6 | (116) | 15 | 0 | (101) | (106) | 0 | 0 |
| Upper township | Cape May | 6 | (17) | 2 | 320 | 305 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Cape May borough | Cape May | 6 | (12) | 3 | (9) | (18) | (20) | 0 | 0 |
| West Wildwood borough | Cape May | 6 | (18) | 5 | 69 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | (117) | 82 | 343 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wildwood Crest borough | Cape May | 6 | (71) | 37 | 87 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodbine borough | Cape May | 6 | (4) | 1 | 263 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bridgeton city | Cumberland | 6 | (59) | 44 | 281 | 266 | (89) | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial township | Cumberland | 6 | (22) | 1 | 135 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | (12) | 1 | 30 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Downe township | Cumberland | 6 | (17) | 0 | (65) | (82) | (97) | 0 | 0 |
| Fairfield township | Cumberland | 6 | (13) | 2 | 13 | 2 | (47) | 0 | 0 |
| Greenwich township | Cumberland | 6 | (3) | 1 | 63 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hopewell township | Cumberland | 6 | (4) | 2 | 28 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lawrence township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maurice River township | Cumberland | 6 | (17) | 2 | 18 | 3 | (6) | 0 | 0 |
| Millville city | Cumberland | 6 | (88) | 46 | 0 | (42) | (205) | 0 | 0 |
| Shiloh borough | Cumberland | 6 | (1) | 1 | 0 | 0 | (4) | 0 | 0 |
| Stow Creek township | Cumberland | 6 | (2) | 0 | (14) | (16) | (18) | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | (36) | 8 | (163) | (191) | (241) | 0 | 0 |
| Vineland city | Cumberland | 6 | (123) | 94 | (691) | (720) | (1,075) | 0 | 0 |
| Alloway township | Salem | 6 | (1) | 1 | (29) | (29) | (33) | 0 | 0 |
| Carneys Point township | Salem | 6 | (15) | 4 | (38) | (49) | (112) | 0 | 0 |
| Elmer borough | Salem | 6 | (1) | 2 | (37) | (36) | (42) | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | LMI Demo- litions | LMI Conver- sions | Net Filtering | Secondary Sources Net | Remaining Secondary Source Allocation | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Elsinboro township | Salem | 6 | (5) | 1 | 35 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower Alloways Creek twp | Salem | 6 | (3) | 1 | 44 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mannington township | Salem | 6 | (6) | 0 | 4 | (2) | (8) | 0 | 0 |
| Oldmans township | Salem | 6 | (5) | 2 | (18) | (21) | (37) | 0 | 0 |
| Penns Grove borough | Salem | 6 | (2) | 12 | 234 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsville township | Salem | 6 | (21) | 15 | 48 | 42 | (7) | 0 | 0 |
| Pilesgrove township | Salem | 6 | (13) | 0 | (46) | (59) | (104) | 0 | 0 |
| Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | (17) | 1 | (24) | (40) | (78) | 0 | 0 |
| Quinton township | Salem | 6 | (5) | 1 | (3) | (7) | (8) | 0 | 0 |
| Salem city | Salem | 6 | (53) | 15 | 272 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | (18) | 0 | (69) | (87) | (101) | 0 | 0 |
| Woodstown borough | Salem | 6 | (7) | 6 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



APPENDIX D: ALLOCATION CAP ADJUSTMENTS TO MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS

TABLE D.1: ALLOCATION CAP ADJUSTMENTS TO MUNICIPAL OBLIGATIONS

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Allendale borough | Bergen | 1 | 14 | 111 | 2,142 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 111 |
| Alpine borough | Bergen | 1 | 4 | 162 | 638 | (35) | 0 | 4 | 127 |
| Bergenfield borough | Bergen | 1 | 152 | 44 | 9,179 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 44 |
| Bogota borough | Bergen | 1 | 24 | 0 | 2,682 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Carlstadt borough | Bergen | 1 | 34 | 146 | 2,213 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 146 |
| Cliffside Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 143 | 69 | 10,487 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 69 |
| Closter borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 159 | 2,787 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| Cresskill borough | Bergen | 1 | 43 | 331 | 3,161 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 331 |
| Demarest borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 118 | 1,653 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| Dumont borough | Bergen | 1 | 39 | 63 | 6,303 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 63 |
| East Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 187 | 94 | 3,892 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 94 |
| Edgewater borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 318 | 5,657 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 318 |
| Elmwood Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 44 | 165 | 7,182 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 165 |
| Emerson borough | Bergen | 1 | 56 | 107 | 2,472 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 107 |
| Englewood city | Bergen | 1 | 380 | 87 | 10,416 | 0 | 0 | 380 | 87 |
| Englewood Cliffs borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 323 | 1,749 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 323 |
| Fair Lawn borough | Bergen | 1 | 167 | 165 | 12,065 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 165 |
| Fairview borough | Bergen | 1 | 227 | 21 | 5,061 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 21 |
| Fort Lee borough | Bergen | 1 | 264 | 258 | 16,761 | 0 | 0 | 264 | 258 |
| Franklin Lakes borough | Bergen | 1 | 33 | 419 | 3,582 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 419 |
| Garfield city | Bergen | 1 | 132 | 51 | 11,028 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 51 |
| Glen Rock borough | Bergen | 1 | 15 | 109 | 3,728 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 109 |
| Hackensack city | Bergen | 1 | 119 | 0 | 18,492 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 |
| Harrington Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 4 | 139 | 1,657 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 139 |
| Hasbrouck Heights borough | Bergen | 1 | 68 | 359 | 4,444 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 359 |
| Haworth borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 72 | 1,147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Hillsdale borough | Bergen | 1 | 14 | 126 | 3,489 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 126 |
| Ho-Ho-Kus borough | Bergen | 1 | 10 | 113 | 1,352 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 113 |
| Leonia borough | Bergen | 1 | 77 | 154 | 3,312 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 154 |
| Little Ferry borough | Bergen | 1 | 118 | 0 | 4,051 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 0 |
| Lodi borough | Bergen | 1 | 172 | 99 | 9,271 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 99 |
| Lyndhurst township | Bergen | 1 | 216 | 117 | 8,483 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 117 |
| Mahwah township | Bergen | 1 | 68 | 236 | 9,722 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 236 |
| Maywood borough | Bergen | 1 | 26 | 63 | 3,636 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 63 |
| Midland Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 26 | 59 | 2,791 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 59 |
| Montvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 2 | 349 | 2,886 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 349 |
| Moonachie borough | Bergen | 1 | 31 | 63 | 1,078 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 63 |
| New Milford borough | Bergen | 1 | 39 | 88 | 6,109 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 88 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|--------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| North Arlington borough | Bergen | 1 | 164 | 39 | 6,129 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 39 |
| Northvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 3 | 71 | 1,506 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 71 |
| Norwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 88 | 1,856 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Oakland borough | Bergen | 1 | 25 | 91 | 4,204 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 91 |
| Old Tappan borough | Bergen | 1 | 10 | 288 | 1,968 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 288 |
| Oradell borough | Bergen | 1 | 14 | 73 | 2,636 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 73 |
| Palisades Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 136 | 167 | 7,526 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 167 |
| Paramus borough | Bergen | 1 | 141 | 613 | 8,581 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 613 |
| Park Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 115 | 116 | 3,135 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 116 |
| Ramsey borough | Bergen | 1 | 53 | 184 | 5,550 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 184 |
| Ridgefield borough | Bergen | 1 | 143 | 128 | 4,116 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 128 |
| Ridgefield Park village | Bergen | 1 | 142 | 0 | 4,563 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 |
| Ridgewood village | Bergen | 1 | 6 | 341 | 8,353 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 341 |
| River Edge borough | Bergen | 1 | 42 | 86 | 3,990 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 86 |
| River Vale township | Bergen | 1 | 20 | 119 | 3,306 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 119 |
| Rochelle Park township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 53 | 2,068 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Rockleigh borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 212 | 71 | (198) | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 170 | 224 | 6,728 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 224 |
| Saddle Brook township | Bergen | 1 | 38 | 103 | 5,199 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 103 |
| Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 45 | 308 | 1,070 | (94) | 0 | 45 | 214 |
| South Hackensack township | Bergen | 1 | 59 | 67 | 936 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 67 |
| Teaneck township | Bergen | 1 | 89 | 665 | 13,105 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 665 |
| Tenafly borough | Bergen | 1 | 24 | 238 | 4,811 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 238 |
| Teterboro borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 115 | 33 | (109) | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Upper Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 8 | 347 | 2,593 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 347 |
| Waldwick borough | Bergen | 1 | 62 | 52 | 3,442 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 52 |
| Wallington borough | Bergen | 1 | 77 | 0 | 4,667 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 |
| Washington township | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 220 | 3,320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 220 |
| Westwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 52 | 78 | 4,324 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 78 |
| Woodcliff Lake borough | Bergen | 1 | 18 | 290 | 2,083 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 290 |
| Wood-Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3,163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wyckoff township | Bergen | 1 | 34 | 272 | 5,817 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 272 |
| Bayonne city | Hudson | 1 | 737 | 927 | 25,630 | 0 | (664) | 737 | 263 |
| East Newark borough | Hudson | 1 | 7 | 37 | 817 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 37 |
| Guttenberg town | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4,650 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harrison town | Hudson | 1 | 214 | 457 | 5,483 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 457 |
| Hoboken city | Hudson | 1 | 186 | 0 | 24,786 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | 3,738 | 1,922 | 97,659 | 0 | 0 | 3,738 | 1,922 |
| Kearny town | Hudson | 1 | 188 | 643 | 13,578 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 643 |
| North Bergen township | Hudson | 1 | 676 | 368 | 21,575 | 0 | (44) | 676 | 324 |
| Secaucus town | Hudson | 1 | 46 | 433 | 7,153 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 433 |
| Union City | Hudson | 1 | 1,396 | 0 | 22,472 | 0 | (396) | 1,000 | 0 |
| Weehawken township | Hudson | 1 | 127 | 0 | 5,966 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 0 |
| West New York town | Hudson | 1 | 504 | 0 | 18,970 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|-----------------------|---------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Bloomington borough | Passaic | 1 | 51 | 24 | 2,875 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 24 |
| Clifton city | Passaic | 1 | 1,516 | 0 | 29,346 | 0 | (516) | 1,000 | 0 |
| Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 54 | 0 | 2,436 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Hawthorne borough | Passaic | 1 | 93 | 59 | 6,998 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 59 |
| Little Falls township | Passaic | 1 | 139 | 119 | 5,312 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 119 |
| North Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 144 | 2,966 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| Passaic city | Passaic | 1 | 5,086 | 0 | 20,236 | 0 | (4,086) | 1,000 | 0 |
