

New Jersey Department of Community Affairs

NON-BINDING FOURTH ROUND
FAIR HOUSING OBLIGATION CALCULATIONS

CONSULTING REPORT

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

NON-BINDING FOURTH ROUND FAIR HOUSING OBLIGATION CALCULATIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Engagement Background..... 1

Consulting Procedures Performed 1

List of Documents Inspected 3

Conclusion 4

Limiting Conditions..... 4

Attachment A

November 15, 2024

Christopher Wheeler, PhD
Chief Data Officer
State of New Jersey, Department of Community Affairs
101 South Broad Street, P.O. Box 800
Trenton, NJ 08625-0800

Dear Mr. Wheeler:

Engagement Background

Mercadien, P.C., Certified Public Accountants ("Mercadien") has performed the consulting services outlined below to assist the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (the "Department") with an assessment of the Department's non-binding fourth round affordable housing obligation calculations and methodology in connection with the requirements set forth in P.L. 2024, c.2. In summary, Mercadien's analysis (as further described below) confirmed the accuracy and consistency of the calculations and methodology required under the relevant public law.

On March 20, 2024, Governor Murphy signed P.L. 2024, c.2. into law, establishing a new framework for determining and enforcing municipalities' affordable housing obligations under the New Jersey Supreme Court's Mount Laurel doctrine and the State's Fair Housing Act. The law requires that the Department perform a non-binding calculation of regional need and municipal present and prospective obligations in accordance with the formulas established in the law.

The overall purpose of this engagement is to inspect and assess the Department's methodology and calculations and provide recommendations for improvements in a written report. Another objective of this engagement is to examine the Geographic Information System ("GIS") methodology and processes utilized to determine the Land Capacity Factor.

See Attachment A for the Department's finalized methodology and background document detailing the calculations performed.

Consulting Procedures Performed

To meet the following objectives outlined in our engagement, we performed a comprehensive inspection and assessment of the Department's non-binding fourth round affordable housing obligation calculations as required by P.L. 2024, c.2. Below are the objectives of the engagement and a detailed summary of the procedures performed:

- Reviewed the Department's non-binding fourth round affordable housing obligation calculations for accuracy and fidelity to the requirements of P.L. 2024, c.2.
- Assessed the methods used by the Department for accuracy and fidelity to the requirements of P.L. 2024, c.2.
- Provided recommendations to improve the calculations and methodology used by the Department.
- Compiled a final written assessment for the Department.

Consulting Procedures Performed (Continued)

Mercadien analyzed relevant documents provided by the Department, including calculation spreadsheets, methodology documents, and other pertinent records. See **List of Documents Inspected** section below for a listing of all relevant documents viewed and relied upon during the engagement. Specifically, Mercadien analyzed the Calculation Workbook and methodology document to understand the approach and data sources used by the Department. We recalculated the affordable housing obligations using the methodologies provided to assess the accuracy of the information provided therein. Our recalculations were cross-checked with the Department's results to determine consistency and accuracy in the computation of the Present Need, Qualified Urban Aid Municipality Calculation, Regional Prospective Need Calculation, Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor, Income Capacity Factor, Land Capacity Factor, and Final Prospective Need Calculation, in accordance with the requirements outlined in P.L. 2024, c.2.

We also traced amounts within the Calculation Workbook to the source data provided and utilized by the Department. This step determined that the data inputs utilized in the calculations were accurately sourced and correctly applied in the computation models.

We assessed the methods used by the Department for accuracy and adherence to the requirements of P.L. 2024, c.2. This included a detailed analysis of each factor utilized in the calculations:

Present Need: Evaluated the methodology for identifying substandard existing deficient housing units currently occupied by low- and moderate-income households.

Qualified Urban Aid Municipality Calculation: Assessed the criteria for qualifying municipalities based on housing deficiency ratios, population density, and vacant land percentages.

Regional Prospective Need Calculation: Evaluated the calculation of projected household changes and the derivation of regional prospective need.

Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor: Verified the changes in nonresidential property valuations and the calculation of each municipality's share of regional changes.

Income Capacity Factor: Checked the computation of income differences from regional income floors and the household-weighted income differences.

Land Capacity Factor: A comprehensive assessment of the data sources, processes, tools and documentation has been conducted based on the information and data provided. This analysis was specifically focused on evaluating the data sources, geoprocessing models and documentation practices to identify their validity and areas for improvement. The scope of this analysis encompassed a comprehensive assessment of the following elements:

1. **Geospatial Data:** A comprehensive analysis of all 21 data sources provided has been conducted, confirming that they are authoritative and represent the best available information for the analysis. Each data source was evaluated for its credibility, relevance and accuracy. It was found that the GIS data used in the analysis represents the best available data at the time of analysis.

Consulting Procedures Performed (Continued)

- 2. Geoprocessing Methodologies:** Analyze the geoprocessing tools and methods used in ArcGIS Pro, specifically focusing on the models built through ModelBuilder and those related to "Vacant Land Processing" and "Calculate Municipalities Totals". The provided ArcGIS Pro project was accompanied by models built through "ModelBuilder". The models within the project are well developed and utilize the appropriate geoprocessing tools for the analysis. The models evaluated which resembled the .SVG files provided were named within the ArcPro project as follows: "RunTheNumbersAugust" model and "UpdateAGOREgional 2 Numbers" model. For both models, we were successfully able to run and complete with minor changes to input and output layers. In comparing these models, there were slight differences noted, however, the numbers obtained through our evaluation were not substantially different and were within an acceptable margin of error to suggest the model is running as intended. Alternatively, there may have been additional processing of the results that are not described in the methodology or were not known at the time of the evaluation, therefore limiting the evaluation's extent and resulting in a scope limitation as it relates to this procedure.
- 3. Process Documentation:** Assessment of the documentation associated with the GIS-based process and models, including variable naming conventions and descriptions of geoprocessing tool configurations.
- 4. Software Utilization:** Evaluate the appropriateness and effectiveness of the software tools employed in the project.

Final Prospective Need Calculation: Examined the averaging of factors and the application of the 1,000 unit/20% cap.

We also evaluated the identification of the regions to determine whether all municipalities were included in the Calculation Workbook and whether the correct municipalities were included in each region. This verification procedure determined that the regional boundaries and groupings were accurate and in accordance with statutory and methodological guidelines.

Lastly, we conducted inquiries with key personnel involved in the calculation process to understand the existing procedures and any challenges faced. These interviews provided insights into the practical application of methodologies and assumptions and/or adjustments made during the calculations. As a part of the inquiry process, we inquired about any open items or discrepancies noted in the calculations. We requested a modified document, if needed, to address any identified issues or inconsistencies. By incorporating these additional steps, we determined whether other potential issues were identified and resolved, and that the final calculations accurately reflected the Department's methodologies and statutory requirements.

List of Documents and Data Inspected

- PDF version of P.L. 2024, c.2
- Fourth Round Fair Housing Obligation Calculation Methodology
- Mount Laurel Obligation Calculation Workbook (the "Calculation Workbook")
- Geospatial data and Esri ArcGIS Pro models

Conclusion

Based on the procedures performed as described above, the Department's calculations were accurate and aligned with the requirements of P.L. 2024, c.2. The methodology used by the Department was consistent with the public law and accurately reflected the legislative intent, as Mercadien understands same. Our engagement has concluded that the Department has accurately calculated the non-binding fourth round affordable housing obligations in accordance with P.L. 2024, c.2, based on the documents and data provided. The methodologies employed are consistent with public law, and we found no issues during our recalculations and verifications.

Limiting Conditions

Our engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' ("AICPA") Statement on Standards for Consulting Services. Our consulting services did not constitute an audit conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, an examination of internal controls, or other attestation or review services in accordance with standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, or other regulatory body.

We were not engaged to, and did not perform an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the specified elements, accounts, or items. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Our analyses, findings and recommendations are based upon information provided to Mercadien as of the date of this report. It is possible that if additional information is forthcoming, our analyses and findings could be different.

Very truly yours,

Mercadien, P.C.
Certified Public Accountants

Attachment A



Affordable Housing Obligations for 2025-2035 (Fourth Round) Methodology and Background

Jacquelyn A. Suárez, Commissioner

Philip D. Murphy, Governor

Tahesha L. Way, Lieutenant Governor

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Present Need and Deficient Low- and Moderate-Income Occupied Housing	4
Qualified Urban Aid Municipality Calculation	9
Regional Prospective Need Calculation	10
Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	11
Income Capacity Factor	12
Land Capacity Factor	14
Final Prospective Need Calculation.....	18
Appendix A: Fourth Round Present Need and Prospective Need Obligations	20
Appendix B: GIS Data Sources	42
Appendix C: Model Builder Flow Process Diagrams – Vacant Land Analysis	43

Introduction

On March 20, 2024, Governor Murphy signed P.L.2024, c.2. into law, establishing a new framework for determining and enforcing municipalities' affordable housing obligations under the New Jersey Supreme Court's Mount Laurel doctrine and the State's Fair Housing Act. The law requires that the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) perform a calculation of regional need and municipal present and prospective obligations in accordance with the formulas established in the law.

This report outlines DCA's fourth round (2025-2035) fair share methodology and calculations of low- and moderate-income housing obligations for New Jersey's 564 municipalities. The report and calculation were prepared by the Offices of Policy and External Affairs and Local Planning Services in the Department of Community Affairs. The report explains how DCA calculated the Present Need and Prospective Need obligations for the fourth round in line with the formulas and criteria outlined in P.L.2024, c.2 (the Affordable Housing Law). Moreover, this report presents information on the data sources used and calculation decisions made to create transparency around the basis of the reported obligations.

The final calculation and obligations for each municipality are presented in an Appendix at the end of this report. Detailed calculations and formulas can be found in the companion multi-tab Excel workbook calculation model, which also outlines all the source datasets used in the calculation and provides weblinks to their locations online.

As a rule, DCA wherever possible utilized primary source data reported at the municipality level to preserve municipal level variation in housing stock characteristics and the low- and moderate-income population. DCA made necessary percentage-based adjustments based on figures available at higher levels of geography (such as the Public Use Microdata Area) when municipal level data was not available. The most recently available data sources were used at the time of analysis, unless the Affordable Housing Law explicitly required a dataset corresponding to a specific time period to be used. Data corresponding to consistent data surveys and products were also used in the calculations wherever possible. The calculations are presented in a way that they can be reproduced and that every calculation step can be traced and verified.

Present Need and Deficient Low- and Moderate-Income Occupied Housing

The first step was to calculate Present Need, defined in the Affordable Housing Law as the number of substandard existing deficient housing units currently occupied by low- and moderate-income (LMI) households. The Affordable Housing Law requires that with respect to this calculation a methodology should be used that is “*similar to the methodology used to determine third round municipal present need, through the use of most recent datasets made available through the federal decennial census and the American Community Survey, including the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy dataset thereof.*”

Third round municipal present need calculations used three factors to calculate present need: the number of housing units lacking complete kitchen facilities, the number of units lacking complete plumbing facilities, and the number of overcrowded units. Moreover, the Affordable Housing Law explicitly defines “deficient housing units” as housing that is over 50 years and overcrowded, that lacks complete plumbing, or that lacks complete kitchen facilities.

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the US Census Bureau publish separate tables on housing age, lack of plumbing facilities, lack of kitchen facilities, and overcrowding. However, there is no data source that reports the number of units that meet any one of those three conditions. Therefore, this number must be estimated using data from existing tables, with measures taken to account for overlap and to narrow the scope to deficient housing units occupied by low- and moderate-income households.

Previous approaches have calculated county-level LMI deficient housing shares from the American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) and used them to estimate the LMI-occupied portion of each municipality’s deficient housing. However, this approach essentially assumes that the LMI share of deficient housing is uniform in a county, which is not the case. For example, data from HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset show that for 2017-21, the LMI share of housing lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities in Atlantic County was 69.1 percent. However, in Brigantine, it was 100 percent. Using the county LMI deficient share for Brigantine would result in underestimating city present need,

undercounting the number of deficient housing units actually occupied by LMI households.