| Paterson city | Passaic | 1 | 2,925 | 0 | 43,950 | 0 | (1,925) | 1,000 | 0 |
| Pompton Lakes borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3,979 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prospect Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,690 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ringwood borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3,910 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totowa borough | Passaic | 1 | 125 | 211 | 3,488 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 211 |
| Wanaque borough | Passaic | 1 | 66 | 0 | 4,144 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
| Wayne township | Passaic | 1 | 245 | 807 | 18,161 | 0 | (52) | 245 | 755 |
| West Milford township | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9,393 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodland Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 224 | 177 | 4,497 | 0 | 0 | 224 | 177 |
| Andover borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Andover township | Sussex | 1 | 5 | 221 | 1,959 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 221 |
| Branchville borough | Sussex | 1 | 1 | 209 | 375 | (134) | 0 | 1 | 75 |
| Byram township | Sussex | 1 | 24 | 47 | 2,915 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 47 |
| Frankford township | Sussex | 1 | 27 | 60 | 2,054 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 60 |
| Franklin borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2,030 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fredon township | Sussex | 1 | 20 | 115 | 1,222 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 115 |
| Green township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 12 | 1,192 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Hamburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,483 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hampton township | Sussex | 1 | 7 | 46 | 2,022 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 46 |
| Hardyston township | Sussex | 1 | 18 | 460 | 3,435 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 460 |
| Hopatcong borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5,689 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lafayette township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 102 | 896 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| Montague township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1,543 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Newton town | Sussex | 1 | 151 | 162 | 3,286 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 162 |
| Ogdensburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 845 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sandyston township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 806 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sparta township | Sussex | 1 | 27 | 13 | 6,710 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 13 |
| Stanhope borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1,411 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stillwater township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 35 | 1,663 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Sussex borough | Sussex | 1 | 3 | 0 | 829 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Vernon township | Sussex | 1 | 28 | 0 | 8,367 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Walpack township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wantage township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4,021 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belleville township | Essex | 2 | 283 | 0 | 12,892 | 0 | 0 | 283 | 0 |
| Bloomfield township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17,835 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 14 | 14 | 3,452 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| Cedar Grove township | Essex | 2 | 15 | 52 | 4,282 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 52 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|--------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| City of Orange township | Essex | 2 | 71 | 0 | 11,234 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 |
| East Orange city | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 25,115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Essex Fells borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | 44 | 705 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Fairfield township | Essex | 2 | 46 | 108 | 2,532 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 108 |
| Glen Ridge borough | Essex | 2 | 24 | 10 | 2,447 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 10 |
| Irvington township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20,193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Livingston township | Essex | 2 | 15 | 166 | 9,670 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 166 |
| Maplewood township | Essex | 2 | 11 | 0 | 8,227 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Millburn township | Essex | 2 | 140 | 339 | 6,677 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 339 |
| Montclair township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14,383 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newark city | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 93,175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 35 | 57 | 2,167 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 57 |
| Nutley township | Essex | 2 | 247 | 0 | 11,264 | 0 | 0 | 247 | 0 |
| Roseland borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | 68 | 2,435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| S. Orange Village township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 275 | 5,312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |
| Verona township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 20 | 5,222 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| West Caldwell township | Essex | 2 | 48 | 76 | 3,821 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 76 |
| West Orange township | Essex | 2 | 251 | 0 | 16,018 | 0 | 0 | 251 | 0 |
| Boonton town | Morris | 2 | 27 | 0 | 3,185 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 |
| Boonton township | Morris | 2 | 25 | 31 | 1,518 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 31 |
| Butler borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2,856 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chatham borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 79 | 2,899 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| Chatham township | Morris | 2 | 59 | 249 | 4,004 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 249 |
| Chester borough | Morris | 2 | 11 | 58 | 561 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 58 |
| Chester township | Morris | 2 | 29 | 35 | 2,476 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 35 |
| Denville township | Morris | 2 | 44 | 0 | 6,486 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| Dover town | Morris | 2 | 139 | 0 | 5,423 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 |
| East Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 37 | 130 | 3,888 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 130 |
| Florham Park borough | Morris | 2 | 73 | 600 | 4,135 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 600 |
| Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 29 | 145 | 5,227 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 145 |
| Harding township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 124 | 1,443 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| Jefferson township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7,765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kinnelon borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 53 | 3,635 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Lincoln Park borough | Morris | 2 | 11 | 44 | 3,966 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 44 |
| Long Hill township | Morris | 2 | 14 | 30 | 2,940 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 30 |
| Madison borough | Morris | 2 | 6 | 95 | 5,469 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 95 |
| Mendham borough | Morris | 2 | 11 | 49 | 1,656 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 49 |
| Mendham township | Morris | 2 | 25 | 82 | 1,977 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 82 |
| Mine Hill township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,221 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Montville township | Morris | 2 | 18 | 99 | 7,529 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 99 |
| Morris township | Morris | 2 | 30 | 382 | 8,291 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 382 |
| Morris Plains borough | Morris | 2 | 35 | 28 | 2,142 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 28 |
| Morristown town | Morris | 2 | 150 | 61 | 7,977 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 61 |
| Mountain Lakes borough | Morris | 2 | 1 | 55 | 1,265 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 55 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|--------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mount Arlington borough | Morris | 2 | 15 | 1 | 2,440 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 |
| Mount Olive township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11,083 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Netcong borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,489 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parsippany-Troy Hills twp | Morris | 2 | 181 | 0 | 19,779 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 |
| Pequannock township | Morris | 2 | 80 | 29 | 6,251 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 29 |
| Randolph township | Morris | 2 | 33 | 3 | 9,090 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 3 |
| Riverdale borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,901 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rockaway borough | Morris | 2 | 18 | 43 | 2,568 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 43 |
| Rockaway township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8,862 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roxbury township | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8,068 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Victory Gardens borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 555 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington township | Morris | 2 | 10 | 39 | 6,472 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 39 |
| Wharton borough | Morris | 2 | 108 | 0 | 2,187 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 0 |
| Berkeley Heights township | Union | 2 | 7 | 238 | 4,388 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 238 |
| Clark township | Union | 2 | 33 | 110 | 5,503 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 110 |
| Cranford township | Union | 2 | 86 | 77 | 8,696 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 77 |
| Elizabeth city | Union | 2 | 4,303 | 0 | 39,526 | 0 | (3,303) | 1,000 | 0 |
| Fanwood borough | Union | 2 | 14 | 28 | 2,545 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 |
| Garwood borough | Union | 2 | 36 | 43 | 1,622 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 43 |
| Hillside township | Union | 2 | 190 | 0 | 7,250 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 0 |
| Kenilworth borough | Union | 2 | 0 | 58 | 2,637 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Linden city | Union | 2 | 408 | 197 | 14,793 | 0 | 0 | 408 | 197 |
| Mountainside borough | Union | 2 | 123 | 35 | 2,424 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 35 |
| New Providence borough | Union | 2 | 56 | 57 | 4,417 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 57 |
| Plainfield city | Union | 2 | 315 | 0 | 14,529 | 0 | 0 | 315 | 0 |
| Rahway city | Union | 2 | 93 | 91 | 10,691 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 91 |
| Roselle borough | Union | 2 | 87 | 0 | 8,299 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 |
| Roselle Park borough | Union | 2 | 68 | 80 | 5,159 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 80 |
| Scotch Plains township | Union | 2 | 89 | 116 | 8,502 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 116 |
| Springfield township | Union | 2 | 0 | 73 | 7,298 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Summit city | Union | 2 | 149 | 183 | 7,733 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 183 |
| Union township | Union | 2 | 357 | 217 | 20,264 | 0 | 0 | 357 | 217 |
| Westfield town | Union | 2 | 66 | 185 | 10,026 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 185 |
| Winfield township | Union | 2 | 18 | 12 | 687 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 12 |
| Allamuchy township | Warren | 2 | 53 | 31 | 2,111 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 31 |
| Alpha borough | Warren | 2 | 10 | 0 | 995 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Belvidere town | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,080 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blairstown township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 12 | 2,150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Franklin township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 10 | 1,104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Frelinghuysen township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 63 | 803 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| Greenwich township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 35 | 1,824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Hackettstown town | Warren | 2 | 131 | 131 | 3,509 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 131 |
| Hardwick township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Harmony township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|-------------------------|-----------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Hope township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 667 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Independence township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Knowlton township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Liberty township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,041 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lopatcong township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3,165 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Warren | 2 | 20 | 122 | 3,092 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 122 |
| Oxford township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Phillipsburg town | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5,824 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pohatcong township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1,217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington borough | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2,572 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington township | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2,472 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White township | Warren | 2 | 59 | 79 | 2,159 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 79 |
| Alexandria township | Hunterdon | 3 | 21 | 15 | 1,670 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 15 |
| Bethlehem township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1,253 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bloomsbury borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Califon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinton town | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1,015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clinton township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4,309 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delaware township | Hunterdon | 3 | 14 | 16 | 1,882 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 |
| East Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 1 | 11 | 1,436 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| Flemington borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 45 | 70 | 1,841 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 70 |
| Franklin township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 42 | 1,187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Frenchtown borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 665 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Glen Gardner borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 723 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hampton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 486 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High Bridge borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1,418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Holland township | Hunterdon | 3 | 35 | 0 | 2,091 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| Kingwood township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1,374 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lambertville city | Hunterdon | 3 | 42 | 5 | 1,869 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 5 |
| Lebanon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 708 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lebanon township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2,252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Milford borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 446 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Raritan township | Hunterdon | 3 | 20 | 119 | 8,407 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 119 |
| Readington township | Hunterdon | 3 | 79 | 283 | 6,071 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 283 |
| Stockton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tewksbury township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 65 | 2,190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Union township | Hunterdon | 3 | 1 | 223 | 1,849 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 223 |
| West Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 26 | 1,074 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Carteret borough | Middlesex | 3 | 95 | 141 | 7,869 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 141 |
| Cranbury township | Middlesex | 3 | 3 | 100 | 1,251 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100 |
| Dunellen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 33 | 2,617 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| East Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 79 | 342 | 16,860 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 342 |
| Edison township | Middlesex | 3 | 569 | 486 | 34,232 | 0 | (55) | 569 | 431 |
| Helmetta borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 0 | 924 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|-----------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Highland Park borough | Middlesex | 3 | 68 | 297 | 5,706 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 297 |
| Jamesburg borough | Middlesex | 3 | 32 | 93 | 2,264 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 93 |
| Metuchen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 70 | 103 | 5,209 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 103 |
| Middlesex borough | Middlesex | 3 | 67 | 134 | 4,843 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 134 |
| Milltown borough | Middlesex | 3 | 35 | 12 | 2,576 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 12 |
| Monroe township | Middlesex | 3 | 91 | 1,225 | 18,184 | 0 | (316) | 91 | 909 |
| New Brunswick city | Middlesex | 3 | 1,337 | 28 | 14,203 | 0 | (365) | 1,000 | 0 |
| North Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 196 | 181 | 14,678 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 181 |
| Old Bridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 181 | 394 | 23,938 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 394 |
| Perth Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 305 | 0 | 16,344 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 0 |
| Piscataway township | Middlesex | 3 | 277 | 212 | 17,381 | 0 | 0 | 277 | 212 |
| Plainsboro township | Middlesex | 3 | 3 | 390 | 9,263 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 390 |
| Sayreville borough | Middlesex | 3 | 129 | 217 | 15,956 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 217 |
| South Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 28 | 0 | 3,589 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| South Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 115 | 266 | 15,284 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 266 |
| South Plainfield borough | Middlesex | 3 | 45 | 264 | 8,152 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 264 |
| South River borough | Middlesex | 3 | 152 | 130 | 5,358 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 130 |
| Spotswood borough | Middlesex | 3 | 11 | 78 | 3,160 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 78 |
| Woodbridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 359 | 628 | 34,464 | 0 | 0 | 359 | 628 |
| Bedminster township | Somerset | 3 | 1 | 108 | 4,001 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 108 |
| Bernards township | Somerset | 3 | 33 | 501 | 9,690 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 501 |
| Bernardsville borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 70 | 2,574 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3,480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Branchburg township | Somerset | 3 | 2 | 57 | 5,176 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 57 |
| Bridgewater township | Somerset | 3 | 120 | 122 | 15,497 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 122 |
| Far Hills borough | Somerset | 3 | 2 | 25 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 |
| Franklin township | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 24,639 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Green Brook township | Somerset | 3 | 11 | 13 | 2,338 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 |
| Hillsborough township | Somerset | 3 | 59 | 55 | 13,515 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 55 |
| Manville borough | Somerset | 3 | 163 | 7 | 3,831 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 7 |
| Millstone borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 46 | 159 | (15) | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Montgomery township | Somerset | 3 | 73 | 223 | 7,475 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 223 |
| North Plainfield borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7,353 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peapack & Gladstone bor. | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 20 | 939 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Raritan borough | Somerset | 3 | 40 | 85 | 3,117 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 85 |
| Rocky Hill borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 18 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Somerville borough | Somerset | 3 | 103 | 12 | 4,736 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 12 |
| South Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1,585 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Warren township | Somerset | 3 | 58 | 203 | 5,007 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 203 |
| Watchung borough | Somerset | 3 | 18 | 113 | 2,107 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 113 |
| East Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 57 | 90 | 9,936 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 90 |
| Ewing township | Mercer | 4 | 115 | 262 | 12,875 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 262 |
| Hamilton township | Mercer | 4 | 484 | 714 | 33,799 | 0 | (198) | 484 | 516 |
| Hightstown borough | Mercer | 4 | 37 | 0 | 1,922 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|----------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Hopewell borough | Mercer | 4 | 16 | 21 | 754 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 21 |
| Hopewell township | Mercer | 4 | 0 | 201 | 6,586 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 |
| Lawrence township | Mercer | 4 | 53 | 128 | 12,053 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 128 |
| Pennington borough | Mercer | 4 | 59 | 0 | 1,031 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 |
| Princeton | Mercer | 4 | 80 | 159 | 9,571 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 159 |
| Robbinsville township | Mercer | 4 | 18 | 101 | 5,281 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 101 |
| Trenton city | Mercer | 4 | 0 | 0 | 28,107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 132 | 49 | 9,893 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 49 |
| Aberdeen township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7,073 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Allenhurst borough | Monmouth | 4 | 4 | 8 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Allentown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 682 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asbury Park city | Monmouth | 4 | 287 | 71 | 6,615 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 71 |
| Atlantic Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 70 | 0 | 1,734 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 |
| Avon-by-the-Sea borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 23 | 869 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Belmar borough | Monmouth | 4 | 60 | 73 | 2,747 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 73 |
| Bradley Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 14 | 33 | 2,197 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 33 |
| Brielle borough | Monmouth | 4 | 11 | 23 | 1,872 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 |
| Colts Neck township | Monmouth | 4 | 14 | 30 | 3,204 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 30 |
| Deal borough | Monmouth | 4 | 2 | 18 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 |
| Eatontown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 124 | 52 | 5,263 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 52 |
| Englishtown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 721 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fair Haven borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 37 | 2,128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Farmingdale borough | Monmouth | 4 | 2 | 13 | 555 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| Freehold borough | Monmouth | 4 | 112 | 0 | 3,895 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 |
| Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 69 | 0 | 12,624 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 |