Therefore, the analysis utilizes data from HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset, which has municipality-level data on the number and percentage of LMI households from a special tabulation of Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) data. The latest CHAS data release at the time of calculation corresponds to the 2017-2021 5 Year Estimates. To ensure data year and source consistency, the LMI deficient housing calculation relies on 2017-2021 data.

The Affordable Housing Law defines low- and moderate-income households as *“persons or families who are, in the case of State assisted projects or programs, so defined by the New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency, or in the case of federally assisted projects or programs, defined as of ‘low- and very low-income’ by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development”*.

Historically, income limits established by the former Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) have been used to identify low- and moderate-income households with respect to state programs. After COAH was declared inoperative by the New Jersey Supreme Court in 2015, these COAH (Housing) Region income limits have been informally calculated and published by the Affordable Housing Professionals of New Jersey and have identified limits corresponding to low-income households as incomes of 50 percent or less of median income and limits corresponding to moderate-income households as incomes between 80 and 50 percent of the median income, with median income defined at the Housing Region level. The federal government utilizes a different set of income limits for its programs, using different regional boundaries¹. HUD defines low-income as 80 percent of Area Median Family Income and very low-income as 50 percent of Area Median Family Income.²

The HUD CHAS data define low- and moderate-income households based on HUD median family income limits, which correspond to federally defined housing market areas. These areas differ from the state Housing Regions, which are typically much

¹The HUD Areas used for income limits can include single counties, groupings of adjacent counties, or entire metropolitan areas, or portions of metropolitan areas.

²https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/il/il2024/2024summary.odn?inputname=STTLT*3499999999%2BNew+Jersey&selection_type=county&stname=New+Jersey&statefp=34.0&year=2024

larger in size. For these reasons HUD income limits differ slightly from State income limits. DCA performed an analysis to determine if using LMI data corresponding to HUD income limits would differ significantly from using LMI data corresponding to State income limits. Utilizing 2020 ACS PUMS data, the Department calculated LMI household shares for New Jersey's 73 Public Use Microdata Areas, using the FY2020 HUD Income Limits and the 2020 State Income Limits, as calculated by the Affordable Housing Professionals of New Jersey. The analysis revealed a very strong 98 percent correlation between the LMI household shares calculated by the HUD and State income limits. That suggests that utilizing HUD CHAS LMI data would not produce substantially different results than if the LMI data were based on State income limits. For this reason, DCA utilizes CHAS LMI data as a proxy for LMI data based on State income limits, as it has the advantage of offering municipal-level estimates and federal income limits are explicitly authorized in the Affordable Housing Law as a means of identifying low- and moderate-income households.

DCA begins by calculating for each municipality on Tab D of the Calculation File the number of housing units that are more than 50 years old and that are overcrowded (more than one person per room) that have complete kitchen and plumbing facilities (to eliminate any overlap with housing units that lack complete kitchen or plumbing facilities), and that are occupied by low- and moderate-income households.

Fifty years prior to the beginning of the fourth round is 1975, however the Census Bureau only reports housing units based on the decade they were built, making it impossible to accurately and precisely calculate pre-1975 housing. Therefore, to best conform to the intent of the Affordable Housing Law, pre-1980 housing is used for this calculation, which would correspond to housing that would be at least fifty years old at the midpoint of the fourth-round obligation period.

DCA begins by pulling the number of pre- and post-1950 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing from ACS Table B25050. This table only contains categories for housing built pre-1940, 1940-49, and 1950 or later, therefore pre-1980 housing had to be estimated using data from the ACS 5 percent PUMS.

The first step was to adjust the figures for post-1950 units to units constructed between 1950 and 1980. The 1950-1980 share of post-1950, overcrowded housing units with

complete plumbing facilities was calculated at the Public Use Microdata Area (PUMA)³ level. This analysis was conducted utilizing data from the IPUMS Center for Data Integration⁴, which produces a formatted version of American Community Survey microdata primed for statistical analysis. The data were analyzed using a statistical program and household-level sampling weights were applied to generate the percentages. The results are shown on Tab I of the Excel calculation model. The PUMA level percentages were applied to each constituent municipality's⁵ post-1950 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing facilities to produce estimates of 1950-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing facilities on Tab D. These figures were added to pre-1950 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing from the ACS, producing an estimate of pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing for each municipality.

The next step was to remove from these estimates units that lacked kitchen facilities. To do this, the percentage of pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing that *lacked* kitchen facilities was calculated for each PUMA. The results are shown on Tab I. These percentages were then assigned to each constituent municipality and subtracted from pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing. This produced an estimate of pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing *and* complete kitchen facilities for each municipality.

The next step was to estimate what percentage of these units were occupied by low- and moderate-income households. Data from CHAS Table 3 were used to estimate the percentage of overcrowded housing units that were occupied by LMI households (households making 80 percent or less of Household Area Median Family Income) in each municipality on Tab F. These percentages were then multiplied by pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. This yielded

³PUMAs are non-overlapping, statistical geographic areas that partition each state or equivalent entity into geographic areas containing no fewer than 100,000 people each. They typically contain data corresponding to a grouping of municipalities or portions of large municipalities that exceed 100,000 population. They are the smallest geography available in the ACS Public Data Microdata Sample.

⁴Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Matthew Sobek, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Renae Rodgers, and Megan Schouweiler. IPUMS USA: Version 15.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V15.0>

⁵92% of municipalities have over 95% of their population within one PUMA. In cases where municipalities were split across multiple PUMAs, they were assigned the PUMA which accounted for a majority of their population. A listing of municipalities by PUMA can be found on Tab J.

an estimate of LMI pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing and complete kitchen facilities.

Next, DCA determined the number of housing units lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities that were occupied by LMI households on Tab H of the Excel calculation model. Data by municipality were available from CHAS Table 8 and LMI specific totals were computed for each municipality.

The final step was to add together and round to the nearest digit the two mutually exclusive components of LMI deficient housing units, LMI pre-1980 overcrowded housing units with complete plumbing and complete kitchen facilities and LMI housing units lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities. This yielded a final total of LMI deficient housing units, totaling 65,410 statewide. This serves as the Department's Present Need obligation calculation and provides one of the components of the Qualified Urban Aid Municipality calculation.

Present Need by Housing Region

Housing Region	Counties	Present Need
1	Bergen, Hudson, Passaic, and Sussex	23,741
2	Essex, Morris, Union, and Warren	18,547
3	Hunterdon, Middlesex, and Somerset	7,073
4	Mercer, Monmouth, and Ocean	6,721
5	Burlington, Camden, and Gloucester	5,927
6	Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, and Salem	3,401
TOTAL		65,410

Qualified Urban Aid Municipality Calculation

The qualified urban aid calculation begins with the list of Urban Aid municipalities. The Urban Aid List is produced by the Division of Local Government Services every year and relies on a statutory formula that considers the municipal tax rate, equalized valuation, number of children participating in the TANF program, population, and population density.

The FY2025 Urban Aid list, the most recent list, was the one used for the calculation. There are 62 municipalities on the list. The FY2025 Urban Aid municipalities were analyzed to determine if they are “qualified” on Tab E of the Excel calculation model. There are three tests, any of which qualifies an Urban Aid municipality. For the first test, the ratio of substandard existing deficient housing units to all housing units in the municipality is compared to the same ratio for its Housing Region using the LMI substandard deficient housing unit data calculated in Tab D and total housing units from ACS Table B25001. If the ratio for the municipality exceeds the ratio for its Housing Region, it qualifies.

For the second test, population density is calculated for every municipality using 2023 Census Population Estimates data (the latest available at the time of analysis) and 2020

Decennial Census land area data. If any municipality's density exceeds 10,000 persons per square mile, it qualifies.

For the third test, municipalities with population densities between 6,000 and 10,000 persons per square mile are analyzed to establish if less than five percent of parcels are vacant and not used as farmland. This is determined by averaging the number of vacant land parcels in the municipality as a percentage of the total number of parcels in the municipality and the valuation of vacant land in the municipality as a percentage of total valuations in the municipality from the 2023 Division of Local Government Services property tax data tables. If this average is less than 5 percent these municipalities qualify. Any municipality meeting at least one of these tests is tagged as a Qualified Urban Aid municipality. The calculation, performed on Tab E, produced 47 Qualified Urban Aid municipalities within 13 counties.

Regional Prospective Need Calculation

The Affordable Housing Law requires that *“Projected household change for a 10-year round in a region shall be estimated by establishing the household change experienced in the region between the most recent federal decennial census, and the second-most recent federal decennial census.”* The most recent federal decennial census is the 2020 Census, and the second-most recent census is the 2010 Census. DCA collected household data at the county level from the Table H14 of the 2010 Census Summary File 1 and Table DP1 of the 2020 Census Demographic Profile. These figures were aggregated to the Housing Region level and the difference between the two was computed, representing the increase in the number of households on the Final Summary tab of the Excel calculation model. The Affordable Housing Law requires that *“this household change, if positive, shall be divided by 2.5 to estimate the number of low- and moderate-income homes needed to address low- and moderate-income household change in the region, and to determine the regional prospective need for a 10-year round of low- and moderate-income housing obligations.”* Pursuant to this requirement, DCA divided the household change for each Housing Region by 2.5, producing Regional Prospective Need figures totaling 84,698 statewide.

Regional Prospective Need Obligations by Housing Region

Housing Region	Counties	Regional Prospective Need	2010 Households - Decennial Census	2020 Households - Decennial Census	Change	Change Divided by 2.5 (Assumed Low- and Moderate- Income Household Growth)
1	Bergen, Hudson, Passaic, and Sussex	27,743	803,704	873,062	69,358	27,743
2	Essex, Morris, Union, and Warren	20,506	693,844	745,108	51,264	20,506
3	Hunterdon, Middlesex, and Somerset	11,604	446,114	475,123	29,009	11,604
4	Mercer, Monmouth, and Ocean	13,822	588,249	622,803	34,554	13,822
5	Burlington, Camden, and Gloucester	9,134	461,569	484,404	22,835	9,134
6	Atlantic, Cape May, Cumberland, and Salem	1,889	220,880	225,602	4,722	1,889
TOTAL		84,698	3,214,360	3,426,102	211,742	84,698

Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor

The Affordable Housing Law requires that “...the changes in nonresidential property valuations in the municipality, since the beginning of the round preceding the round being calculated, shall be calculated using data published by the Division of Local Government Services in the department.” It defines the beginning of this period as being 1999.

Utilizing the data from the NJ Division of Local Government Services, 1999 and 2023 Property Value Classification Files, DCA added together the commercial and industrial property valuations for each municipality to obtain total nonresidential valuation.⁶ These figures were then adjusted by the State Equalization Table Average Ratios in 1999 and 2023 to obtain 1999 and 2023 equalized nonresidential valuations for every municipality. The 1999-2023 change in these valuations was then computed and

⁶The Borough of Pine Valley was merged into the Borough of Pine Hill in 2022 and Princeton Township and Princeton Borough merged into a single municipality in 2013. For the purposes of calculating the 1999-2023 change in valuation, the 1999 valuation for Pine Valley was added to the 1999 valuation for Pine Hill and the 1999 Princeton Borough and Princeton Township valuations were combined into a single consolidated Princeton valuation.

aggregated to the Housing Region level, less the valuation changes in Qualified Urban Aid municipalities. All of these changes were positive.

For the next step, the Affordable Housing Law requires that *“the change in the municipality’s nonresidential valuations shall be divided by the regional total change in nonresidential valuations to determine the municipality’s share of the regional change as the equalized nonresidential valuation factor.”* Each municipality’s equalized nonresidential valuation change was then divided by the change for its Housing Region to determine its Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor.

Income Capacity Factor

The Affordable Housing Law requires calculation of an Income Capacity Factor, which measures the extent to which a municipality’s income level differs from that of the lowest-income municipality in its Housing Region. It is calculated as the average of two measures. The first is *“the municipal share of the regional sum of the differences between the median municipal household income, according to the most recent American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates, and an income floor of \$100 below the lowest median household income in the region.”* The second is *“the municipal share of the regional sum of the differences between the median municipal household incomes and an income floor of \$100 below the lowest median household income in the region, weighted by the number of the households in the municipality.”*

DCA began by pulling the median household income for every municipality from Table S1903 of the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey 2018-22 5-Year Estimates, the most recently available dataset for all New Jersey municipalities at the time of the calculation. Household data from Table S1901 was also used to implement the household weighting required by the Affordable Housing Law.