| Hazlet township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7,029 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2,327 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Holmdel township | Monmouth | 4 | 37 | 18 | 5,588 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 18 |
| Howell township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 18,101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Interlaken borough | Monmouth | 4 | 3 | 11 | 374 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| Keansburg borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3,988 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Keyport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 13 | 0 | 3,167 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Lake Como borough | Monmouth | 4 | 4 | 47 | 762 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 47 |
| Little Silver borough | Monmouth | 4 | 8 | 24 | 2,079 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 24 |
| Loch Arbour village | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 10 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Long Branch city | Monmouth | 4 | 340 | 256 | 12,218 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 256 |
| Manalapan township | Monmouth | 4 | 31 | 0 | 13,730 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| Manasquan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 1 | 65 | 2,442 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 65 |
| Marlboro township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12,859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Matawan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3,433 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middletown township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 24,028 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Millstone township | Monmouth | 4 | 25 | 8 | 3,399 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 8 |
| Monmouth Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 31 | 1,564 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Neptune township | Monmouth | 4 | 95 | 15 | 11,191 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 15 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|----------------------------|----------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Neptune City borough | Monmouth | 4 | 14 | 42 | 2,002 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42 |
| Ocean township | Monmouth | 4 | 88 | 31 | 10,750 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 31 |
| Oceanport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 36 | 2,141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Red Bank borough | Monmouth | 4 | 140 | 0 | 5,083 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 |
| Roosevelt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 277 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rumson borough | Monmouth | 4 | 29 | 81 | 2,285 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 81 |
| Sea Bright borough | Monmouth | 4 | 12 | 19 | 686 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 19 |
| Sea Girt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 53 | 785 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Shrewsbury borough | Monmouth | 4 | 11 | 25 | 1,466 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 25 |
| Shrewsbury township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 469 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spring Lake borough | Monmouth | 4 | 13 | 48 | 1,206 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 48 |
| Spring Lake Heights bor. | Monmouth | 4 | 21 | 51 | 2,204 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 51 |
| Tinton Falls borough | Monmouth | 4 | 67 | 0 | 8,129 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 |
| Union Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1,808 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 47 | 0 | 2,387 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 |
| Wall township | Monmouth | 4 | 113 | 133 | 10,045 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 133 |
| West Long Branch borough | Monmouth | 4 | 14 | 23 | 2,535 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 23 |
| Barneget township | Ocean | 4 | 57 | 38 | 8,629 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 38 |
| Barneget Light borough | Ocean | 4 | 12 | 1 | 282 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 |
| Bay Head borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 15 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Beach Haven borough | Ocean | 4 | 1 | 31 | 518 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 |
| Beachwood borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3,584 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Berkeley township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 20,644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brick township | Ocean | 4 | 247 | 0 | 29,717 | 0 | 0 | 247 | 0 |
| Eagleswood township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 12 | 583 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Harvey Cedars borough | Ocean | 4 | 1 | 7 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Island Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 3 | 23 | 691 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 |
| Jackson township | Ocean | 4 | 49 | 136 | 19,992 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 136 |
| Lacey township | Ocean | 4 | 50 | 0 | 10,699 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| Lakehurst borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 901 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lakewood township | Ocean | 4 | 471 | 536 | 25,610 | 0 | (7) | 471 | 529 |
| Lavallette borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 35 | 885 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Little Egg Harbor township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8,073 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Long Beach township | Ocean | 4 | 15 | 76 | 1,354 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 76 |
| Manchester township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 22,663 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mantoloking borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 23 | 105 | (3) | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Ocean township | Ocean | 4 | 5 | 86 | 3,676 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 86 |
| Ocean Gate borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 779 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pine Beach borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 797 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Plumsted township | Ocean | 4 | 13 | 44 | 2,936 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 44 |
| Point Pleasant borough | Ocean | 4 | 9 | 75 | 7,211 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 75 |
| Point Pleasant Beach bor. | Ocean | 4 | 30 | 63 | 1,758 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 63 |
| Seaside Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 77 | 0 | 1,428 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 |
| Seaside Park borough | Ocean | 4 | 28 | 17 | 647 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 17 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|------------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ship Bottom borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 50 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| South Toms River borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1,035 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stafford township | Ocean | 4 | 123 | 0 | 10,104 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 |
| Surf City borough | Ocean | 4 | 3 | 24 | 614 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 |
| Toms River township | Ocean | 4 | 269 | 152 | 34,118 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 152 |
| Tuckerton borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1,297 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bass River township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 9 | 562 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Beverly city | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 958 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bordentown city | Burlington | 5 | 28 | 0 | 1,819 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Bordentown township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4,399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burlington city | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4,141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burlington township | Burlington | 5 | 35 | 113 | 7,624 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 113 |
| Chesterfield township | Burlington | 5 | 25 | 7 | 1,795 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 7 |
| Cinnaminson township | Burlington | 5 | 12 | 29 | 6,149 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 29 |
| Delanco township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Delran township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5,988 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eastampton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 141 | 2,450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| Edgewater Park township | Burlington | 5 | 10 | 0 | 3,603 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Evesham township | Burlington | 5 | 94 | 92 | 17,367 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 92 |
| Fieldsboro borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Florence township | Burlington | 5 | 67 | 0 | 4,946 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 |
| Hainesport township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 72 | 2,243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Lumberton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4,443 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mansfield township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3,186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maple Shade township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8,094 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Medford township | Burlington | 5 | 18 | 118 | 8,302 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 118 |
| Medford Lakes borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,570 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moorestown township | Burlington | 5 | 32 | 168 | 7,385 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 168 |
| Mount Holly township | Burlington | 5 | 8 | 0 | 3,483 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Mount Laurel township | Burlington | 5 | 59 | 110 | 17,628 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 110 |
| New Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 189 | 764 | (37) | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| North Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 213 | 2,531 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 |
| Palmyra borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3,159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pemberton borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 44 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Pemberton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10,008 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2,811 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverton borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 14 | 1,072 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Shamong township | Burlington | 5 | 29 | 39 | 2,210 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 39 |
| Southampton township | Burlington | 5 | 31 | 33 | 4,692 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 33 |
| Springfield township | Burlington | 5 | 4 | 17 | 1,225 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| Tabernacle township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 32 | 2,446 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Washington township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Westampton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3,010 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Willingboro township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10,818 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|-------------------------|------------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Woodland township | Burlington | 5 | 2 | 43 | 534 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 43 |
| Wrightstown borough | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Audubon borough | Camden | 5 | 53 | 70 | 3,567 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 70 |
| Audubon Park borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 8 | 494 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Barrington borough | Camden | 5 | 17 | 132 | 2,895 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 132 |
| Bellmawr borough | Camden | 5 | 25 | 131 | 4,336 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 131 |
| Berlin borough | Camden | 5 | 37 | 100 | 2,693 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 100 |
| Berlin township | Camden | 5 | 39 | 140 | 1,897 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 140 |
| Brooklawn borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Camden city | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 24,771 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cherry Hill township | Camden | 5 | 276 | 511 | 26,823 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 511 |
| Chesilhurst borough | Camden | 5 | 8 | 0 | 578 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Clementon borough | Camden | 5 | 51 | 18 | 2,203 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 18 |
| Collingswood borough | Camden | 5 | 40 | 359 | 6,289 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 359 |
| Gibbsboro borough | Camden | 5 | 21 | 20 | 770 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 20 |
| Gloucester township | Camden | 5 | 98 | 115 | 23,125 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 115 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4,146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Haddon township | Camden | 5 | 39 | 193 | 6,184 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 193 |
| Haddonfield borough | Camden | 5 | 7 | 74 | 4,201 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 74 |
| Haddon Heights borough | Camden | 5 | 15 | 85 | 2,878 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 85 |
| Hi-Nella borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Laurel Springs borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 664 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lawnside borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,029 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lindenwold borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7,412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Magnolia borough | Camden | 5 | 15 | 29 | 1,715 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 29 |
| Merchantville borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 75 | 1,596 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Mount Ephraim borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,932 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oaklyn borough | Camden | 5 | 10 | 47 | 1,700 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 47 |
| Pennsauken township | Camden | 5 | 137 | 45 | 12,176 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 45 |
| Pine Hill borough | Camden | 5 | 8 | 36 | 4,062 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 36 |
| Pine Valley borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 12 | 2 | (12) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Runnemede borough | Camden | 5 | 28 | 99 | 3,026 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 99 |
| Somerdale borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 241 | 2,205 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 |
| Stratford borough | Camden | 5 | 12 | 50 | 2,652 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 50 |
| Tavistock borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 4 | 3 | (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Voorhees township | Camden | 5 | 205 | 274 | 11,344 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 274 |
| Waterford township | Camden | 5 | 0 | 149 | 3,575 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 |
| Winslow township | Camden | 5 | 41 | 260 | 13,971 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 260 |
| Woodlynne borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 939 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clayton borough | Gloucester | 5 | 44 | 114 | 3,166 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 114 |
| Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 89 | 228 | 11,850 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 228 |
| East Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 9 | 0 | 3,476 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Elk township | Gloucester | 5 | 6 | 53 | 1,527 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 53 |
| Franklin township | Gloucester | 5 | 52 | 107 | 5,640 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 107 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|--------------------------|------------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Glassboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 13 | 368 | 6,072 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 368 |
| Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 36 | 2,056 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 65 | 4,015 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Logan township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 183 | 2,183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 183 |
| Mantua township | Gloucester | 5 | 57 | 107 | 5,856 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 107 |
| Monroe township | Gloucester | 5 | 91 | 189 | 13,087 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 189 |
| National Park borough | Gloucester | 5 | 6 | 8 | 1,048 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| Newfield borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 607 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Paulsboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 40 | 0 | 2,181 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 |
| Pitman borough | Gloucester | 5 | 37 | 0 | 3,533 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| South Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 26 | 968 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Swedesboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 22 | 10 | 955 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 10 |
| Washington township | Gloucester | 5 | 175 | 75 | 17,246 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 75 |
| Wenonah borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 790 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 15 | 234 | 9,123 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 234 |
| Westville borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,728 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodbury city | Gloucester | 5 | 17 | 30 | 3,962 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 30 |
| Woodbury Heights borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woolwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3,839 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Absecon city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3,123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 16,023 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brigantine city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4,226 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buena borough | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buena Vista township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2,933 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Corbin City | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Egg Harbor township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 15,195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Egg Harbor City | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,464 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estell Manor city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Folsom borough | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 616 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Galloway township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 12,091 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hamilton township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9,403 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hammonontown | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5,443 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Linwood city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2,527 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Longport borough | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 525 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Margate City | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3,109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mullica township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2,058 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northfield city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3,168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pleasantville city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7,023 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Port Republic city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 366 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Somers Point city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4,470 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ventnor City | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4,493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Weymouth township | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Avalon borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 962 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cape May city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,609 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Adjusted Present Need | Adjusted Prospective Need | Est. 2015 Occ. Units | 20% Capped Units | 1,000 Capped Units | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need |
|---------------------------|------------|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cape May Point borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dennis township | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2,478 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower township | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9,976 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Middle township | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 7,792 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,975 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ocean City | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5,714 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sea Isle City | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,131 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stone Harbor borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper township | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4,856 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Cape May borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 479 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Wildwood borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2,504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wildwood Crest borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,599 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodbine borough | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 816 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bridgeton city | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5,905 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,885 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,002 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Downe township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 542 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fairfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greenwich township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hopewell township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,624 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lawrence township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maurice River township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,497 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Millville city | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 10,329 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Shiloh borough | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stow Creek township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2,890 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vineland city | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 21,147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alloway township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carneys Point township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3,195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elmer borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elsinboro township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 453 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower Alloways Creek twp | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 628 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mannington township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 503 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oldmans township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Penns Grove borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,907 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsville township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5,619 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pilesgrove township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,496 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3,310 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Quinton township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,035 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salem city | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,942 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Woodstown borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1,408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