First, DCA computed the lowest municipal median household income in each Housing Region and subtracted 100 from that to produce Housing Region median household income floors.

Lowest Median Income by Housing Region

Housing Region	Lowest Median Household Income	Lowest Income Municipality in Region
1	52,092	Paterson city
2	46,360	Newark city
3	56,139	Perth Amboy city
4	44,344	Trenton city
5	36,158	Camden city
6	29,721	Penns Grove borough

Then for each municipality, excluding the Qualified Urban Aid municipalities, the regional income floor was subtracted from the median household income⁷ to compute the difference from the regional income floor. Those differences were then summed to the Housing Region level to produce aggregated income differences by region, less any differences accounted for by Qualified Urban Aid municipalities. Each municipality’s difference from the regional income floor was then divided by its Housing Region aggregated income differences, to compute its share of Housing Region income differences. Next, the same calculation was performed, however each municipality’s difference from the regional income floor was multiplied by its number of households to produce household-weighted income differences. These differences were then aggregated to the Housing Region level, and each municipality’s weighted difference was divided by its Housing Region aggregated household-weighted income differences, producing its share of Housing Region household-weighted income differences.

The share of Housing Region income differences and share of Housing Region household-weighted income differences were then averaged to produce the Income Capacity Factor.

⁷Three municipalities, Walpack Township, Teterboro Borough, and Tavistock Borough did not have 2018-22 Median Household Income estimates available. As the Affordable Housing Law requires that “the most recent American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates” be used, DCA used the most recently available ACS figures for these municipalities, which were 2008-12 for Tavistock, 2011-15 for Walpack, and 2015-19 for Teterboro. Six municipalities, Ho-Ho-Kus, Tavistock, Millburn, Rumson, Chatham Borough, and Mountain Lakes, had median household incomes that were top-coded at 250,000 by the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau top-codes median household incomes above 250,000 to ensure privacy for individuals reporting high incomes.

Land Capacity Factor

The Land Capacity Factor is computed pursuant to statutory edict by determining, for each municipality, the total acreage that is developable utilizing the most recent land use / land cover (LULC) data from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), the most recently available (released in 2024) MOD-IV Property Tax List data from the Division of Taxation in the Department of the Treasury, and construction permit data from the Department of Community Affairs. As discussed below, DCA excluded lands that did not correspond to a tax parcel with a Property Class Code denoting vacant land or qualified farmland. DCA also excluded lands subject to development limitations and applied weighting factors as specified in the Affordable Housing Law. Weights were applied to developable lands based on the planning area type in which such land was located, as required by the Law. The weights were as follows:

Planning Area Weights

Planning Area	Weight
Planning Area 1 (Metropolitan)	1
Planning Area 2 (Suburban)	1
Planning Area 3 (Fringe)	0.5
Planning Area 4 (Rural)	0
Planning Area 5 (Environmentally Sensitive)	0
Centers in Planning Areas 1 and 2	1
Centers in Planning Areas 3, 4, and 5	0.5
Pinelands Regional Growth Area	0.5
Pinelands Town	0.5
All other Pinelands	0
Meadowlands	1
Meadowlands Center	1
Highlands Preservation Area	0
Highlands Planning Area Existing Community Zone	1
Highlands Designated Center in a Highlands-conforming municipality	1
Highlands Planning Area, State-designated sewer service area, Highlands municipality that is not a Highlands-conforming municipality as determined by the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council	1
All other Highlands Planning Areas	0

The analysis work was done using Model Builder in ArcGIS Pro. A description of GIS data sources and the Model Builder flow process is included in the appendix. Only the land area within the above planning areas were included in the analysis. The total developable land area for each municipality was divided by the Housing Region total, excluding land area corresponding to Qualified Urban Aid municipalities, to determine its Land Capacity Factor.

The datasets mandated for use by the legislation have significant limitations in their use. The LULC data reflect a geographic depiction of the classification system established by the U.S. Geological Survey (Anderson Codes) and modified by DEP. Based on aerial imagery from 2020, land areas are identified by category to reflect uses and coverages.

The following LULC areas were used to identify vacant, developable land:

LULC Areas Identified as Vacant, Developable Land

Code	Description
2100	Cropland and Pastureland
2200	Orchards/Vineyards/Nurseries/Horticultural Areas
4110	Deciduous Forest (10-50% Crown Closure)
4120	Deciduous Forest (>50% Crown Closure)
4210	Coniferous Forest (10-50% Crown Closure)
4220	Coniferous Forest (>50% Crown Closure)
4230	Plantation
4311	Mixed Forest (>50% Coniferous With 10-50% Crown Closure)
4312	Mixed Forest (>50% Coniferous With >50% Crown Closure)
4321	Mixed Forest (>50% Deciduous With 10-50% Crown Closure)
4322	Mixed Forest (>50% Deciduous With >50% Crown Closure)
4410	Old Field (< 25% Brush Covered)
4411	Phragmites Dominate Old Field
4420	Deciduous Brush/Shrubland
4430	Coniferous Brush/Shrubland
4440	Mixed Deciduous/Coniferous Brush/Shrubland
4500	Severe Burned Upland Vegetation
7600	Undifferentiated Barren Lands

Vacant land identified from a mapping of the above LULC categories was initially supplemented with a mapping of all tax parcels coded as vacant land or qualified

farmland by individual municipal tax assessors. Each individual tax lot in the state is assigned a unique identifier called a PAMS PIN which consists of a concatenation of the Division of Taxation four-digit Municipality Code, Block, Lot and Qualification Code for each of the over 3.4 million individual tax lots in the state. However, there are abundant instances throughout the state where multiple adjoining parcels with the same Property Class and under one ownership are consolidated for the purposes of generating tax bills. However, the individual parcel boundaries are not consolidated. The result of this practice is that a Property Class Code is only assigned to one parcel and the associated parcels are only noted in the MOD-IV Property Tax data via an “Additional Lots” field that is not standardized to a point where queries and data joins are practical. In most cases, these additional lots are assigned a null value in all of the other property characteristic fields within the dataset, and they cannot be easily identified as vacant or qualified farmland parcels. While an attempt was made to capture these null value fields and integrate them with the main parcel with which they are associated, success was limited. Additionally, many parcels coded by local Tax Assessors may technically be vacant land but are not actually developable. The most prevalent examples of this are common open space that is part of planned residential development, detention basins, utility rights of way, and landfills. However, uncoded additional lots, common open space and landfills are generally captured by the LULC part of the analysis. Consequently, tax parcels identified as vacant land and qualified farmland were not used as a source dataset to identify developable land in the analysis.

Conversely, because the LULC data identify land cover based aerial imagery, many instances were noted where forested crown closure was actually rear yards of clustered residences, buffer areas on non-residential development or tree-covered roadways. To address this issue, a mask was built, using the MOD-IV data, to remove LULC areas where there is no underlying tax parcel (indicating rights of way), and underlying tax parcels with property class codes for residential, commercial, industrial, apartment, railroad, and school.

Given the age of both the LULC and MOD-IV Property Tax data, an analysis of construction permit data reported to DCA by municipalities was incorporated to capture more recent development activities that warranted removal of properties otherwise identified as vacant. However, these data are “as reported by municipalities” and are therefore neither standardized nor consistent.

The aggregate of land areas identified as vacant from the LULC geospatial data, as adjusted to reflect underlying non-vacant property class coded parcels and updated information from construction permit data, served as a starting point for the DCA Land Capacity Analysis.

GIS data that reflect the statutorily defined Housing Regions 1 through 6, planning area weights, and municipal boundaries were used to isolate and identify vacant land at the municipal and regional levels. These areas were then reduced to reflect undevelopable land based on GIS mappings of open space, preserved farmland, category 1 waterways and wetlands (and associated buffers based on special resource area restrictions), steep slopes exceeding 15 percent, and open waters.

Steep slope areas obtained from the 10 foot digital elevation model LiDAR data compiled by the State Office of GIS (OGIS) are extremely granular and reflect steep slope areas that are too small and fragmented to be realistically included in a generalized analysis of vacant land for the purposes of this study. The sheer size (over 176 million polygons) of the dataset also presented impediments from the perspective of computational resource capacities. Therefore, certain thresholds were used to both reduce the size of datasets and focus on steep slopes that reflect impactful constraints on development potential. Small patches of steep slope areas consisting of 5,000 square feet or less were removed from the dataset. The 5,000 square foot threshold is adopted from the definition of Steep Slope Protection Areas established by the New Jersey Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council.

MOD-IV data are compiled by individual Tax Assessors throughout the state and not all characteristics of vacant land are recorded uniformly. Initially, notes in various comment field were analyzed to identify remove parcels noted as common area, detention basins, road rights of way, etc. In a best effort further analysis to capture these inconsistencies, approximately 22,000 vacant parcels were manually reviewed to identify and remove additional homeowner association common areas, detention basins, and road and utility rights of way.

Due to limitations resulting from inconsistencies between source datasets, the resulting municipal and regional mappings include many instances of small land areas caused by

an incongruous alignment of geospatial layers. These “slivers” are considered artifacts of error that are common when overlaying polygons and vectors from non-coincident data sources. To correct for this anomaly, and to account for very small areas remaining after the exclusion of various environmental constraints, all feature parts with an area less than 2,500 square feet (presuming a 25 by 100-foot area could be a developable property) were removed from the resulting analysis.

The resulting land area for each municipality was summed with the resulting land areas for all other municipalities within each the housing region to then determine the municipal percentage of land capacity for the housing region.

Final Prospective Need Calculation

To calculate prospective need for each municipality, DCA averaged the equalized nonresidential valuation factor, land capacity factor, and income capacity factor for each municipality into an average allocation factor. Qualified Urban Aid municipalities received an average allocation factor of 0 since they have no prospective need obligations under the Affordable Housing Law. The Prospective Need for each Housing Region was multiplied by each constituent municipality’s average allocation factor and a regional adjustment factor particular to each housing region to yield its number of prospective need units. The regional adjustment factors are factors evenly applied across housing regions designed to ensure that the summed total of all constituent municipalities’ prospective need obligations equals the regional obligation exactly. Without these factors, the totals would not equal the regional obligation due to rounding. They range from 0.9998 (Housing Region 5) to 1.0004 (Housing Region 6).

Next, the Department calculates the prospective need obligations with the 1,000 unit/20 percent cap outlined in the Affordable Housing Law:

The municipality may in its plan lower its prospective need obligation to the extent necessary to prevent establishing a prospective need obligation that requires the municipality to provide a realistic opportunity for more than 1,000 housing units, after the application of any excess credits, or to prevent a prospective need obligation that exceeds 20 percent of the total number of households in a municipality according to the most recent federal decennial census, not including any prior round obligation.

DCA calculates each municipality's prospective need as a percentage of households reported by 2020 Decennial Census Table DP1⁸ (the most recent federal decennial census). The Department then determines if each municipality's prospective need obligation exceeds 1,000 or has a prospective need as a percentage of households more than 20 percent. If either condition is met, then the obligation is reduced to the lesser of the two, reported as the prospective need obligation with the 1,000 unit/20 percent cap.

⁸Total households for the Borough of Pine Hill include households in the Borough of Pine Valley counted in the 2020 Census. Pine Valley merged into the Borough of Pine Hill in 2022.