APPENDIX E: INITIAL SUMMARY OBLIGATIONS BY MUNICIPALITY

TABLE E.1: INITIAL SUMMARY OBLIGATIONS BY MUNICIPALITY

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|---------------------------|--------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Allendale borough | Bergen | 1 | 137 | 14 | 111 | 262 |
| Alpine borough | Bergen | 1 | 214 | 4 | 127 | 345 |
| Bergenfield borough | Bergen | 1 | 87 | 152 | 44 | 283 |
| Bogota borough | Bergen | 1 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 37 |
| Carlstadt borough | Bergen | 1 | 227 | 34 | 146 | 407 |
| Cliffside Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 28 | 143 | 69 | 240 |
| Closter borough | Bergen | 1 | 110 | 0 | 159 | 269 |
| Cresskill borough | Bergen | 1 | 70 | 43 | 331 | 444 |
| Demarest borough | Bergen | 1 | 66 | 0 | 118 | 184 |
| Dumont borough | Bergen | 1 | 33 | 39 | 63 | 135 |
| East Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 90 | 187 | 94 | 371 |
| Edgewater borough | Bergen | 1 | 28 | 0 | 318 | 346 |
| Elmwood Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 54 | 44 | 165 | 263 |
| Emerson borough | Bergen | 1 | 74 | 56 | 107 | 237 |
| Englewood city | Bergen | 1 | 152 | 380 | 87 | 619 |
| Englewood Cliffs borough | Bergen | 1 | 219 | 0 | 323 | 542 |
| Fair Lawn borough | Bergen | 1 | 152 | 167 | 165 | 484 |
| Fairview borough | Bergen | 1 | 20 | 227 | 21 | 268 |
| Fort Lee borough | Bergen | 1 | 181 | 264 | 258 | 703 |
| Franklin Lakes borough | Bergen | 1 | 358 | 33 | 419 | 810 |
| Garfield city | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 132 | 51 | 183 |
| Glen Rock borough | Bergen | 1 | 118 | 15 | 109 | 242 |
| Hackensack city | Bergen | 1 | 201 | 119 | 0 | 320 |
| Harrington Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 56 | 4 | 139 | 199 |
| Hasbrouck Heights borough | Bergen | 1 | 58 | 68 | 359 | 485 |
| Haworth borough | Bergen | 1 | 64 | 0 | 72 | 136 |
| Hillsdale borough | Bergen | 1 | 111 | 14 | 126 | 251 |
| Ho-Ho-Kus borough | Bergen | 1 | 83 | 10 | 113 | 206 |
| Leonia borough | Bergen | 1 | 30 | 77 | 154 | 261 |
| Little Ferry borough | Bergen | 1 | 28 | 118 | 0 | 146 |
| Lodi borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 172 | 99 | 271 |
| Lyndhurst township | Bergen | 1 | 100 | 216 | 117 | 433 |
| Mahwah township | Bergen | 1 | 350 | 68 | 236 | 654 |
| Maywood borough | Bergen | 1 | 36 | 26 | 63 | 125 |

¹¹⁴ Note that the initial summary obligations include the full unadjusted Prior Round (1987-1999) obligations for each municipality as initially assigned by COAH in 1993. Municipalities can then reduce that initial obligation through the demonstration of applicable adjustments, housing activity and credits on a case by case basis in their efforts to secure approvals of their affordable housing plans.

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|----------------------------|--------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Midland Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 54 | 26 | 59 | 139 |
| Montvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 255 | 2 | 349 | 606 |
| Moonachie borough | Bergen | 1 | 95 | 31 | 63 | 189 |
| New Milford borough | Bergen | 1 | 23 | 39 | 88 | 150 |
| North Arlington borough | Bergen | 1 | 4 | 164 | 39 | 207 |
| Northvale borough | Bergen | 1 | 86 | 3 | 71 | 160 |
| Norwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 118 | 0 | 88 | 206 |
| Oakland borough | Bergen | 1 | 220 | 25 | 91 | 336 |
| Old Tappan borough | Bergen | 1 | 98 | 10 | 288 | 396 |
| Oradell borough | Bergen | 1 | 89 | 14 | 73 | 176 |
| Palisades Park borough | Bergen | 1 | 0 | 136 | 167 | 303 |
| Paramus borough | Bergen | 1 | 698 | 141 | 613 | 1,452 |
| Park Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 111 | 115 | 116 | 342 |
| Ramsey borough | Bergen | 1 | 189 | 53 | 184 | 426 |
| Ridgefield borough | Bergen | 1 | 47 | 143 | 128 | 318 |
| Ridgefield Park village | Bergen | 1 | 25 | 142 | 0 | 167 |
| Ridgewood village | Bergen | 1 | 229 | 6 | 341 | 576 |
| River Edge borough | Bergen | 1 | 73 | 42 | 86 | 201 |
| River Vale township | Bergen | 1 | 121 | 20 | 119 | 260 |
| Rochelle Park township | Bergen | 1 | 63 | 0 | 53 | 116 |
| Rockleigh borough | Bergen | 1 | 84 | 0 | 14 | 98 |
| Rutherford borough | Bergen | 1 | 95 | 170 | 224 | 489 |
| Saddle Brook township | Bergen | 1 | 127 | 38 | 103 | 268 |
| Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 162 | 45 | 214 | 421 |
| South Hackensack township | Bergen | 1 | 50 | 59 | 67 | 176 |
| Teaneck township | Bergen | 1 | 192 | 89 | 665 | 946 |
| Tenafly borough | Bergen | 1 | 159 | 24 | 238 | 421 |
| Teterboro borough | Bergen | 1 | 106 | 0 | 6 | 112 |
| Upper Saddle River borough | Bergen | 1 | 206 | 8 | 347 | 561 |
| Waldwick borough | Bergen | 1 | 81 | 62 | 52 | 195 |
| Wallington borough | Bergen | 1 | 5 | 77 | 0 | 82 |
| Washington township | Bergen | 1 | 85 | 0 | 220 | 305 |
| Westwood borough | Bergen | 1 | 87 | 52 | 78 | 217 |
| Woodcliff Lake borough | Bergen | 1 | 170 | 18 | 290 | 478 |
| Wood-Ridge borough | Bergen | 1 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Wyckoff township | Bergen | 1 | 221 | 34 | 272 | 527 |
| Bayonne city | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 737 | 263 | 1,000 |
| East Newark borough | Hudson | 1 | 3 | 7 | 37 | 47 |
| Guttenberg town | Hudson | 1 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Harrison town | Hudson | 1 | 30 | 214 | 457 | 701 |
| Hoboken city | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 186 |
| Jersey City | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 3,738 | 1,922 | 5,660 |
| Kearny town | Hudson | 1 | 211 | 188 | 643 | 1,042 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|-------------------------|---------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| North Bergen township | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 676 | 324 | 1,000 |
| Secaucus town | Hudson | 1 | 590 | 46 | 433 | 1,069 |
| Union City | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| Weehawken township | Hudson | 1 | 3 | 127 | 0 | 130 |
| West New York town | Hudson | 1 | 0 | 504 | 0 | 504 |
| Bloomingtondale borough | Passaic | 1 | 168 | 51 | 24 | 243 |
| Clifton city | Passaic | 1 | 379 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,379 |
| Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 5 | 54 | 0 | 59 |
| Hawthorne borough | Passaic | 1 | 58 | 93 | 59 | 210 |
| Little Falls township | Passaic | 1 | 101 | 139 | 119 | 359 |
| North Haledon borough | Passaic | 1 | 92 | 0 | 144 | 236 |
| Passaic city | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| Paterson city | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| Pompton Lakes borough | Passaic | 1 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| Prospect Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ringwood borough | Passaic | 1 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Totowa borough | Passaic | 1 | 247 | 125 | 211 | 583 |
| Wanaque borough | Passaic | 1 | 332 | 66 | 0 | 398 |
| Wayne township | Passaic | 1 | 1,158 | 245 | 755 | 2,158 |
| West Milford township | Passaic | 1 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Woodland Park borough | Passaic | 1 | 146 | 224 | 177 | 547 |
| Andover borough | Sussex | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Andover township | Sussex | 1 | 55 | 5 | 221 | 281 |
| Branchville borough | Sussex | 1 | 13 | 1 | 75 | 89 |
| Byram township | Sussex | 1 | 33 | 24 | 47 | 104 |
| Frankford township | Sussex | 1 | 36 | 27 | 60 | 123 |
| Franklin borough | Sussex | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Fredon township | Sussex | 1 | 29 | 20 | 115 | 164 |
| Green township | Sussex | 1 | 20 | 0 | 12 | 32 |
| Hamburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Hampton township | Sussex | 1 | 44 | 7 | 46 | 97 |
| Hardyston township | Sussex | 1 | 18 | 18 | 460 | 496 |
| Hopatcong borough | Sussex | 1 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 93 |
| Lafayette township | Sussex | 1 | 27 | 0 | 102 | 129 |
| Montague township | Sussex | 1 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 15 |
| Newton town | Sussex | 1 | 24 | 151 | 162 | 337 |
| Ogdensburg borough | Sussex | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Sandyston township | Sussex | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Sparta township | Sussex | 1 | 76 | 27 | 13 | 116 |
| Stanhope borough | Sussex | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Stillwater township | Sussex | 1 | 15 | 0 | 35 | 50 |
| Sussex borough | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Vernon township | Sussex | 1 | 60 | 28 | 0 | 88 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|----------------------------|--------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Walpack township | Sussex | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wantage township | Sussex | 1 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Belleville township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 283 | 0 | 283 |
| Bloomfield township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 28 |
| Cedar Grove township | Essex | 2 | 70 | 15 | 52 | 137 |
| City of Orange township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 71 |
| East Orange city | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Essex Fells borough | Essex | 2 | 40 | 0 | 44 | 84 |
| Fairfield township | Essex | 2 | 318 | 46 | 108 | 472 |
| Glen Ridge borough | Essex | 2 | 28 | 24 | 10 | 62 |
| Irvington township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Livingston township | Essex | 2 | 375 | 15 | 166 | 556 |
| Maplewood township | Essex | 2 | 51 | 11 | 0 | 62 |
| Millburn township | Essex | 2 | 261 | 140 | 339 | 740 |
| Montclair township | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newark city | Essex | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Caldwell borough | Essex | 2 | 63 | 35 | 57 | 155 |
| Nutley township | Essex | 2 | 29 | 247 | 0 | 276 |
| Roseland borough | Essex | 2 | 182 | 0 | 68 | 250 |
| S. Orange Village township | Essex | 2 | 63 | 0 | 275 | 338 |
| Verona township | Essex | 2 | 24 | 0 | 20 | 44 |
| West Caldwell township | Essex | 2 | 200 | 48 | 76 | 324 |
| West Orange township | Essex | 2 | 226 | 251 | 0 | 477 |
| Boonton town | Morris | 2 | 11 | 27 | 0 | 38 |
| Boonton township | Morris | 2 | 20 | 25 | 31 | 76 |
| Butler borough | Morris | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Chatham borough | Morris | 2 | 77 | 0 | 79 | 156 |
| Chatham township | Morris | 2 | 83 | 59 | 249 | 391 |
| Chester borough | Morris | 2 | 16 | 11 | 58 | 85 |
| Chester township | Morris | 2 | 32 | 29 | 35 | 96 |
| Denville township | Morris | 2 | 325 | 44 | 0 | 369 |
| Dover town | Morris | 2 | 6 | 139 | 0 | 145 |
| East Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 262 | 37 | 130 | 429 |
| Florham Park borough | Morris | 2 | 326 | 73 | 600 | 999 |
| Hanover township | Morris | 2 | 356 | 29 | 145 | 530 |
| Harding township | Morris | 2 | 83 | 0 | 124 | 207 |
| Jefferson township | Morris | 2 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Kinnelon borough | Morris | 2 | 73 | 0 | 53 | 126 |
| Lincoln Park borough | Morris | 2 | 74 | 11 | 44 | 129 |
| Long Hill township | Morris | 2 | 62 | 14 | 30 | 106 |
| Madison borough | Morris | 2 | 86 | 6 | 95 | 187 |
| Mendham borough | Morris | 2 | 25 | 11 | 49 | 85 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|---------------------------|--------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Mendham township | Morris | 2 | 41 | 25 | 82 | 148 |
| Mine Hill township | Morris | 2 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Montville township | Morris | 2 | 261 | 18 | 99 | 378 |
| Morris township | Morris | 2 | 293 | 30 | 382 | 705 |
| Morris Plains borough | Morris | 2 | 144 | 35 | 28 | 207 |
| Morristown town | Morris | 2 | 227 | 150 | 61 | 438 |
| Mountain Lakes borough | Morris | 2 | 80 | 1 | 55 | 136 |
| Mount Arlington borough | Morris | 2 | 17 | 15 | 1 | 33 |
| Mount Olive township | Morris | 2 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Netcong borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parsippany-Troy Hills twp | Morris | 2 | 663 | 181 | 0 | 844 |
| Pequannock township | Morris | 2 | 134 | 80 | 29 | 243 |
| Randolph township | Morris | 2 | 261 | 33 | 3 | 297 |
| Riverdale borough | Morris | 2 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Rockaway borough | Morris | 2 | 43 | 18 | 43 | 104 |
| Rockaway township | Morris | 2 | 370 | 0 | 0 | 370 |
| Roxbury township | Morris | 2 | 255 | 0 | 0 | 255 |
| Victory Gardens borough | Morris | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington township | Morris | 2 | 66 | 10 | 39 | 115 |
| Wharton borough | Morris | 2 | 42 | 108 | 0 | 150 |
| Berkeley Heights township | Union | 2 | 183 | 7 | 238 | 428 |
| Clark township | Union | 2 | 92 | 33 | 110 | 235 |
| Cranford township | Union | 2 | 148 | 86 | 77 | 311 |
| Elizabeth city | Union | 2 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| Fanwood borough | Union | 2 | 45 | 14 | 28 | 87 |
| Garwood borough | Union | 2 | 18 | 36 | 43 | 97 |
| Hillside township | Union | 2 | 0 | 190 | 0 | 190 |
| Kenilworth borough | Union | 2 | 83 | 0 | 58 | 141 |
| Linden city | Union | 2 | 209 | 408 | 197 | 814 |
| Mountainside borough | Union | 2 | 123 | 123 | 35 | 281 |
| New Providence borough | Union | 2 | 135 | 56 | 57 | 248 |
| Plainfield city | Union | 2 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 315 |
| Rahway city | Union | 2 | 70 | 93 | 91 | 254 |
| Roselle borough | Union | 2 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 87 |
| Roselle Park borough | Union | 2 | 0 | 68 | 80 | 148 |
| Scotch Plains township | Union | 2 | 182 | 89 | 116 | 387 |
| Springfield township | Union | 2 | 135 | 0 | 73 | 208 |
| Summit city | Union | 2 | 171 | 149 | 183 | 503 |
| Union township | Union | 2 | 234 | 357 | 217 | 808 |
| Westfield town | Union | 2 | 139 | 66 | 185 | 390 |
| Winfield township | Union | 2 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 30 |
| Allamuchy township | Warren | 2 | 13 | 53 | 31 | 97 |
| Alpha borough | Warren | 2 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 23 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|------------------------|-----------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Belvidere town | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blairstown township | Warren | 2 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 24 |
| Franklin township | Warren | 2 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 21 |
| Frelinghuysen township | Warren | 2 | 6 | 0 | 63 | 69 |
| Greenwich township | Warren | 2 | 41 | 0 | 35 | 76 |
| Hackettstown town | Warren | 2 | 62 | 131 | 131 | 324 |
| Hardwick township | Warren | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Harmony township | Warren | 2 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Hope township | Warren | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Independence township | Warren | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Knowlton township | Warren | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Liberty township | Warren | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Lopatcong township | Warren | 2 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Mansfield township | Warren | 2 | 3 | 20 | 122 | 145 |
| Oxford township | Warren | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Phillipsburg town | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pohatcong township | Warren | 2 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Washington borough | Warren | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington township | Warren | 2 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| White township | Warren | 2 | 16 | 59 | 79 | 154 |
| Alexandria township | Hunterdon | 3 | 22 | 21 | 15 | 58 |
| Bethlehem township | Hunterdon | 3 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Bloomsbury borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Califon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Clinton town | Hunterdon | 3 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Clinton township | Hunterdon | 3 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 335 |
| Delaware township | Hunterdon | 3 | 23 | 14 | 16 | 53 |
| East Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 40 | 1 | 11 | 52 |
| Flemington borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 38 | 45 | 70 | 153 |
| Franklin township | Hunterdon | 3 | 36 | 0 | 42 | 78 |
| Frenchtown borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Glen Gardner borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Hampton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| High Bridge borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Holland township | Hunterdon | 3 | 17 | 35 | 0 | 52 |
| Kingwood township | Hunterdon | 3 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Lambertville city | Hunterdon | 3 | 0 | 42 | 5 | 47 |
| Lebanon borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Lebanon township | Hunterdon | 3 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Milford borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Raritan township | Hunterdon | 3 | 360 | 20 | 119 | 499 |
| Readington township | Hunterdon | 3 | 394 | 79 | 283 | 756 |
| Stockton borough | Hunterdon | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|--------------------------|-----------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Tewksbury township | Hunterdon | 3 | 119 | 0 | 65 | 184 |
| Union township | Hunterdon | 3 | 78 | 1 | 223 | 302 |
| West Amwell township | Hunterdon | 3 | 16 | 0 | 26 | 42 |
| Carteret borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 95 | 141 | 236 |
| Cranbury township | Middlesex | 3 | 217 | 3 | 100 | 320 |
| Dunellen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 |
| East Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 648 | 79 | 342 | 1,069 |
| Edison township | Middlesex | 3 | 965 | 569 | 431 | 1,965 |
| Helmetta borough | Middlesex | 3 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Highland Park borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 68 | 297 | 365 |
| Jamesburg borough | Middlesex | 3 | 8 | 32 | 93 | 133 |
| Metuchen borough | Middlesex | 3 | 99 | 70 | 103 | 272 |
| Middlesex borough | Middlesex | 3 | 105 | 67 | 134 | 306 |
| Milltown borough | Middlesex | 3 | 64 | 35 | 12 | 111 |
| Monroe township | Middlesex | 3 | 554 | 91 | 909 | 1,554 |
| New Brunswick city | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 1,000 |
| North Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 395 | 196 | 181 | 772 |
| Old Bridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 438 | 181 | 394 | 1,013 |
| Perth Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 305 | 0 | 305 |
| Piscataway township | Middlesex | 3 | 736 | 277 | 212 | 1,225 |
| Plainsboro township | Middlesex | 3 | 205 | 3 | 390 | 598 |
| Sayreville borough | Middlesex | 3 | 261 | 129 | 217 | 607 |
| South Amboy city | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| South Brunswick township | Middlesex | 3 | 842 | 115 | 266 | 1,223 |
| South Plainfield borough | Middlesex | 3 | 379 | 45 | 264 | 688 |
| South River borough | Middlesex | 3 | 0 | 152 | 130 | 282 |
| Spotswood borough | Middlesex | 3 | 48 | 11 | 78 | 137 |
| Woodbridge township | Middlesex | 3 | 955 | 359 | 628 | 1,942 |
| Bedminster township | Somerset | 3 | 154 | 1 | 108 | 263 |
| Bernards township | Somerset | 3 | 508 | 33 | 501 | 1,042 |
| Bernardsville borough | Somerset | 3 | 127 | 0 | 70 | 197 |
| Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Branchburg township | Somerset | 3 | 302 | 2 | 57 | 361 |
| Bridgewater township | Somerset | 3 | 713 | 120 | 122 | 955 |
| Far Hills borough | Somerset | 3 | 38 | 2 | 25 | 65 |
| Franklin township | Somerset | 3 | 766 | 0 | 0 | 766 |
| Green Brook township | Somerset | 3 | 151 | 11 | 13 | 175 |
| Hillsborough township | Somerset | 3 | 461 | 59 | 55 | 575 |
| Manville borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 163 | 7 | 170 |
| Millstone borough | Somerset | 3 | 21 | 0 | 31 | 52 |
| Montgomery township | Somerset | 3 | 307 | 73 | 223 | 603 |
| North Plainfield borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peapack & Gladstone bor. | Somerset | 3 | 82 | 0 | 20 | 102 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|----------------------------|----------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Raritan borough | Somerset | 3 | 82 | 40 | 85 | 207 |
| Rocky Hill borough | Somerset | 3 | 25 | 0 | 18 | 43 |
| Somerville borough | Somerset | 3 | 153 | 103 | 12 | 268 |
| South Bound Brook borough | Somerset | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Warren township | Somerset | 3 | 543 | 58 | 203 | 804 |
| Watchung borough | Somerset | 3 | 206 | 18 | 113 | 337 |
| East Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 367 | 57 | 90 | 514 |
| Ewing township | Mercer | 4 | 481 | 115 | 262 | 858 |
| Hamilton township | Mercer | 4 | 706 | 484 | 516 | 1,706 |
| Hightstown borough | Mercer | 4 | 45 | 37 | 0 | 82 |
| Hopewell borough | Mercer | 4 | 29 | 16 | 21 | 66 |
| Hopewell township | Mercer | 4 | 520 | 0 | 201 | 721 |
| Lawrence township | Mercer | 4 | 891 | 53 | 128 | 1,072 |
| Pennington borough | Mercer | 4 | 52 | 59 | 0 | 111 |
| Princeton | Mercer | 4 | 641 | 80 | 159 | 880 |
| Robbinsville township | Mercer | 4 | 293 | 18 | 101 | 412 |
| Trenton city | Mercer | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| West Windsor township | Mercer | 4 | 899 | 132 | 49 | 1,080 |
| Aberdeen township | Monmouth | 4 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 270 |
| Allenhurst borough | Monmouth | 4 | 50 | 4 | 8 | 62 |
| Allentown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Asbury Park city | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 287 | 71 | 358 |
| Atlantic Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 86 | 70 | 0 | 156 |
| Avon-by-the-Sea borough | Monmouth | 4 | 20 | 0 | 23 | 43 |
| Belmar borough | Monmouth | 4 | 59 | 60 | 73 | 192 |
| Bradley Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 20 | 14 | 33 | 67 |
| Brielle borough | Monmouth | 4 | 159 | 11 | 23 | 193 |
| Colts Neck township | Monmouth | 4 | 218 | 14 | 30 | 262 |
| Deal borough | Monmouth | 4 | 54 | 2 | 18 | 74 |
| Eatontown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 504 | 124 | 52 | 680 |
| Englishtown borough | Monmouth | 4 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Fair Haven borough | Monmouth | 4 | 135 | 0 | 37 | 172 |
| Farmingdale borough | Monmouth | 4 | 19 | 2 | 13 | 34 |
| Freehold borough | Monmouth | 4 | 188 | 112 | 0 | 300 |
| Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 1,036 | 69 | 0 | 1,105 |
| Hazlet township | Monmouth | 4 | 407 | 0 | 0 | 407 |
| Highlands borough | Monmouth | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Holmdel township | Monmouth | 4 | 768 | 37 | 18 | 823 |
| Howell township | Monmouth | 4 | 955 | 0 | 0 | 955 |
| Interlaken borough | Monmouth | 4 | 40 | 3 | 11 | 54 |
| Keansburg borough | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Keyport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 14 |
| Lake Como borough | Monmouth | 4 | 31 | 4 | 47 | 82 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|--------------------------|----------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Little Silver borough | Monmouth | 4 | 197 | 8 | 24 | 229 |
| Loch Arbour village | Monmouth | 4 | 30 | 0 | 10 | 40 |
| Long Branch city | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 340 | 256 | 596 |
| Manalapan township | Monmouth | 4 | 706 | 31 | 0 | 737 |
| Manasquan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 149 | 1 | 65 | 215 |
| Marlboro township | Monmouth | 4 | 1,019 | 0 | 0 | 1,019 |
| Matawan borough | Monmouth | 4 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| Middletown township | Monmouth | 4 | 1,561 | 0 | 0 | 1,561 |
| Millstone township | Monmouth | 4 | 81 | 25 | 8 | 114 |
| Monmouth Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 70 | 0 | 31 | 101 |
| Neptune township | Monmouth | 4 | 0 | 95 | 15 | 110 |
| Neptune City borough | Monmouth | 4 | 33 | 14 | 42 | 89 |
| Ocean township | Monmouth | 4 | 873 | 88 | 31 | 992 |
| Oceanport borough | Monmouth | 4 | 149 | 0 | 36 | 185 |
| Red Bank borough | Monmouth | 4 | 428 | 140 | 0 | 568 |
| Roosevelt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Rumson borough | Monmouth | 4 | 268 | 29 | 81 | 378 |
| Sea Bright borough | Monmouth | 4 | 37 | 12 | 19 | 68 |
| Sea Girt borough | Monmouth | 4 | 115 | 0 | 53 | 168 |
| Shrewsbury borough | Monmouth | 4 | 277 | 11 | 25 | 313 |
| Shrewsbury township | Monmouth | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Spring Lake borough | Monmouth | 4 | 132 | 13 | 48 | 193 |
| Spring Lake Heights bor. | Monmouth | 4 | 76 | 21 | 51 | 148 |
| Tinton Falls borough | Monmouth | 4 | 622 | 67 | 0 | 689 |
| Union Beach borough | Monmouth | 4 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Upper Freehold township | Monmouth | 4 | 43 | 47 | 0 | 90 |
| Wall township | Monmouth | 4 | 1,073 | 113 | 133 | 1,319 |
| West Long Branch borough | Monmouth | 4 | 219 | 14 | 23 | 256 |
| Barnegat township | Ocean | 4 | 329 | 57 | 38 | 424 |
| Barnegat Light borough | Ocean | 4 | 83 | 12 | 1 | 96 |
| Bay Head borough | Ocean | 4 | 65 | 0 | 15 | 80 |
| Beach Haven borough | Ocean | 4 | 70 | 1 | 31 | 102 |
| Beachwood borough | Ocean | 4 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| Berkeley township | Ocean | 4 | 610 | 0 | 0 | 610 |
| Brick township | Ocean | 4 | 930 | 247 | 0 | 1,177 |
| Eagleswood township | Ocean | 4 | 36 | 0 | 12 | 48 |
| Harvey Cedars borough | Ocean | 4 | 44 | 1 | 7 | 52 |
| Island Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 31 | 3 | 23 | 57 |
| Jackson township | Ocean | 4 | 1,247 | 49 | 136 | 1,432 |
| Lacey township | Ocean | 4 | 580 | 50 | 0 | 630 |
| Lakehurst borough | Ocean | 4 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Lakewood township | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 471 | 529 | 1,000 |
| Lavallette borough | Ocean | 4 | 82 | 0 | 35 | 117 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|----------------------------|------------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Little Egg Harbor township | Ocean | 4 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| Long Beach township | Ocean | 4 | 41 | 15 | 76 | 132 |
| Manchester township | Ocean | 4 | 370 | 0 | 0 | 370 |
| Mantoloking borough | Ocean | 4 | 60 | 0 | 20 | 80 |
| Ocean township | Ocean | 4 | 236 | 5 | 86 | 327 |
| Ocean Gate borough | Ocean | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Pine Beach borough | Ocean | 4 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Plumsted township | Ocean | 4 | 47 | 13 | 44 | 104 |
| Point Pleasant borough | Ocean | 4 | 343 | 9 | 75 | 427 |
| Point Pleasant Beach bor. | Ocean | 4 | 167 | 30 | 63 | 260 |