Appendix A: Fourth Round Present Need and Prospective Need Obligations

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Absecon city	Atlantic	6	39	No	0.97%	1.11%	1.44%	1.17%	22	723	22
Atlantic City	Atlantic	6	875	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Brigantine city	Atlantic	6	13	No	0.98%	0.00%	2.10%	1.03%	19	760	19
Buena borough	Atlantic	6	3	No	0.12%	0.05%	1.26%	0.48%	9	353	9
Buena Vista township	Atlantic	6	22	No	0.74%	0.05%	1.35%	0.71%	13	550	13
Corbin City	Atlantic	6	0	No	0.06%	0.00%	0.84%	0.30%	6	37	6
Egg Harbor township	Atlantic	6	164	No	9.19%	7.77%	6.49%	7.81%	148	1,000	148
Egg Harbor City	Atlantic	6	61	No	0.40%	0.51%	0.53%	0.48%	9	342	9
Estell Manor city	Atlantic	6	0	No	0.07%	0.00%	1.45%	0.51%	10	126	10
Folsom borough	Atlantic	6	0	No	0.34%	0.00%	1.46%	0.60%	11	134	11
Galloway township	Atlantic	6	260	No	4.67%	4.50%	4.96%	4.71%	89	1,000	89
Hamilton township	Atlantic	6	13	No	3.04%	3.23%	4.05%	3.44%	65	1,000	65
Hammonton town	Atlantic	6	64	No	2.73%	2.80%	2.25%	2.59%	49	1,000	49
Linwood city	Atlantic	6	49	No	0.91%	0.11%	2.94%	1.32%	25	529	25
Longport borough	Atlantic	6	0	No	-0.02%	0.00%	1.17%	0.38%	7	90	7
Margate City	Atlantic	6	19	No	1.08%	0.00%	2.31%	1.13%	21	530	21
Mullica township	Atlantic	6	0	No	0.24%	0.37%	1.48%	0.70%	13	439	13
Northfield city	Atlantic	6	10	No	1.33%	0.16%	2.30%	1.27%	24	623	24
Pleasantville city	Atlantic	6	294	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Port Republic city	Atlantic	6	10	No	0.05%	0.00%	1.62%	0.55%	10	82	10
Somers Point city	Atlantic	6	27	No	3.38%	0.05%	1.50%	1.65%	31	969	31
Ventnor City	Atlantic	6	24	No	0.69%	0.00%	1.55%	0.75%	14	859	14
Weymouth township	Atlantic	6	0	No	0.37%	0.00%	0.77%	0.38%	7	241	7
Allendale borough	Bergen	1	159	No	0.56%	1.21%	1.05%	0.94%	260	465	260
Alpine borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.17%	1.41%	1.19%	0.93%	257	117	117

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Bergenfield borough	Bergen	1	137	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Bogota borough	Bergen	1	26	No	0.23%	0.06%	0.66%	0.32%	88	588	88
Carlstadt borough	Bergen	1	0	No	5.14%	0.01%	0.37%	1.84%	511	486	486
Cliffside Park borough	Bergen	1	150	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Closter borough	Bergen	1	16	No	0.84%	0.57%	1.30%	0.91%	251	552	251
Cresskill borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.40%	0.11%	1.17%	0.56%	155	603	155
Demarest borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.03%	0.15%	0.96%	0.38%	106	320	106
Dumont borough	Bergen	1	16	No	0.30%	0.06%	1.03%	0.46%	128	1,000	128
East Rutherford borough	Bergen	1	53	No	3.27%	0.69%	0.50%	1.49%	412	861	412
Edgewater borough	Bergen	1	6	No	1.77%	0.02%	1.40%	1.06%	295	1,000	295
Elmwood Park borough	Bergen	1	154	No	0.76%	0.25%	0.55%	0.52%	145	1,000	145
Emerson borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.37%	0.70%	0.89%	0.65%	181	496	181
Englewood city	Bergen	1	166	No	2.53%	0.65%	0.94%	1.37%	381	1,000	381
Englewood Cliffs borough	Bergen	1	0	No	1.78%	0.36%	1.41%	1.18%	329	369	329
Fair Lawn borough	Bergen	1	65	No	2.12%	0.16%	2.19%	1.49%	412	1,000	412
Fairview borough	Bergen	1	313	No	0.94%	0.01%	0.11%	0.35%	97	1,000	97
Fort Lee borough	Bergen	1	241	No	2.26%	0.22%	1.66%	1.38%	382	1,000	382
Franklin Lakes borough	Bergen	1	65	No	0.57%	3.04%	1.78%	1.79%	497	744	497
Garfield city	Bergen	1	322	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Glen Rock borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.35%	0.33%	1.72%	0.80%	222	787	222
Hackensack city	Bergen	1	593	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Harrington Park borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.22%	0.84%	1.13%	0.73%	202	319	202
Hasbrouck Heights borough	Bergen	1	8	No	0.71%	0.13%	0.77%	0.54%	149	907	149
Haworth borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.20%	1.16%	1.24%	0.87%	242	221	221
Hillsdale borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.23%	0.77%	1.37%	0.79%	220	700	220
Ho-Ho-Kus borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.10%	0.66%	1.60%	0.78%	218	283	218

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Leonia borough	Bergen	1	68	No	0.31%	0.16%	0.65%	0.37%	104	672	104
Little Ferry borough	Bergen	1	114	No	0.80%	0.02%	0.26%	0.36%	99	870	99
Lodi borough	Bergen	1	140	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Lyndhurst township	Bergen	1	91	No	2.85%	0.09%	1.02%	1.32%	366	1,000	366
Mahwah township	Bergen	1	36	No	2.91%	2.49%	1.40%	2.27%	629	1,000	629
Maywood borough	Bergen	1	12	No	0.58%	0.06%	0.77%	0.47%	131	743	131
Midland Park borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.40%	0.40%	0.87%	0.56%	155	550	155
Montvale borough	Bergen	1	30	No	0.55%	1.91%	1.30%	1.26%	348	603	348
Moonachie borough	Bergen	1	102	No	1.97%	1.01%	0.28%	1.09%	301	224	224
New Milford borough	Bergen	1	14	No	0.27%	0.11%	0.85%	0.41%	114	1,000	114
North Arlington borough	Bergen	1	36	No	1.37%	0.36%	0.71%	0.82%	227	1,000	227
Northvale borough	Bergen	1	8	No	0.53%	0.11%	0.57%	0.40%	112	328	112
Norwood borough	Bergen	1	15	No	0.41%	0.40%	0.93%	0.58%	161	389	161
Oakland borough	Bergen	1	10	No	1.18%	0.74%	1.39%	1.10%	306	871	306
Old Tappan borough	Bergen	1	4	No	0.03%	1.20%	1.28%	0.84%	233	396	233
Oradell borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.41%	0.15%	1.45%	0.67%	186	556	186
Palisades Park borough	Bergen	1	333	No	1.67%	0.03%	0.69%	0.80%	221	1,000	221
Paramus borough	Bergen	1	254	No	12.40%	2.49%	1.58%	5.49%	1,523	1,000	1,000
Park Ridge borough	Bergen	1	137	No	0.07%	0.21%	1.21%	0.50%	138	662	138
Ramsey borough	Bergen	1	51	No	1.60%	2.34%	1.50%	1.81%	503	1,000	503
Ridgefield borough	Bergen	1	62	No	1.66%	0.10%	0.64%	0.80%	223	810	223
Ridgefield Park village	Bergen	1	163	No	0.73%	0.06%	0.57%	0.45%	126	997	126
Ridgewood village	Bergen	1	4	No	1.19%	0.41%	3.02%	1.54%	427	1,000	427
River Edge borough	Bergen	1	33	No	0.31%	0.18%	1.23%	0.57%	159	838	159
River Vale township	Bergen	1	49	No	0.07%	0.58%	1.46%	0.70%	195	707	195
Rochelle Park township	Bergen	1	10	No	0.61%	0.01%	0.56%	0.39%	109	430	109

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Rockleigh borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.03%	0.29%	0.94%	0.42%	116	14	14
Rutherford borough	Bergen	1	16	No	1.06%	0.12%	1.23%	0.80%	223	1,000	223
Saddle Brook township	Bergen	1	42	No	1.70%	0.32%	0.99%	1.00%	279	1,000	279
Saddle River borough	Bergen	1	75	No	0.13%	3.58%	1.41%	1.71%	473	249	249
South Hackensack township	Bergen	1	7	No	1.62%	0.00%	0.26%	0.63%	174	184	174
Teaneck township	Bergen	1	214	No	1.51%	1.13%	2.03%	1.55%	431	1,000	431
Tenafly borough	Bergen	1	68	No	0.55%	0.55%	2.11%	1.07%	297	983	297
Teterboro borough	Bergen	1	4	No	0.99%	0.01%	0.00%	0.33%	92	5	5
Upper Saddle River borough	Bergen	1	0	No	0.06%	0.65%	1.80%	0.84%	233	532	233
Waldwick borough	Bergen	1	19	No	0.38%	0.44%	1.10%	0.64%	178	715	178
Wallington borough	Bergen	1	81	No	0.53%	0.10%	0.37%	0.33%	92	965	92
Washington township	Bergen	1	0	No	0.11%	0.73%	1.14%	0.66%	184	656	184
Westwood borough	Bergen	1	19	No	1.06%	0.14%	1.34%	0.85%	235	903	235
Woodcliff Lake borough	Bergen	1	0	No	1.39%	1.77%	1.61%	1.59%	441	423	423
Wood-Ridge borough	Bergen	1	17	No	0.43%	0.03%	0.95%	0.47%	130	784	130
Wyckoff township	Bergen	1	40	No	0.58%	1.66%	1.95%	1.39%	387	1,000	387
Bass River township	Burlington	5	30	No	0.25%	0.00%	0.50%	0.25%	23	104	23
Beverly city	Burlington	5	15	No	0.03%	0.07%	0.52%	0.21%	19	194	19
Bordentown city	Burlington	5	0	No	0.31%	0.01%	0.60%	0.30%	28	375	28
Bordentown township	Burlington	5	95	No	3.19%	0.79%	1.24%	1.74%	159	901	159
Burlington city	Burlington	5	63	No	0.31%	0.17%	0.49%	0.33%	30	801	30
Burlington township	Burlington	5	132	No	4.41%	4.25%	1.46%	3.37%	308	1,000	308
Chesterfield township	Burlington	5	0	No	0.10%	0.00%	1.88%	0.66%	60	402	60
Cinnaminson township	Burlington	5	32	No	0.92%	0.41%	1.74%	1.02%	93	1,000	93
Delanco township	Burlington	5	20	No	0.26%	0.31%	0.43%	0.33%	30	406	30
Delran township	Burlington	5	40	No	1.43%	0.41%	1.33%	1.06%	96	1,000	96

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Eastampton township	Burlington	5	24	No	0.15%	0.14%	0.86%	0.38%	35	490	35
Edgewater Park township	Burlington	5	72	No	1.00%	0.32%	0.62%	0.65%	59	732	59
Evesham township	Burlington	5	111	No	3.94%	0.11%	3.18%	2.41%	220	1,000	220
Fieldsboro borough	Burlington	5	0	No	0.01%	0.01%	0.40%	0.14%	13	43	13
Florence township	Burlington	5	42	No	1.49%	0.90%	1.12%	1.17%	107	1,000	107
Hainesport township	Burlington	5	0	No	0.82%	0.61%	1.09%	0.84%	77	455	77
Lumberton township	Burlington	5	38	No	1.16%	1.06%	1.27%	1.16%	106	950	106
Mansfield township	Burlington	5	0	No	0.66%	1.00%	1.03%	0.90%	82	709	82
Maple Shade township	Burlington	5	73	No	1.67%	0.05%	0.84%	0.85%	78	1,000	78
Medford township	Burlington	5	69	No	1.42%	1.33%	2.86%	1.87%	171	1,000	171
Medford Lakes borough	Burlington	5	0	No	0.04%	0.00%	1.12%	0.38%	35	304	35
Moorestown township	Burlington	5	20	No	4.36%	1.04%	2.80%	2.73%	250	1,000	250
Mount Holly township	Burlington	5	42	No	0.51%	0.17%	0.66%	0.45%	41	752	41
Mount Laurel township	Burlington	5	46	No	9.08%	1.96%	3.13%	4.72%	431	1,000	431
New Hanover township	Burlington	5	1	No	0.07%	0.00%	0.62%	0.23%	21	129	21
North Hanover township	Burlington	5	37	No	0.34%	0.00%	0.59%	0.31%	28	576	28
Palmyra borough	Burlington	5	2	No	0.18%	0.15%	0.67%	0.34%	31	654	31
Pemberton borough	Burlington	5	0	No	0.03%	0.00%	0.45%	0.16%	15	113	15
Pemberton township	Burlington	5	79	No	0.49%	1.05%	1.04%	0.86%	79	1,000	79
Riverside township	Burlington	5	126	No	0.11%	0.03%	0.45%	0.20%	18	582	18
Riverton borough	Burlington	5	0	No	0.12%	0.01%	0.86%	0.33%	30	208	30
Shamong township	Burlington	5	0	No	0.13%	0.05%	1.00%	0.39%	36	442	36
Southampton township	Burlington	5	33	No	0.67%	0.03%	0.75%	0.48%	44	931	44
Springfield township	Burlington	5	2	No	0.25%	0.00%	1.05%	0.43%	40	234	40
Tabernacle township	Burlington	5	0	No	0.17%	0.17%	0.89%	0.41%	37	484	37
Washington township	Burlington	5	0	No	0.09%	0.00%	0.35%	0.15%	13	57	13

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Westampton township	Burlington	5	0	No	2.15%	2.15%	1.13%	1.81%	165	655	165
Willingboro township	Burlington	5	16	No	0.89%	0.22%	1.42%	0.84%	77	1,000	77
Woodland township	Burlington	5	4	No	0.05%	0.00%	1.00%	0.35%	32	94	32
Wrightstown borough	Burlington	5	17	No	0.07%	0.17%	0.14%	0.13%	12	63	12
Audubon borough	Camden	5	0	No	0.41%	0.02%	0.95%	0.46%	42	725	42
Audubon Park borough	Camden	5	4	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.14%	0.05%	4	98	4
Barrington borough	Camden	5	34	No	0.33%	0.08%	0.65%	0.36%	32	639	32
Bellmawr borough	Camden	5	74	No	0.73%	0.09%	0.60%	0.47%	43	956	43
Berlin borough	Camden	5	15	No	0.49%	0.72%	0.83%	0.68%	62	572	62
Berlin township	Camden	5	60	No	1.27%	0.88%	0.63%	0.93%	84	460	84
Brooklawn borough	Camden	5	7	No	0.20%	0.02%	0.21%	0.14%	13	147	13
Camden city	Camden	5	1,342	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Cherry Hill township	Camden	5	378	No	12.32%	1.73%	4.72%	6.26%	571	1,000	571
Chesilhurst borough	Camden	5	0	No	0.03%	0.70%	0.44%	0.39%	36	114	36
Clementon borough	Camden	5	0	No	0.12%	0.20%	0.33%	0.22%	20	441	20
Collingswood borough	Camden	5	10	No	0.55%	0.00%	0.86%	0.47%	43	1,000	43
Gibbsboro borough	Camden	5	14	No	0.17%	0.83%	0.54%	0.51%	47	159	47
Gloucester township	Camden	5	221	No	3.50%	4.60%	3.03%	3.71%	339	1,000	339
Gloucester City	Camden	5	7	No	0.40%	0.06%	0.55%	0.34%	31	822	31
Haddon township	Camden	5	35	No	0.67%	0.04%	1.55%	0.75%	69	1,000	69
Haddonfield borough	Camden	5	35	No	0.81%	0.03%	2.23%	1.02%	93	882	93
Haddon Heights borough	Camden	5	30	No	0.26%	0.02%	1.12%	0.47%	43	602	43
Hi-Nella borough	Camden	5	5	No	0.01%	0.03%	0.25%	0.10%	9	77	9
Laurel Springs borough	Camden	5	0	No	0.01%	0.01%	0.73%	0.25%	23	150	23
Lawnside borough	Camden	5	29	No	0.28%	0.47%	0.39%	0.38%	35	230	35
Lindenwold borough	Camden	5	293	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Magnolia borough	Camden	5	0	No	0.24%	0.06%	0.43%	0.24%	22	355	22
Merchantville borough	Camden	5	15	No	0.10%	0.00%	0.39%	0.16%	15	312	15
Mount Ephraim borough	Camden	5	40	No	0.18%	0.02%	0.53%	0.24%	22	388	22
Oaklyn borough	Camden	5	31	No	0.08%	0.01%	0.50%	0.20%	18	352	18
Pennsauken township	Camden	5	392	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Pine Hill borough	Camden	5	53	No	0.16%	1.89%	0.53%	0.86%	79	882	79
Runnemede borough	Camden	5	59	No	0.46%	0.13%	0.68%	0.43%	39	675	39
Somerdale borough	Camden	5	5	No	0.33%	0.09%	0.58%	0.33%	30	458	30
Stratford borough	Camden	5	10	No	0.12%	0.02%	0.68%	0.27%	25	536	25
Tavistock borough	Camden	5	0	No	0.08%	0.00%	1.75%	0.61%	56	0	0
Voorhees township	Camden	5	289	No	3.17%	1.46%	2.13%	2.25%	206	1,000	206
Waterford township	Camden	5	10	No	0.21%	0.55%	0.95%	0.57%	52	759	52
Winslow township	Camden	5	132	No	1.61%	6.26%	1.73%	3.20%	292	1,000	292
Woodlynne borough	Camden	5	7	No	0.02%	0.01%	0.31%	0.11%	10	180	10
Avalon borough	Cape May	6	0	No	2.64%	0.00%	2.22%	1.62%	31	127	31
Cape May city	Cape May	6	46	No	6.72%	0.00%	0.83%	2.52%	48	276	48
Cape May Point borough	Cape May	6	0	No	-0.01%	0.00%	0.77%	0.25%	5	30	5
Dennis township	Cape May	6	0	No	2.83%	0.30%	2.15%	1.76%	33	472	33
Lower township	Cape May	6	75	No	4.24%	1.53%	3.07%	2.95%	56	1,000	56
Middle township	Cape May	6	51	No	7.23%	2.58%	3.08%	4.30%	81	1,000	81
North Wildwood city	Cape May	6	39	No	2.89%	0.00%	1.24%	1.38%	26	384	26
Ocean City	Cape May	6	160	No	7.82%	0.00%	3.01%	3.61%	68	1,000	68
Sea Isle City	Cape May	6	0	No	2.71%	0.00%	1.22%	1.31%	25	220	25
Stone Harbor borough	Cape May	6	0	No	2.46%	0.00%	1.67%	1.38%	26	80	26
Upper township	Cape May	6	0	No	2.74%	1.54%	3.22%	2.50%	47	964	47
West Cape May borough	Cape May	6	0	No	0.78%	0.00%	0.94%	0.57%	11	100	11

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
West Wildwood borough	Cape May	6	8	No	0.14%	0.00%	0.44%	0.19%	4	52	4
Wildwood city	Cape May	6	15	No	7.03%	0.00%	0.53%	2.52%	48	457	48
Wildwood Crest borough	Cape May	6	10	No	3.16%	0.00%	0.83%	1.33%	25	295	25
Woodbine borough	Cape May	6	27	No	0.24%	3.81%	0.21%	1.42%	27	145	27
Bridgeton city	Cumberland	6	290	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Commercial township	Cumberland	6	2	No	0.15%	0.75%	0.60%	0.50%	9	355	9
Deerfield township	Cumberland	6	3	No	0.24%	0.00%	0.96%	0.40%	8	221	8
Downe township	Cumberland	6	4	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.54%	0.18%	3	117	3
Fairfield township	Cumberland	6	35	No	0.25%	5.01%	0.69%	1.98%	37	352	37
Greenwich township	Cumberland	6	4	No	0.01%	0.00%	1.02%	0.34%	7	63	7
Hopewell township	Cumberland	6	31	No	0.50%	8.78%	1.34%	3.54%	67	329	67
Lawrence township	Cumberland	6	17	No	0.06%	0.00%	1.10%	0.39%	7	214	7
Maurice River township	Cumberland	6	0	No	0.34%	0.08%	0.81%	0.41%	8	251	8
Millville city	Cumberland	6	132	No	3.94%	12.09%	2.72%	6.25%	118	1,000	118
Shiloh borough	Cumberland	6	0	No	0.02%	0.00%	0.85%	0.29%	5	39	5
Stow Creek township	Cumberland	6	4	No	0.04%	0.00%	1.16%	0.40%	8	104	8
Upper Deerfield township	Cumberland	6	31	No	1.61%	15.75%	1.32%	6.23%	118	568	118
Vineland city	Cumberland	6	276	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Belleville township	Essex	2	324	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Bloomfield township	Essex	2	329	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Caldwell borough	Essex	2	57	No	0.38%	0.01%	0.76%	0.38%	79	708	79
Cedar Grove township	Essex	2	15	No	0.74%	0.46%	1.29%	0.83%	170	951	170
City of Orange township	Essex	2	678	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
East Orange city	Essex	2	1,850	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Essex Fells borough	Essex	2	0	No	0.02%	0.40%	1.39%	0.60%	124	150	124
Fairfield township	Essex	2	0	No	4.90%	1.00%	0.63%	2.18%	447	549	447

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Glen Ridge borough	Essex	2	0	No	0.78%	0.00%	1.83%	0.87%	178	506	178
Irvington township	Essex	2	1,404	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Livingston township	Essex	2	0	No	2.69%	1.06%	3.00%	2.25%	461	1,000	461
Maplewood township	Essex	2	20	No	1.14%	0.03%	1.99%	1.05%	216	1,000	216
Millburn township	Essex	2	0	No	4.60%	0.46%	3.06%	2.71%	555	1,000	555
Montclair township	Essex	2	132	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Newark city	Essex	2	4,630	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
North Caldwell borough	Essex	2	0	No	0.06%	0.18%	1.49%	0.58%	118	452	118
Nutley township	Essex	2	85	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Roseland borough	Essex	2	0	No	0.72%	0.70%	0.81%	0.74%	152	505	152
South Orange Village twp.	Essex	2	20	No	0.64%	0.03%	1.71%	0.80%	163	1,000	163
Verona township	Essex	2	0	No	0.65%	0.45%	1.43%	0.84%	173	1,000	173
West Caldwell township	Essex	2	4	No	2.22%	0.61%	1.15%	1.33%	272	801	272
West Orange township	Essex	2	409	No	2.20%	5.17%	2.28%	3.22%	660	1,000	660
Clayton borough	Gloucester	5	1	No	0.22%	1.13%	0.77%	0.71%	65	646	65
Deptford township	Gloucester	5	87	No	3.91%	7.57%	1.59%	4.36%	398	1,000	398
East Greenwich township	Gloucester	5	0	No	0.37%	3.13%	1.53%	1.68%	153	787	153
Elk township	Gloucester	5	17	No	0.19%	5.67%	1.17%	2.34%	214	317	214
Franklin township	Gloucester	5	48	No	0.54%	6.71%	1.07%	2.78%	253	1,000	253
Glassboro borough	Gloucester	5	121	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Greenwich township	Gloucester	5	18	No	0.82%	1.87%	0.63%	1.11%	101	395	101
Harrison township	Gloucester	5	40	No	0.76%	7.14%	2.14%	3.35%	306	887	306
Logan township	Gloucester	5	0	No	8.57%	2.84%	0.88%	4.10%	374	419	374
Mantua township	Gloucester	5	21	No	1.02%	2.22%	1.32%	1.52%	139	1,000	139
Monroe township	Gloucester	5	50	No	1.82%	6.12%	2.01%	3.32%	303	1,000	303
National Park borough	Gloucester	5	10	No	0.03%	0.08%	0.47%	0.19%	18	225	18

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Newfield borough	Gloucester	5	0	No	0.04%	0.00%	0.63%	0.22%	20	130	20
Paulsboro borough	Gloucester	5	130	No	0.12%	0.13%	0.28%	0.18%	16	463	16
Pitman borough	Gloucester	5	55	No	0.04%	0.26%	0.81%	0.37%	34	682	34
South Harrison township	Gloucester	5	14	No	0.25%	0.01%	0.92%	0.39%	36	221	36
Swedesboro borough	Gloucester	5	5	No	0.19%	0.11%	0.55%	0.28%	26	191	26
Washington township	Gloucester	5	157	No	4.72%	4.36%	2.82%	3.97%	362	1,000	362
Wenonah borough	Gloucester	5	0	No	0.03%	0.05%	0.87%	0.31%	29	169	29
West Deptford township	Gloucester	5	42	No	2.66%	4.71%	1.17%	2.85%	260	1,000	260
Westville borough	Gloucester	5	16	No	0.20%	0.02%	0.31%	0.18%	16	351	16
Woodbury city	Gloucester	5	147	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	814	0
Woodbury Heights borough	Gloucester	5	15	No	0.24%	0.19%	0.77%	0.40%	36	219	36
Woolwich township	Gloucester	5	16	No	0.62%	5.51%	1.78%	2.64%	241	820	241
Bayonne city	Hudson	1	749	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
East Newark borough	Hudson	1	31	No	0.16%	0.00%	0.08%	0.08%	22	178	22
Guttenberg town	Hudson	1	116	No	0.29%	0.00%	0.32%	0.20%	56	984	56
Harrison town	Hudson	1	257	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Hoboken city	Hudson	1	126	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Jersey City	Hudson	1	3,733	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Kearny town	Hudson	1	630	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
North Bergen township	Hudson	1	596	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Secaucus town	Hudson	1	25	No	6.95%	5.45%	1.46%	4.62%	1,282	1,000	1,000
Union City	Hudson	1	2,088	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Weehawken township	Hudson	1	84	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
West New York town	Hudson	1	1,173	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Alexandria township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.05%	0.68%	1.22%	0.65%	75	350	75
Bethlehem township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.05%	0.00%	1.28%	0.44%	51	269	51

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Bloomsbury borough	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.05%	0.00%	0.32%	0.13%	15	68	15
Califon borough	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.03%	0.00%	0.56%	0.20%	23	81	23
Clinton town	Hunterdon	3	3	No	0.15%	0.24%	1.00%	0.46%	54	223	54
Clinton township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.38%	2.24%	1.88%	1.50%	174	932	174
Delaware township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.06%	0.00%	1.49%	0.52%	60	359	60
East Amwell township	Hunterdon	3	4	No	0.28%	0.00%	0.85%	0.38%	44	310	44
Flemington borough	Hunterdon	3	74	No	0.23%	0.02%	0.40%	0.22%	25	371	25
Franklin township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.04%	0.11%	1.19%	0.44%	52	234	52
Frenchtown borough	Hunterdon	3	11	No	0.07%	0.00%	0.49%	0.19%	22	126	22
Glen Gardner borough	Hunterdon	3	10	No	0.01%	0.00%	0.27%	0.09%	11	157	11
Hampton borough	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.01%	0.00%	0.21%	0.07%	9	122	9
High Bridge borough	Hunterdon	3	4	No	0.09%	0.12%	0.64%	0.28%	33	285	33
Holland township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	-0.01%	0.17%	0.95%	0.37%	43	400	43
Kingwood township	Hunterdon	3	20	No	0.12%	0.00%	1.19%	0.44%	50	295	50
Lambertville city	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.37%	0.00%	0.65%	0.34%	39	419	39
Lebanon borough	Hunterdon	3	7	No	0.16%	0.05%	0.59%	0.27%	31	159	31
Lebanon township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.10%	0.00%	1.09%	0.40%	46	474	46
Milford borough	Hunterdon	3	3	No	-0.03%	0.25%	0.37%	0.20%	23	105	23
Raritan township	Hunterdon	3	44	No	2.72%	3.38%	2.59%	2.90%	336	1,000	336
Readington township	Hunterdon	3	45	No	0.67%	12.00%	1.84%	4.84%	561	1,000	561
Stockton borough	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.03%	0.00%	0.48%	0.17%	20	47	20
Tewksbury township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.11%	0.10%	1.74%	0.65%	76	437	76
Union township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.14%	2.01%	0.89%	1.01%	118	368	118
West Amwell township	Hunterdon	3	0	No	0.12%	0.00%	0.90%	0.34%	39	229	39
East Windsor township	Mercer	4	166	No	2.28%	4.29%	1.42%	2.66%	368	1,000	368
Ewing township	Mercer	4	99	No	2.93%	2.93%	1.06%	2.31%	319	1,000	319

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Hamilton township	Mercer	4	186	No	6.85%	2.41%	2.60%	3.95%	546	1,000	546
Hightstown borough	Mercer	4	47	No	0.16%	0.01%	0.58%	0.25%	35	419	35
Hopewell borough	Mercer	4	0	No	0.09%	0.00%	0.76%	0.28%	39	157	39
Hopewell township	Mercer	4	8	No	2.85%	6.90%	2.05%	3.93%	543	1,000	543
Lawrence township	Mercer	4	68	No	3.67%	1.47%	1.81%	2.32%	320	1,000	320
Pennington borough	Mercer	4	4	No	0.17%	0.02%	1.06%	0.42%	58	206	58
Princeton	Mercer	4	60	No	2.08%	1.35%	2.56%	2.00%	276	1,000	276
Robbinsville township	Mercer	4	40	No	2.59%	2.95%	1.76%	2.43%	336	1,000	336
Trenton city	Mercer	4	1,084	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
West Windsor township	Mercer	4	61	No	4.42%	6.87%	3.06%	4.78%	661	1,000	661
Carteret borough	Middlesex	3	164	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Cranbury township	Middlesex	3	0	No	4.48%	1.82%	1.82%	2.71%	314	265	265
Dunellen borough	Middlesex	3	79	No	0.14%	0.01%	0.45%	0.20%	23	524	23
East Brunswick township	Middlesex	3	170	No	3.09%	1.69%	3.34%	2.71%	314	1,000	314
Edison township	Middlesex	3	637	No	12.80%	1.30%	4.69%	6.27%	727	1,000	727
Helmetta borough	Middlesex	3	3	No	0.01%	0.04%	0.58%	0.21%	24	210	24
Highland Park borough	Middlesex	3	209	No	0.25%	0.08%	0.83%	0.38%	45	1,000	45
Jamesburg borough	Middlesex	3	19	No	0.17%	0.03%	0.80%	0.33%	38	423	38
Metuchen borough	Middlesex	3	5	No	1.07%	0.08%	1.95%	1.03%	120	1,000	120
Middlesex borough	Middlesex	3	14	No	1.07%	0.09%	0.93%	0.70%	81	1,000	81
Milltown borough	Middlesex	3	13	No	0.23%	0.06%	1.02%	0.44%	51	523	51
Monroe township	Middlesex	3	76	No	4.78%	12.19%	2.45%	6.47%	751	1,000	751
New Brunswick city	Middlesex	3	1,225	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
North Brunswick township	Middlesex	3	130	No	3.29%	0.83%	2.07%	2.06%	239	1,000	239
Old Bridge township	Middlesex	3	318	No	3.02%	12.32%	2.39%	5.91%	685	1,000	685
Perth Amboy city	Middlesex	3	987	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Piscataway township	Middlesex	3	150	No	9.71%	1.51%	2.73%	4.65%	539	1,000	539
Plainsboro township	Middlesex	3	53	No	2.50%	3.67%	1.81%	2.66%	309	1,000	309
Sayreville borough	Middlesex	3	194	No	2.21%	3.19%	1.58%	2.32%	270	1,000	270
South Amboy city	Middlesex	3	19	No	0.34%	0.26%	0.68%	0.43%	49	748	49
South Brunswick township	Middlesex	3	132	No	9.68%	11.74%	3.37%	8.27%	959	1,000	959
South Plainfield borough	Middlesex	3	54	No	3.55%	0.15%	1.67%	1.79%	208	1,000	208
South River borough	Middlesex	3	66	No	0.60%	0.20%	0.81%	0.53%	62	1,000	62
Spotswood borough	Middlesex	3	7	No	0.23%	0.14%	0.71%	0.36%	42	639	42
Woodbridge township	Middlesex	3	694	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Aberdeen township	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.66%	0.21%	1.34%	0.73%	101	1,000	101
Allenhurst borough	Monmouth	4	4	No	0.16%	0.00%	0.38%	0.18%	25	40	25
Allentown borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.03%	0.03%	0.56%	0.21%	28	139	28
Asbury Park city	Monmouth	4	214	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Atlantic Highlands borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.28%	0.05%	0.72%	0.35%	48	390	48
Avon-by-the-Sea borough	Monmouth	4	5	No	0.11%	0.00%	0.52%	0.21%	29	180	29
Belmar borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.45%	0.00%	0.49%	0.31%	43	573	43
Bradley Beach borough	Monmouth	4	64	No	0.20%	0.00%	0.44%	0.22%	30	431	30
Brielle borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.26%	0.03%	1.12%	0.47%	65	390	65
Colts Neck township	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.48%	0.00%	1.71%	0.73%	101	661	101
Deal borough	Monmouth	4	5	No	0.10%	0.01%	0.22%	0.11%	15	69	15
Eatontown borough	Monmouth	4	20	No	3.14%	0.39%	0.66%	1.40%	193	1,000	193
Englishtown borough	Monmouth	4	25	No	0.14%	0.03%	0.47%	0.21%	30	158	30
Fair Haven borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.15%	0.01%	1.85%	0.67%	92	399	92
Farmingdale borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.10%	0.00%	0.39%	0.16%	22	123	22
Freehold borough	Monmouth	4	270	No	0.67%	0.03%	0.35%	0.35%	49	829	49
Freehold township	Monmouth	4	39	No	4.49%	5.70%	2.13%	4.11%	568	1,000	568

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Hazlet township	Monmouth	4	0	No	1.10%	0.67%	1.28%	1.02%	140	1,000	140
Highlands borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.20%	0.00%	0.45%	0.22%	30	485	30
Holmdel township	Monmouth	4	129	No	0.18%	0.76%	1.94%	0.96%	133	1,000	133
Howell township	Monmouth	4	63	No	2.77%	1.84%	2.72%	2.45%	338	1,000	338
Interlaken borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.85%	0.28%	39	72	39
Keansburg borough	Monmouth	4	91	No	0.23%	0.00%	0.44%	0.23%	31	762	31
Keyport borough	Monmouth	4	29	No	0.43%	0.02%	0.37%	0.27%	37	640	37
Lake Como borough	Monmouth	4	11	No	0.10%	0.00%	0.32%	0.14%	19	156	19
Little Silver borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.30%	0.06%	1.76%	0.71%	98	439	98
Loch Arbour village	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.01%	0.00%	0.57%	0.19%	27	19	19
Long Branch city	Monmouth	4	317	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Manalapan township	Monmouth	4	62	No	1.51%	1.79%	2.82%	2.04%	282	1,000	282
Manasquan borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.55%	0.00%	0.90%	0.48%	67	492	67
Marlboro township	Monmouth	4	5	No	2.25%	7.02%	3.30%	4.19%	579	1,000	579
Matawan borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.41%	0.13%	0.99%	0.51%	70	770	70
Middletown township	Monmouth	4	186	No	1.58%	2.10%	3.84%	2.50%	346	1,000	346
Millstone township	Monmouth	4	7	No	0.37%	0.00%	1.75%	0.71%	98	665	98
Monmouth Beach borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.09%	0.00%	0.92%	0.34%	47	290	47
Neptune township	Monmouth	4	97	No	1.83%	0.84%	1.02%	1.23%	170	1,000	170
Neptune City borough	Monmouth	4	12	No	0.31%	0.01%	0.38%	0.23%	32	422	32
Ocean township	Monmouth	4	51	No	1.60%	0.54%	1.47%	1.20%	166	1,000	166
Oceanport borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.35%	0.05%	0.93%	0.44%	61	469	61
Red Bank borough	Monmouth	4	54	No	2.64%	0.01%	0.70%	1.12%	154	1,000	154
Roosevelt borough	Monmouth	4	30	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.43%	0.14%	20	61	20
Rumson borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.41%	0.02%	2.11%	0.85%	117	480	117
Sea Bright borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.46%	0.00%	0.54%	0.33%	46	159	46

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Sea Girt borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.11%	0.04%	1.43%	0.53%	73	157	73
Shrewsbury borough	Monmouth	4	35	No	1.05%	0.02%	1.03%	0.70%	97	291	97
Shrewsbury township	Monmouth	4	4	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.26%	0.09%	12	101	12
Spring Lake borough	Monmouth	4	10	No	0.47%	0.01%	1.00%	0.49%	68	245	68
Spring Lake Heights borough	Monmouth	4	35	No	0.32%	0.01%	0.62%	0.32%	44	486	44
Tinton Falls borough	Monmouth	4	413	No	2.31%	1.22%	1.21%	1.58%	219	1,000	219
Union Beach borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.06%	0.12%	0.79%	0.32%	45	407	45
Upper Freehold township	Monmouth	4	15	No	0.20%	0.00%	1.32%	0.51%	70	494	70
Wall township	Monmouth	4	224	No	5.75%	8.47%	1.94%	5.38%	744	1,000	744
West Long Branch borough	Monmouth	4	0	No	0.53%	0.06%	0.76%	0.45%	62	510	62
Boonton town	Morris	2	23	No	0.72%	1.00%	0.52%	0.75%	153	682	153
Boonton township	Morris	2	4	No	0.09%	0.14%	0.95%	0.40%	81	301	81
Butler borough	Morris	2	0	No	0.56%	0.17%	0.65%	0.46%	94	652	94
Chatham borough	Morris	2	8	No	0.59%	0.07%	1.99%	0.88%	181	611	181
Chatham township	Morris	2	30	No	0.28%	0.23%	1.77%	0.76%	156	793	156
Chester borough	Morris	2	10	No	0.38%	0.03%	0.65%	0.35%	72	127	72
Chester township	Morris	2	0	No	0.08%	0.06%	1.62%	0.59%	120	515	120
Denville township	Morris	2	58	No	1.65%	3.89%	1.56%	2.37%	485	1,000	485
Dover town	Morris	2	349	No	1.31%	0.05%	0.30%	0.55%	113	1,000	113
East Hanover township	Morris	2	0	No	2.56%	0.99%	1.06%	1.54%	315	787	315
Florham Park borough	Morris	2	66	No	2.16%	1.75%	1.12%	1.68%	344	894	344
Hanover township	Morris	2	69	No	4.85%	1.77%	1.34%	2.65%	544	1,000	544
Harding township	Morris	2	0	No	0.16%	0.26%	0.80%	0.40%	83	284	83
Jefferson township	Morris	2	52	No	0.59%	2.22%	1.20%	1.34%	274	1,000	274
Kinnelon borough	Morris	2	22	No	0.21%	0.00%	1.28%	0.50%	102	681	102
Lincoln Park borough	Morris	2	15	No	0.43%	1.79%	0.74%	0.98%	202	813	202

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Long Hill township	Morris	2	0	No	0.43%	0.01%	1.06%	0.50%	102	624	102
Madison borough	Morris	2	0	No	1.11%	0.37%	1.53%	1.00%	206	1,000	206
Mendham borough	Morris	2	0	No	0.18%	0.40%	1.37%	0.65%	133	352	133
Mendham township	Morris	2	0	No	0.02%	0.06%	1.67%	0.58%	120	397	120
Mine Hill township	Morris	2	13	No	0.18%	0.28%	0.50%	0.32%	65	295	65
Montville township	Morris	2	9	No	1.19%	2.95%	1.86%	2.00%	410	1,000	410
Morris township	Morris	2	9	No	0.63%	5.37%	2.34%	2.78%	571	1,000	571
Morris Plains borough	Morris	2	0	No	0.43%	0.68%	0.90%	0.67%	137	486	137
Morristown town	Morris	2	140	No	2.93%	0.89%	1.17%	1.66%	341	1,000	341
Mountain Lakes borough	Morris	2	0	No	0.29%	2.03%	1.59%	1.30%	267	275	267
Mount Arlington borough	Morris	2	38	No	0.23%	0.20%	0.45%	0.29%	60	530	60
Mount Olive township	Morris	2	99	No	1.49%	3.98%	1.23%	2.24%	459	1,000	459
Netcong borough	Morris	2	24	No	0.14%	0.28%	0.31%	0.24%	50	287	50
Parsippany-Troy Hills township	Morris	2	138	No	4.75%	1.20%	2.15%	2.70%	553	1,000	553
Pequanock township	Morris	2	44	No	1.14%	2.00%	0.95%	1.37%	280	1,000	280
Randolph township	Morris	2	84	No	1.69%	1.30%	2.21%	1.73%	355	1,000	355
Riverdale borough	Morris	2	44	No	0.78%	0.35%	0.48%	0.54%	110	386	110
Rockaway borough	Morris	2	195	No	0.45%	0.17%	0.44%	0.36%	73	512	73
Rockaway township	Morris	2	20	No	2.52%	2.24%	1.60%	2.12%	435	1,000	435
Roxbury township	Morris	2	59	No	2.34%	10.87%	1.26%	4.82%	989	1,000	989
Victory Gardens borough	Morris	2	8	No	0.03%	0.00%	0.06%	0.03%	6	114	6
Washington township	Morris	2	20	No	0.37%	0.80%	1.83%	1.00%	205	1,000	205
Wharton borough	Morris	2	91	No	0.58%	0.08%	0.43%	0.36%	74	521	74
Barneget Light borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.16%	2.60%	0.37%	1.04%	144	64	64
Barneget township	Ocean	4	38	No	0.75%	0.00%	0.79%	0.51%	71	1,000	71

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Bay Head borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.21%	0.02%	0.65%	0.29%	40	87	40
Beach Haven borough	Ocean	4	1	No	0.52%	0.00%	0.52%	0.35%	48	97	48
Beachwood borough	Ocean	4	8	No	0.16%	0.17%	0.68%	0.34%	47	744	47
Berkeley township	Ocean	4	150	No	1.25%	2.61%	0.68%	1.51%	209	1,000	209
Brick township	Ocean	4	149	No	3.97%	1.58%	2.26%	2.60%	360	1,000	360
Eagleswood township	Ocean	4	0	No	0.10%	0.06%	0.39%	0.18%	25	135	25
Harvey Cedars borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.06%	0.00%	0.60%	0.22%	31	40	31
Island Heights borough	Ocean	4	5	No	0.08%	0.04%	0.49%	0.20%	28	144	28
Jackson township	Ocean	4	186	No	3.17%	15.26%	2.27%	6.90%	954	1,000	954
Lacey township	Ocean	4	52	No	1.77%	0.81%	1.16%	1.24%	172	1,000	172
Lakehurst borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.11%	0.05%	0.29%	0.15%	21	182	21
Lakewood township	Ocean	4	878	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Lavallette borough	Ocean	4	4	No	0.18%	0.00%	0.54%	0.24%	34	185	34
Little Egg Harbor township	Ocean	4	32	No	0.76%	2.47%	0.76%	1.33%	184	1,000	184
Long Beach township	Ocean	4	0	No	0.41%	0.00%	0.61%	0.34%	47	319	47
Manchester township	Ocean	4	154	No	1.89%	6.70%	0.36%	2.98%	412	1,000	412
Mantoloking borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.04%	0.00%	1.44%	0.49%	68	32	32
Ocean township	Ocean	4	56	No	0.41%	0.43%	0.67%	0.50%	69	796	69
Ocean Gate borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.02%	0.01%	0.19%	0.07%	10	170	10
Pine Beach borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.03%	0.02%	0.60%	0.22%	30	168	30
Plumsted township	Ocean	4	22	No	0.21%	0.00%	0.50%	0.24%	33	599	33
Point Pleasant borough	Ocean	4	41	No	0.89%	0.03%	1.10%	0.67%	93	1,000	93
Point Pleasant Beach borough	Ocean	4	10	No	1.18%	0.03%	0.73%	0.65%	89	409	89
Seaside Heights borough	Ocean	4	20	No	0.71%	0.00%	0.06%	0.26%	36	230	36
Seaside Park borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.08%	0.00%	0.31%	0.13%	18	154	18
Ship Bottom borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.55%	0.00%	0.40%	0.32%	44	110	44

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
South Toms River borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.15%	0.16%	0.45%	0.25%	35	216	35
Stafford township	Ocean	4	38	No	2.49%	0.71%	1.32%	1.51%	208	1,000	208
Surf City borough	Ocean	4	2	No	0.31%	0.00%	0.53%	0.28%	39	129	39
Toms River township	Ocean	4	526	No	7.25%	4.59%	2.71%	4.85%	670	1,000	670
Tuckerton borough	Ocean	4	0	No	0.16%	0.19%	0.34%	0.23%	32	315	32
Bloomington borough	Passaic	1	0	No	0.16%	3.77%	0.77%	1.57%	434	622	434
Clifton city	Passaic	1	884	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Haledon borough	Passaic	1	45	No	0.33%	0.91%	0.50%	0.58%	160	603	160
Hawthorne borough	Passaic	1	105	No	1.06%	1.26%	0.92%	1.08%	300	1,000	300
Little Falls township	Passaic	1	0	No	0.65%	1.46%	0.97%	1.03%	285	944	285
North Haledon borough	Passaic	1	0	No	0.18%	1.49%	0.80%	0.82%	228	611	228
Passaic city	Passaic	1	3,179	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Paterson city	Passaic	1	3,966	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Pompton Lakes borough	Passaic	1	45	No	0.37%	0.01%	0.76%	0.38%	106	840	106
Prospect Park borough	Passaic	1	77	No	0.10%	0.67%	0.02%	0.26%	73	386	73
Ringwood borough	Passaic	1	26	No	0.32%	0.00%	1.11%	0.48%	133	836	133
Totowa borough	Passaic	1	211	No	3.58%	1.43%	0.70%	1.90%	528	780	528
Wanaque borough	Passaic	1	15	No	0.22%	1.06%	0.70%	0.66%	183	878	183
Wayne township	Passaic	1	162	No	6.19%	9.41%	3.28%	6.29%	1,746	1,000	1,000
West Milford township	Passaic	1	105	No	0.72%	0.00%	1.41%	0.71%	197	1,000	197
Woodland Park borough	Passaic	1	153	No	0.83%	2.37%	0.53%	1.25%	346	1,000	346
Alloway township	Salem	6	20	No	0.09%	0.00%	1.72%	0.61%	11	245	11
Carneys Point township	Salem	6	43	No	2.77%	10.65%	1.41%	4.94%	93	677	93
Elmer borough	Salem	6	7	No	0.22%	0.00%	1.01%	0.41%	8	102	8
Elsinboro township	Salem	6	0	No	0.02%	0.00%	0.92%	0.31%	6	92	6

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Lower Alloways Creek township	Salem	6	0	No	1.07%	0.00%	0.78%	0.62%	12	139	12
Mannington township	Salem	6	0	No	0.12%	0.00%	1.16%	0.43%	8	102	8
Oldmans township	Salem	6	0	No	1.05%	10.97%	1.33%	4.45%	84	141	84
Penns Grove borough	Salem	6	7	No	0.23%	0.02%	0.00%	0.09%	2	337	2
Pennsville township	Salem	6	69	No	0.06%	5.43%	1.87%	2.45%	46	1,000	46
Pilesgrove township	Salem	6	0	No	0.58%	0.00%	2.52%	1.04%	20	314	20
Pittsgrove township	Salem	6	25	No	0.46%	0.00%	1.47%	0.64%	12	644	12
Quinton township	Salem	6	4	No	0.24%	0.00%	1.00%	0.41%	8	209	8
Salem city	Salem	6	10	No	0.36%	0.00%	0.14%	0.17%	3	419	3
Upper Pittsgrove township	Salem	6	0	No	0.27%	0.00%	1.02%	0.43%	8	266	8
Woodstown borough	Salem	6	9	No	0.35%	0.00%	1.26%	0.54%	10	307	10
Bedminster township	Somerset	3	6	No	0.50%	0.12%	1.24%	0.62%	72	844	72
Bernards township	Somerset	3	24	No	0.78%	1.51%	3.33%	1.88%	218	1,000	218
Bernardsville borough	Somerset	3	0	No	0.36%	0.09%	2.48%	0.98%	113	551	113
Bound Brook borough	Somerset	3	91	No	0.38%	0.00%	0.42%	0.27%	31	836	31
Branchburg township	Somerset	3	0	No	3.88%	1.62%	2.18%	2.56%	297	1,000	297
Bridgewater township	Somerset	3	130	No	5.64%	2.59%	4.02%	4.08%	474	1,000	474
Far Hills borough	Somerset	3	0	No	0.04%	0.04%	0.99%	0.35%	41	74	41
Franklin township	Somerset	3	268	No	10.76%	4.58%	3.11%	6.15%	714	1,000	714
Green Brook township	Somerset	3	26	No	0.56%	0.43%	2.10%	1.03%	120	487	120
Hillsborough township	Somerset	3	111	No	1.97%	8.97%	3.68%	4.87%	565	1,000	565
Manville borough	Somerset	3	36	No	0.32%	0.03%	0.54%	0.30%	34	818	34
Millstone borough	Somerset	3	0	No	0.00%	0.01%	0.83%	0.28%	33	31	31
Montgomery township	Somerset	3	73	No	0.62%	1.95%	4.16%	2.24%	260	1,000	260
North Plainfield borough	Somerset	3	427	No	0.90%	0.12%	0.62%	0.55%	64	1,000	64

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Peapack and Gladstone borough	Somerset	3	10	No	-0.05%	0.45%	1.53%	0.64%	75	177	75
Raritan borough	Somerset	3	9	No	1.61%	0.24%	0.71%	0.85%	99	599	99
Rocky Hill borough	Somerset	3	4	No	0.05%	0.14%	0.76%	0.32%	37	56	37
Somerville borough	Somerset	3	103	No	0.91%	0.10%	0.90%	0.64%	74	1,000	74
South Bound Brook borough	Somerset	3	67	No	0.08%	0.00%	0.50%	0.19%	22	371	22
Warren township	Somerset	3	10	No	0.69%	3.38%	2.72%	2.26%	262	1,000	262
Watchung borough	Somerset	3	35	No	0.77%	0.87%	1.44%	1.03%	119	435	119
Andover borough	Sussex	1	0	No	0.04%	0.00%	0.17%	0.07%	20	51	20
Andover township	Sussex	1	11	No	0.20%	0.00%	0.55%	0.25%	69	420	69
Branchville borough	Sussex	1	4	No	-0.02%	0.00%	0.43%	0.14%	38	67	38
Byram township	Sussex	1	27	No	0.21%	0.21%	0.83%	0.42%	115	589	115
Frankford township	Sussex	1	13	No	0.16%	0.00%	0.53%	0.23%	64	417	64
Franklin borough	Sussex	1	25	No	0.36%	3.43%	0.33%	1.37%	381	409	381
Fredon township	Sussex	1	0	No	0.05%	0.00%	0.71%	0.25%	70	238	70
Green township	Sussex	1	4	No	0.12%	1.88%	0.86%	0.95%	265	249	249
Hamburg borough	Sussex	1	0	No	0.08%	1.06%	0.22%	0.45%	125	290	125
Hampton township	Sussex	1	0	No	0.42%	0.00%	0.45%	0.29%	81	399	81
Hardyston township	Sussex	1	22	No	0.39%	16.44%	0.71%	5.85%	1,622	674	674
Hopatcong borough	Sussex	1	3	No	0.29%	2.21%	0.81%	1.10%	306	1,000	306
Lafayette township	Sussex	1	7	No	0.10%	0.00%	0.46%	0.19%	52	176	52
Montague township	Sussex	1	23	No	0.18%	0.00%	0.42%	0.20%	55	312	55
Newton town	Sussex	1	45	No	0.55%	0.00%	0.23%	0.26%	72	680	72
Ogdensburg borough	Sussex	1	4	No	0.03%	0.00%	0.40%	0.14%	40	175	40
Sandyston township	Sussex	1	4	No	0.05%	0.00%	0.36%	0.14%	38	161	38
Sparta township	Sussex	1	10	No	1.13%	1.68%	1.80%	1.54%	427	1,000	427

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Stanhope borough	Sussex	1	0	No	0.08%	1.24%	0.58%	0.63%	176	286	176
Stillwater township	Sussex	1	11	No	0.04%	0.00%	0.54%	0.19%	53	322	53
Sussex borough	Sussex	1	14	No	0.04%	0.00%	0.10%	0.05%	13	180	13
Vernon township	Sussex	1	33	No	0.28%	1.87%	1.14%	1.10%	304	1,000	304
Walpack township	Sussex	1	0	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1	0
Wantage township	Sussex	1	32	No	0.25%	0.00%	0.59%	0.28%	77	812	77
Berkeley Heights township	Union	2	0	No	1.10%	1.17%	1.76%	1.34%	275	897	275
Clark township	Union	2	71	No	1.33%	0.09%	1.01%	0.81%	166	1,000	166
Cranford township	Union	2	204	No	1.42%	0.62%	1.88%	1.31%	268	1,000	268
Elizabeth city	Union	2	3,132	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Fanwood borough	Union	2	0	No	0.30%	0.03%	1.26%	0.53%	109	545	109
Garwood borough	Union	2	31	No	0.64%	0.01%	0.52%	0.39%	80	384	80
Hillside township	Union	2	224	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Kenilworth borough	Union	2	35	No	2.47%	0.09%	0.49%	1.01%	208	586	208
Linden city	Union	2	299	No	9.75%	0.74%	1.02%	3.84%	787	1,000	787
Mountainside borough	Union	2	120	No	0.94%	0.49%	1.07%	0.83%	171	480	171
New Providence borough	Union	2	20	No	1.33%	0.23%	1.50%	1.02%	210	1,000	210
Plainfield city	Union	2	1,346	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Rahway city	Union	2	98	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Roselle borough	Union	2	360	Yes	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0	1,000	0
Roselle Park borough	Union	2	78	No	0.42%	0.04%	0.64%	0.37%	75	1,000	75
Scotch Plains township	Union	2	53	No	0.61%	0.68%	2.29%	1.19%	244	1,000	244
Springfield township	Union	2	53	No	2.07%	0.72%	1.37%	1.39%	284	1,000	284
Summit city	Union	2	59	No	2.71%	0.24%	2.10%	1.68%	345	1,000	345
Union township	Union	2	317	No	5.83%	0.56%	2.18%	2.86%	585	1,000	585
Westfield town	Union	2	0	No	2.08%	0.71%	3.02%	1.94%	397	1,000	397

Municipality	County	Region	Present Need	Qualified Urban Aid Municipality	Equalized Nonresidential Valuation Factor	Land Capacity Factor	Income Capacity Factor	Average Allocation Factor	Prospective Need	1,000/20% Cap	Prospective Need with 1,000/20% Cap
Winfield township	Union	2	8	No	0.00%	0.05%	0.10%	0.05%	11	138	11
Allamuchy township	Warren	2	0	No	0.02%	3.38%	0.70%	1.37%	281	472	281
Alpha borough	Warren	2	4	No	0.19%	0.42%	0.23%	0.28%	58	194	58
Belvidere town	Warren	2	20	No	0.00%	1.54%	0.37%	0.64%	131	206	131
Blairstown township	Warren	2	0	No	0.19%	0.00%	0.75%	0.31%	65	421	65
Franklin township	Warren	2	32	No	0.17%	0.66%	0.55%	0.46%	95	225	95
Frelinghuysen township	Warren	2	0	No	0.07%	2.78%	0.50%	1.12%	229	156	156
Greenwich township	Warren	2	0	No	0.46%	9.46%	1.01%	3.64%	747	360	360
Hackettstown town	Warren	2	87	No	0.81%	0.20%	0.52%	0.51%	105	754	105
Hardwick township	Warren	2	0	No	0.00%	0.00%	0.42%	0.14%	29	116	29
Harmony township	Warren	2	4	No	0.66%	0.05%	0.32%	0.35%	71	199	71
Hope township	Warren	2	0	No	0.04%	0.00%	0.40%	0.15%	31	149	31
Independence township	Warren	2	6	No	0.09%	0.44%	0.42%	0.32%	65	465	65
Knowlton township	Warren	2	4	No	0.06%	0.00%	0.41%	0.16%	32	221	32
Liberty township	Warren	2	25	No	0.01%	0.00%	0.50%	0.17%	35	204	35
Lopatcong township	Warren	2	0	No	0.51%	0.25%	0.50%	0.42%	87	718	87
Mansfield township	Warren	2	7	No	0.53%	5.13%	0.46%	2.04%	418	628	418
Oxford township	Warren	2	0	No	0.02%	0.38%	0.40%	0.26%	54	193	54
Phillipsburg town	Warren	2	21	No	0.35%	0.50%	0.26%	0.37%	75	1,000	75
Pohatcong township	Warren	2	0	No	0.20%	0.35%	0.40%	0.32%	65	262	65
Washington borough	Warren	2	0	No	0.13%	0.05%	0.21%	0.13%	27	600	27
Washington township	Warren	2	31	No	0.28%	1.77%	0.60%	0.89%	181	485	181
White township	Warren	2	100	No	-0.05%	4.67%	0.09%	1.57%	322	434	322
TOTAL			65,410						84,698		80,798

Appendix B: GIS Data Sources

Data Layer	URL	Date of Download
Land Use /Land Cover	https://services1.arcgis.com/QWdNfRs7lkPq4g4Q/arcgis/rest/services/Land_Use_2020/FeatureServer/5	3/26/2024
Municipalities	https://services2.arcgis.com/XVOqAjTOJ5P6ngMu/arcgis/rest/services/NJ_Municipalities_3857/FeatureServer/0	3/26/2024
Housing Regions	Derived from Legislation	3/26/2024
Planning Areas	https://services3.arcgis.com/iy3mGBSHxkFa1uPL/arcgis/rest/services/Planning_Area_Boundaries_of_the_NJ_State_Development_and_Redevelopment_Plan_New_Jersey/FeatureServer/0	3/26/2024
Pinelands Areas	https://services1.arcgis.com/nCm6SZaiGMuGX35l/arcgis/rest/services/Pinelands_ManagementAreas/FeatureServer	3/28/2024
Meadowlands	https://maps.nj.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Framework/Government_Boundaries/MapServer/7	3/28/2024
Highlands Areas	https://services6.arcgis.com/ZrVIS0wslq8Nvq5l/arcgis/rest/services/Preservation_and_Planning_Area/FeatureServer	3/28/2024
Highlands HERZ	https://services6.arcgis.com/ZrVIS0wslq8Nvq5l/arcgis/rest/services/Highlands_Designated_Centers_HERZ/FeatureServer/1	4/4/2024
Highlands Conforming Towns	https://services6.arcgis.com/ZrVIS0wslq8Nvq5l/arcgis/rest/services/Highlands_Conforming_Towns/FeatureServer/7	4/4/2024
Highlands Land Use Capability Zones	https://services6.arcgis.com/ZrVIS0wslq8Nvq5l/arcgis/rest/services/Land_Use_Capability_Zones/FeatureServer/4	4/4/2024
Sewer Service Areas	https://mapsdep.nj.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Features/Utilities/MapServer/8	4/4/2024
Designated Centers	https://services3.arcgis.com/iy3mGBSHxkFa1uPL/arcgis/rest/services/Designated_Centers_of_the_NJ_State_Development_and_Redevelopment_Plan/FeatureServer/0	3/26/2024
Preserved Open Space	https://mapsdep.nj.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Features/Land/MapServer/65	6/18/2024
Wetlands	https://mapsdep.nj.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Features/Land_lu/MapServer/2	6/18/2024
Highlands Wetlands	https://services6.arcgis.com/ZrVIS0wslq8Nvq5l/arcgis/rest/services/Wetlands/FeatureServer/1	6/18/2024
Pinelands Wetlands	https://services1.arcgis.com/nCm6SZaiGMuGX35l/arcgis/rest/services/Pinelands_Wetlands/FeatureServer/0	6/18/2024
Preserved Farmland	https://services.arcgis.com/gzSkSfQGxyX6dicF/arcgis/rest/services/NJFPP_Preserved_Farms/FeatureServer/0	6/18/2024
C1 Waters	https://mapsdep.nj.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Features/Hydrography/MapServer/6	6/18/2024
Parcels	https://maps.nj.gov/arcgis/rest/services/Framework/Cadastral/MapServer/0	4/4/2024
Steep Slope	https://njin.nj.gov/njin/edata/elevation/#swdp4	7/3/2024
Hydrography	https://njogis-newjersey.opendata.arcgis.com/documents/247f2f76682843109eafc881d7a2c0bf/about	6/18/2024

Appendix C: Model Builder Flow Process Diagrams – Vacant Land Analysis