| Seaside Heights borough | Ocean | 4 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 77 |
| Seaside Park borough | Ocean | 4 | 52 | 28 | 17 | 97 |
| Ship Bottom borough | Ocean | 4 | 71 | 0 | 50 | 121 |
| South Toms River borough | Ocean | 4 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| Stafford township | Ocean | 4 | 555 | 123 | 0 | 678 |
| Surf City borough | Ocean | 4 | 49 | 3 | 24 | 76 |
| Toms River township | Ocean | 4 | 2,233 | 269 | 152 | 2,654 |
| Tuckerton borough | Ocean | 4 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Bass River township | Burlington | 5 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 24 |
| Beverly city | Burlington | 5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Bordentown city | Burlington | 5 | 33 | 28 | 0 | 61 |
| Bordentown township | Burlington | 5 | 211 | 0 | 0 | 211 |
| Burlington city | Burlington | 5 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Burlington township | Burlington | 5 | 445 | 35 | 113 | 593 |
| Chesterfield township | Burlington | 5 | 55 | 25 | 7 | 87 |
| Cinnaminson township | Burlington | 5 | 331 | 12 | 29 | 372 |
| Delanco township | Burlington | 5 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| Delran township | Burlington | 5 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 208 |
| Eastampton township | Burlington | 5 | 49 | 0 | 141 | 190 |
| Edgewater Park township | Burlington | 5 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 40 |
| Evesham township | Burlington | 5 | 534 | 94 | 92 | 720 |
| Fieldsboro borough | Burlington | 5 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Florence township | Burlington | 5 | 114 | 67 | 0 | 181 |
| Hainesport township | Burlington | 5 | 150 | 0 | 72 | 222 |
| Lumberton township | Burlington | 5 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| Mansfield township | Burlington | 5 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Maple Shade township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Medford township | Burlington | 5 | 418 | 18 | 118 | 554 |
| Medford Lakes borough | Burlington | 5 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Moorestown township | Burlington | 5 | 621 | 32 | 168 | 821 |
| Mount Holly township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Mount Laurel township | Burlington | 5 | 815 | 59 | 110 | 984 |
| New Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 4 | 0 | 152 | 156 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|------------------------|------------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| North Hanover township | Burlington | 5 | 1 | 0 | 213 | 214 |
| Palmyra borough | Burlington | 5 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Pemberton borough | Burlington | 5 | 9 | 0 | 44 | 53 |
| Pemberton township | Burlington | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside township | Burlington | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Riverton borough | Burlington | 5 | 15 | 0 | 14 | 29 |
| Shamong township | Burlington | 5 | 84 | 29 | 39 | 152 |
| Southampton township | Burlington | 5 | 85 | 31 | 33 | 149 |
| Springfield township | Burlington | 5 | 54 | 4 | 17 | 75 |
| Tabernacle township | Burlington | 5 | 106 | 0 | 32 | 138 |
| Washington township | Burlington | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Westampton township | Burlington | 5 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 221 |
| Willingboro township | Burlington | 5 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 268 |
| Woodland township | Burlington | 5 | 19 | 2 | 43 | 64 |
| Wrightstown borough | Burlington | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Audubon borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 53 | 70 | 123 |
| Audubon Park borough | Camden | 5 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 12 |
| Barrington borough | Camden | 5 | 8 | 17 | 132 | 157 |
| Bellmawr borough | Camden | 5 | 107 | 25 | 131 | 263 |
| Berlin borough | Camden | 5 | 154 | 37 | 100 | 291 |
| Berlin township | Camden | 5 | 109 | 39 | 140 | 288 |
| Brooklawn borough | Camden | 5 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Camden city | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cherry Hill township | Camden | 5 | 1,829 | 276 | 511 | 2,616 |
| Chesilhurst borough | Camden | 5 | 28 | 8 | 0 | 36 |
| Clementon borough | Camden | 5 | 19 | 51 | 18 | 88 |
| Collingswood borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 40 | 359 | 399 |
| Gibbsboro borough | Camden | 5 | 112 | 21 | 20 | 153 |
| Gloucester township | Camden | 5 | 359 | 98 | 115 | 572 |
| Gloucester City | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Haddon township | Camden | 5 | 35 | 39 | 193 | 267 |
| Haddonfield borough | Camden | 5 | 192 | 7 | 74 | 273 |
| Haddon Heights borough | Camden | 5 | 23 | 15 | 85 | 123 |
| Hi-Nella borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Laurel Springs borough | Camden | 5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Lawnside borough | Camden | 5 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Lindenwold borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Magnolia borough | Camden | 5 | 22 | 15 | 29 | 66 |
| Merchantville borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 75 |
| Mount Ephraim borough | Camden | 5 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Oaklyn borough | Camden | 5 | 1 | 10 | 47 | 58 |
| Pennsauken township | Camden | 5 | 0 | 137 | 45 | 182 |
| Pine Hill borough | Camden | 5 | 22 | 8 | 36 | 66 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|--------------------------|------------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Pine Valley borough | Camden | 5 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Runnemede borough | Camden | 5 | 40 | 28 | 99 | 167 |
| Somerdale borough | Camden | 5 | 95 | 0 | 241 | 336 |
| Stratford borough | Camden | 5 | 70 | 12 | 50 | 132 |
| Tavistock borough | Camden | 5 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Voorhees township | Camden | 5 | 456 | 205 | 274 | 935 |
| Waterford township | Camden | 5 | 102 | 0 | 149 | 251 |
| Winslow township | Camden | 5 | 377 | 41 | 260 | 678 |
| Woodlynne borough | Camden | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clayton borough | Gloucester | 5 | 94 | 44 | 114 | 252 |
| Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 522 | 89 | 228 | 839 |
| East Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 252 | 9 | 0 | 261 |
| Elk township | Gloucester | 5 | 127 | 6 | 53 | 186 |
| Franklin township | Gloucester | 5 | 166 | 52 | 107 | 325 |
| Glassboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 13 | 368 | 381 |
| Greenwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 308 | 0 | 36 | 344 |
| Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 198 | 0 | 65 | 263 |
| Logan township | Gloucester | 5 | 454 | 0 | 183 | 637 |
| Mantua township | Gloucester | 5 | 292 | 57 | 107 | 456 |
| Monroe township | Gloucester | 5 | 439 | 91 | 189 | 719 |
| National Park borough | Gloucester | 5 | 28 | 6 | 8 | 42 |
| Newfield borough | Gloucester | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Paulsboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 40 |
| Pitman borough | Gloucester | 5 | 40 | 37 | 0 | 77 |
| South Harrison township | Gloucester | 5 | 31 | 0 | 26 | 57 |
| Swedesboro borough | Gloucester | 5 | 23 | 22 | 10 | 55 |
| Washington township | Gloucester | 5 | 507 | 175 | 75 | 757 |
| Wenonah borough | Gloucester | 5 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| West Deptford township | Gloucester | 5 | 368 | 15 | 234 | 617 |
| Westville borough | Gloucester | 5 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Woodbury city | Gloucester | 5 | 0 | 17 | 30 | 47 |
| Woodbury Heights borough | Gloucester | 5 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Woolwich township | Gloucester | 5 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 209 |
| Absecon city | Atlantic | 6 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| Atlantic City | Atlantic | 6 | 2,458 | 0 | 0 | 2,458 |
| Brigantine city | Atlantic | 6 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 124 |
| Buena borough | Atlantic | 6 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Buena Vista township | Atlantic | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Corbin City | Atlantic | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Egg Harbor township | Atlantic | 6 | 763 | 0 | 0 | 763 |
| Egg Harbor City | Atlantic | 6 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Estell Manor city | Atlantic | 6 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Folsom borough | Atlantic | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|--------------------------|------------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Galloway township | Atlantic | 6 | 328 | 0 | 0 | 328 |
| Hamilton township | Atlantic | 6 | 349 | 0 | 0 | 349 |
| Hammonton town | Atlantic | 6 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 257 |
| Linwood city | Atlantic | 6 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 140 |
| Longport borough | Atlantic | 6 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Margate City | Atlantic | 6 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Mullica township | Atlantic | 6 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Northfield city | Atlantic | 6 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 190 |
| Pleasantville city | Atlantic | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Port Republic city | Atlantic | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Somers Point city | Atlantic | 6 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Ventnor City | Atlantic | 6 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Weymouth township | Atlantic | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Avalon borough | Cape May | 6 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 234 |
| Cape May city | Cape May | 6 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Cape May Point borough | Cape May | 6 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Dennis township | Cape May | 6 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 220 |
| Lower township | Cape May | 6 | 324 | 0 | 0 | 324 |
| Middle township | Cape May | 6 | 454 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| North Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| Ocean City | Cape May | 6 | 411 | 0 | 0 | 411 |
| Sea Isle City | Cape May | 6 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| Stone Harbor borough | Cape May | 6 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| Upper township | Cape May | 6 | 317 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| West Cape May borough | Cape May | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| West Wildwood borough | Cape May | 6 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Wildwood city | Cape May | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wildwood Crest borough | Cape May | 6 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| Woodbine borough | Cape May | 6 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Bridgeton city | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial township | Cumberland | 6 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Downe township | Cumberland | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Fairfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| Greenwich township | Cumberland | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Hopewell township | Cumberland | 6 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Lawrence township | Cumberland | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Maurice River township | Cumberland | 6 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Millville city | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Shiloh borough | Cumberland | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Stow Creek township | Cumberland | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Upper Deerfield township | Cumberland | 6 | 242 | 0 | 0 | 242 |
| Vineland city | Cumberland | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Municipality | County | Reg. | Prior Rd (87-99) Initial Obligation (unadjusted) | Capped Present Need | Capped Prospective Need | Initial Summary Obligation ¹¹⁴ |
|---------------------------|--------|------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Alloway township | Salem | 6 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Carneys Point township | Salem | 6 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| Elmer borough | Salem | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Elsinboro township | Salem | 6 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Lower Alloways Creek twp | Salem | 6 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Mannington township | Salem | 6 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Oldmans township | Salem | 6 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 184 |
| Penns Grove borough | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pennsville township | Salem | 6 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 228 |
| Pilesgrove township | Salem | 6 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| Quinton township | Salem | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Salem city | Salem | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Pittsgrove township | Salem | 6 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Woodstown borough | Salem | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |