

# Housing Targets Task Force

## Recommended Housing Targets

Endorsed by CCRPC on November 22, 2004

### Introduction

Chittenden County is experiencing a housing crisis characterized by limited housing choice and rapidly increasing housing costs. In 2001, the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) invited housing experts and business and community leaders to serve on the Chittenden County Housing Task Force (2001 Task Force) to identify strategies to address this crisis.

The 2001 Task Force found that the major cause of the County's housing crisis is the failure of the supply of housing to keep pace with the housing demand resulting from the County's expanding economy. This group also recommended that CCRPC assemble representatives of the County's 19 municipalities in order to build greater regional collaboration in addressing housing shortages.

CCRPC's mission is to plan for anticipated growth in the County so that development occurs in suitable locations that best preserve and utilize Vermont's resources. However, CCRPC's planning for the County is advisory: The Commission is not authorized to enact land use regulations, nor does it allocate funds for the construction of key infrastructure. The County's 19 municipalities are authorized to manage development through regulation and infrastructure investments. However, no single municipality can successfully address the entire County's housing crisis.

Vermont's planning enabling acts (see Figure 1) contemplate regional collaboration in addressing housing needs by requiring that

- ☞ Municipal plans contain a housing element that includes a recommended program for addressing certain housing needs as identified by the regional planning commission and
- ☞ Regional plans contain a housing element that identifies the need for housing for all economic groups in the region and in the region's communities.

To avoid having each municipality and CCRPC work at cross purposes to meet these statutory obligations, in 2003 CCRPC requested each of the County's 19 municipalities to designate a representative to a newly formed Housing Targets Task Force (see Figure 2). CCRPC charged the 2003 Task Force with developing principled, realistic, and fair approaches for identifying

- ☞ Chittenden County's future housing needs and
- ☞ The portions of the County's future housing needs that should serve as planning targets for each of the 19 communities, so that each community's plan can include a program of local actions to address its portion of the County's future housing needs.

This report documents the Housing Targets Task Force's recommendations relating to these two charges. After CCRPC has endorsed municipal housing targets, the Task Force representatives will work with CCRPC staff to identify

- ☞ Barriers that each community faces in meeting its housing targets and
- ☞ Approaches for each community to consider incorporating into its program of local actions to meet its housing targets.

The next section of this report identifies the specific housing targets for each municipality. The final section of the report documents the recommendations made by the Task Force over the course of 18 months that yielded these municipal housing targets.

**Figure 1**  
**Vermont Statutory Requirements**  
**for the Housing Elements of Municipal Plans & Regional Plans**

**§4382. The Plan for a municipality.**

- (a) A **plan for a municipality** may be consistent with the goals established in section 4302 of this title and compatible with approved plans of other municipalities in the region and with the regional plan and **shall include** the following:
- ...(10) A **housing element that shall include a recommended program for addressing low and moderate income persons' housing needs as identified by the regional planning commission** pursuant to section 4348a(a)(9) of this title. ...
- ...(c) **Where appropriate**, and to further the purposes of section 4302(b) of this title, a **municipal plan shall be based upon inventories, studies, and analyses of current trends and shall consider the probable social and economic consequences of the proposed plan.** Such studies may **consider** or contain, but not be limited to:
- (1) **population characteristics and distribution, including income and employment;**
  - (2) **the existing and projected housing needs by amount, type, and location for all economic groups within the municipality and the region;**
  - (3) **existing and estimated patterns and rates of growth in the various land use classifications, and desired patterns and rates of growth** in terms of the community's ability to finance and provide public facilities and services.

*Vermont Statutes Annotated*, Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4382 [Emphasis Added]

**§ 4348a. Elements of a regional plan.**

- (a) A **regional plan** shall be consistent with the goals established in section 4302 of this title and **shall include** but need not be limited to the following:
- ... (9) A **housing element** that identifies the **need for housing for all economic groups in the region and communities.** In establishing the identified need, **due consideration shall be given to data gathered pursuant to section 4382(c)** of this title. **If no such data has been gathered, the regional planning commission shall gather it.**

*Vermont Statutes Annotated*, Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4348a [Emphasis Added]

**Figure 2**  
**Housing Targets Task Force**

Selma Gokey <i>BOLTON</i>	Tim Jerman <i>ESSEX JUNCTION</i>	Mike Cram <i>MILTON</i>	Carolyn Gregson <i>UNDERHILL</i>
Maura McClure <i>BUEL'S GORE</i>	Tom James <i>ESSEX</i>	Mel Pritchett <i>RICHMOND</i>	Kenneth Tardie <i>WESTFORD</i>
Brian Pine** <i>BURLINGTON</i>	Rocky Martin <i>HINESBURG</i>	Tom Carlson <i>ST. GEORGE</i>	Mike Kanfer* <i>WILLISTON</i>
Ted Montgomery <i>CHARLOTTE</i>	Amy Dohner <i>HUNTINGTON</i>	Paul W. Bohne, III <i>SHELBURNE</i>	J. Ladd <i>WINOOSKI</i>
Sarah Hadd <i>COLCHESTER</i>	John Shullenberger <i>JERICO</i>	Terry Sheahan <i>SOUTH BURLINGTON</i>	*Chair ** Vice Chair

Recommended Municipal Housing Targets

Figure 3 identifies the recommended housing targets for each of Chittenden County's 19 municipalities. Each target is the number of housing units to be added to the community's housing supply between 2000 and 2010. Each community has three housing targets:

1. Total Housing (includes the number of housing units in targets #2 & #3),
2. Moderate Income Housing (housing units that can be afforded by households earning 80 percent to 120 percent of the Burlington MSA's median household income\*), and
3. Affordable Housing (housing units that can be afforded by households earning less than 80 percent of the Burlington MSA's median household income\*).

*\* Median household income in the Burlington MSA as established by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. Median household income changes annually; in 2004 = \$68,800; 80% = \$55,040; 120% = \$82,560.*

Communities also are encouraged to consider the need to include in their programs of local actions to address housing needs goals relating to people with special housing needs.

The housing targets for each community are intended to be a set of goals to guide the community in designing its own program of local actions to address an appropriate portion of the County's anticipated housing needs. The targets are **not** quotas of the minimum number of housing units that the community must meet **nor** are the targets maximum ceilings on the number of units that should be built in the community. These targets are the result of a series of recommendations made by the Task Force that are detailed in the final section of this report.

**Figure 3**  
**Recommended Municipal 2000-2010 Housing Targets**

Municipality	Recommended Housing Targets (Number of Housing Units to be Added between 2000 and 2010)		
	Total Housing (Incl. Moderate & Affordable)	Moderate Income Housing (= 10% of Total Housing)	Affordable Housing (= 10% of Total Housing)
Bolton	28	3	3
Buels Gore	1	0	0
Burlington	1,560	156	156
Charlotte	195	20	20
Colchester	1,277	128	128
Essex	666	67	67
Essex Jct.	504	50	50
Hinesburg	299	30	30
Huntington	199	20	20
Jericho	308	31	31
Milton	633	63	63
Richmond	280	28	28
St. George	18	2	2
Shelburne	531	53	53
S. Burlington	1,444	144	144
Underhill	205	21	21
Westford	178	18	18
Williston	1,093	109	109
Winooski	144	14	14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,563</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>956</b>

### Supporting Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The initial housing targets should be established for **2010** and subsequent housing targets should be established at **five-year intervals**.

Rationale: The initial housing targets should be far enough in the future so that each community has a meaningful opportunity to develop and begin to implement a program of local actions to meet its housing targets. Vermont statutes establish that municipal plans and the *Regional Plan* will be updated every five years, although individual communities and CCRPC are on different five-year cycles.

Recommendation 2: The Housing Targets Program should use the statement and lists of land uses provided in Figure 4 to determine for the Program **what constitutes housing and what does not**.

Rationale: Because housing has varied features and characteristics, reasonable people may disagree whether a particular land use is “housing” or not. Clearly distinguishing what constitutes housing (and what does not) in advance of initiating the Housing Targets Program will help to prevent disputes from arising during Program implementation. What constitutes “housing” for the Program relates to the purposes of the Program. These determinations do not purport to apply to other housing issues or programs.

The Program should involve permanent housing (not temporary shelters, such as tents) that is intended to be occupied year-round (not seasonally occupied) by residents (not by people with short-term shelter needs, such as tourists).

Recommendation 3: The **housing targets** should have the following **three components**:

1. Total Housing,
2. Moderate Income Housing (housing units that can be afforded by households earning 80 percent to 120 percent of the Burlington MSA’s median household income), and
3. Affordable Housing (housing units that can be afforded by households earning less than 80 percent of the Burlington MSA’s median household income).

Communities should be encouraged to consider the need to identify other types of housing goals that relate to people with special housing needs in municipal programs of local actions to address housing needs.

Rationale: Having a small number of targets helps to make it easier for communities to achieve the targets and easier to verify that the targets have been achieved. Each housing target should be clearly tied to one or more significant housing shortage concerns, so that it is clearly recognized that the programs of local actions to be undertaken to achieve each goal will address significant housing shortage concerns. In 2002, the Chittenden County Housing Task Force recommended that the housing targets should have these three components.

**Figure 4**  
**Land Uses that Do and Do Not Count as Housing**  
**for the Housing Targets Program<sup>a</sup>**

The Chittenden County Housing Targets Program addresses permanent housing (not temporary shelters) that is occupied year-round (not seasonally) by residents (not by people who have short-term needs for shelter or who are not able to use other types of shelter).

**Land Uses that Count as Housing**

Single Family Detached Dwelling  
Mobile Home, Modular Home  
Farm Residence  
Rectory  
Duplex, Two-Family Dwelling<sup>b</sup>  
Townhouse, Single Family Attached Dwelling<sup>b</sup>  
Apartment Building, Multifamily Dwelling<sup>b</sup>  
Mobile Home Park<sup>b</sup>  
Rooming House, Boarding House<sup>b</sup>  
Group Home, Congregate Housing<sup>b</sup>  
Co-op Housing<sup>b</sup>  
Planned Residential Development (PRD), Planned  
Unit Development (PUD)<sup>b</sup>  
Adult Community, Seniors Only Community,  
Retirement Community<sup>b</sup>  
Employer-Owned Housing<sup>b</sup>  
Accessory Dwelling Unit, Accessory Apartment,  
Granny Flat<sup>b</sup>  
Nursing Home, Convalescent Home<sup>b</sup>  
Dormitory<sup>b</sup>  
Fraternity, Sorority<sup>b</sup>

**Land Uses that Do NOT Count as Housing**

Camp, Cabin, Seasonal Home, Vacation Home  
(Year-Round Occupancy Not Permitted)  
Recreational Vehicle, Tent Cabin, Tent  
Hotel, Motel, Inn, Hostel, Marina  
Bed & Breakfast, Guest House, Tourist Home  
Extended Stay Hotel, Residence Hotel  
Campground, RV Park  
Homeless Shelter  
Emergency Shelter, Fire Station  
Hospital, Hospice, Asylum  
Seasonal Worker Housing  
Military Barracks  
Monastery, Friary, Nunnery  
Religious Haven, Religious Shelter for Pilgrims  
or Other Temporary Guests  
Jails, Prisons, Reformatories

---

<sup>a</sup> Land uses that count as housing do so regardless of the form of tenure (e.g., fee simple ownership, condominium, or rental).

<sup>b</sup> Each part of this land use that is intended to be occupied by a separate household (including a single person household) counts as a separate housing unit for the purposes of attaining the numerical Housing Target.

The County's housing shortages do not impact all households equally and some households have less ability to deal with the hardships resulting from housing shortages. Households without high incomes can afford only a portion of the region's housing supply, hence have fewer housing choices in terms of location, type, size, and quality. Vermont law [24 VSA 4382 (a) (10)] requires that each municipal plan have a housing element that includes a recommended program for addressing "low and moderate income persons' housing needs as identified by the regional planning commission..."

Some households (such as the elderly, people with disabilities, renters, first-time homebuyers, single person households, and large households) need housing with special characteristics or features. It is less likely that these special needs will be met when there are housing shortages.

Each housing target needs to be stated in a way so that it is easy for each community and others to determine definitively whether the goal has or has not been met. The median income of the Burlington MSA is the best single measure for determining income-sensitive housing targets.

Recommendation 4: Given the challenges of forecasting future housing needs, a 2000-to-2010 growth in the County housing supply of 10,000 housing units is a reasonable (analytically sound and attainable) **Countywide housing target**.

Rationale: The housing targets should focus on meeting the County's future housing needs that will be created by changes anticipated to occur in the future.

The need for housing units will be determined by the demands of households. People form households of different sizes and types for different reasons at different times in their lives. As the characteristics and preferences of the County's population change over time, the rates of formation of different types of households change. This means that even if the region's population were to remain the same, this same number of people may form a different number of households, hence may demand different numbers of different types of housing units.

Most households strive to live within a reasonable commuting range of the workplaces of the household's workers. Chittenden County is a part of the economic region of Northwest Vermont (that includes Addison, Chittenden, Franklin, Grand Isle, Lamoille, & Washington counties). Employment locations and transportation facilities and services influence the regional housing market. The U.S. Census reports that in 2000, 19,856 people who worked in Chittenden County resided outside of the County (21 percent of the County's workforce) and 5,572 people who resided in Chittenden County worked outside of the County (seven percent of the County's labor force).

A household's demand for housing is influenced also by a host of other factors such as the costs of housing, land, and construction, the existing stock of different housing types, the site characteristics of available developable land, proximity to commercial and institutional uses, social

networks, and access to community services (principally schools). As documented in the Census commuting figures above, some people who work within Chittenden County prefer to reside outside the County.

Economic & Policy Resources, Inc. (EPR) has prepared two studies that help to forecast Chittenden County's 2010 housing needs. In "Housing in Northwestern Vermont" (Aug. 2000), EPR forecasted a need for 31,472 additional total housing units for the six-county Northwestern Vermont region in 2010. *If Chittenden County's portion of this forecasted regional total need were the same as the County's 2000 portion of the region's total housing units (43.1 percent), then the Chittenden County 2010 need would be **13,564 units**.* In "Economic and Demographic Forecasts for Chittenden County" (Sept. 2000), EPR forecasted a 2000-2010 increase in "housing unit demand" of 12,654 for Chittenden County. In June 2001, EPR adjusted its population forecasts based on the 2000 Census results. *If this housing unit demand forecast is reduced by the same rate as the adjusted population forecast, it would be 12,591 units. If this housing unit demand of 12,591 units is adjusted to reflect a five-percent vacancy rate, it would represent a County 2010 housing need of **13,221 units**.*

Both of EPR's 2010 housing need forecasts are based on employment growth forecasts. It could be argued that changes in the regional economy since 2000 (e.g., the national economic slowdown and local IBM layoffs) suggest the need to reconsider EPR's employment forecasts, especially when they are applied to a relatively near-term forecast year (i.e., 2010) versus a long-term year (i.e., 2025). Dr. Michael Munson (formerly Town Planner in Williston) has recognized that the 1978-to-2002 change in the total jobs in Chittenden County (using annual employment data provided by the Vermont Department of Employment and Training) is a remarkably stable, linear trend. Employing linear regression to project this trend (with  $R^2 = 0.975$ ) yields a projected 2010 total employment for Chittenden County of 112,616. EPR's "2000 Economic and Demographic Forecast" forecasted that Chittenden County's 2010 total employment would be 151,112. *If the approximate 2000 to 2010 housing need that is based on the EPR forecasts (~13,400 units) is adjusted by the percentage difference between the EPR employment forecast and the Munson employment model (-25.5 percent), it yields a forecasted housing need of **9,983 units** (~17.0% growth from 2000 to 2010).*

A Countywide target of 10,000 more housing units in 2010 than in 2000 is reasonable compared with recent 10-year increases in total housing units in the six-county region and Chittenden County (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5**  
**Recent 10-Year Housing Increases**

Years	6-County Region		Chittenden County	
	#	%	#	%
1990-2000	13,981	11.4	6,769	13.0
1980-1990	31,450	34.5	11,990	29.9

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, STF3, 1980, 1990, 2000.

Recommendation 5: Figure 6 identifies the **eight factors used in the formula** recommended by the Task Force **to calculate the municipal portions of the Countywide target**.

Rationale: In order to produce a principled and fair target, each factor in the formula describes an important (not trivial) concern. Different types of factors were used to attempt to account for different considerations. Four factors attempt to account for a community's contribution to creating a greater "demand" for housing (e.g., increased amounts of job-producing land uses). Three factors attempt to account for a community's capacity or ability to absorb additional housing "supply" (e.g., the amount of undeveloped, developable land). One factor attempts to account for the "regional development" policies of the *2001 Chittenden County Regional Plan*.

Some programs in other parts of the Country employ factors that attempt to correct for past intentional actions by some communities in a region to not bear their "fair share" of the region's housing need. The Housing Targets Program is not attempting to do this. Rather, it is attempting to portion our region's future housing need.

Each factor must be capable of being "operationalized" by one or more quantitative measures that are used in the actual calculation formula. The Task Force concluded that each of the measures used accounts for the effect of that factor with acceptable precision and reliability.

The operational measures of two factors (Existing Employment and Recent Employment Growth) uses Vermont Department of Employment & Training data on annual workforce data by municipality. The Task Force decided that these VDET data should be used even though they have the following two limitations:

1. "Covered Employment" – The DET dataset counts those workers who are eligible for unemployment insurance. This omits several types of workers (e.g., railroad workers, self-employed workers, and agricultural establishments with less than 10 workers).
2. Essex / Essex Junction – There is no breakdown of the workers tabulated for the Town of Essex who work in the Village of Essex Junction. The Task Force representatives for these two communities mutually agreed that the Town of Essex should be regarded as having 25 percent and the Village should be regarded as having 75 percent of the VDET data reported for the Town of Essex.

Figure 7 presents the calculations of the eight factors included in the formula. These calculations followed certain rules recommended by the Task Force. For example, negative proportions are retained as negative values (rather than converted to zeros) and the housing target for Buels Gore is based on averaging the factors for which data exist for Buels Gore.

Figure 8 presents the municipal targets that result from the use of the recommended eight-factor formula with each factor being equally weighted.



**Figure 6**  
**Factors Recommended to be Used in the Formula**  
**to Calculate Municipal Housing Targets**

Factor / Type of Factor	Operational Measure*	Data Source / Measurement Units
Existing Population (Demand)	<u>Municipal Population</u> County Population	2000 Census (Population)
Recent Population Growth (Demand)	<u>Municipal 1990–2000 Population Growth</u> County 1990–2000 Population Growth	1990 & 2000 Census (Population)
Existing Employment (Demand)	<u>Municipal Workforce</u> County Workforce	2002 VT Dept of Employment & Training (Covered Employment)
Recent Employment Growth (Demand)	<u>Municipal 1990–2002 Workforce Growth</u> County 1990–2002 Workforce Growth	1990 & 2002 VT Dept. of Employm. & Training (Covered Employm.)
Existing Housing Supply (Supply)	<u>Municipal Housing Units</u> County Housing Units	2000 Census (Housing Units)
Undeveloped, Developable Land Zoned for Development (Supply)	<u>Municipal Acres of Such Land in 2002</u> County Acres of Such Land in 2002	CCRPC GIS based on Municipal Zoning (Acres)
Residential Redevelopment Capacity (Supply)	<u>Municipal Net Buildout Capacity in 2002</u> County Net Buildout Capacity in 2002	CCRPC GIS based on Municipal Zoning (Dwelling Units)
Regional Development Suitability** (Regional Development)	<u>Municipal Acres of Such Land in 2002</u> County Acres of Such Land in 2002	CCRPC GIS based on 2001 <i>Chittenden County Regional Plan</i> (Acres)

\* All of the operational measures are municipal proportions of County totals to facilitate combining these separate measures into a single composite factor.

\*\* Land area that is undeveloped, developable, and located in the areas designated by the 2001 *Chittenden County Regional Plan* as Metropolitan Planning Area, Village Planning Area, Transition Planning Area or Special Planning Area (not including the Ethan Allen Firing Range).

**Figure 7  
 TARGET FORMULA FACTORS**

Municipality	Recent (2000) Population <sup>a</sup>		Recent (1990-2000) Population Growth <sup>a</sup>		Recent (2002) Employment <sup>b</sup>		Recent (1990-2002) Employment Growth <sup>b</sup>	
	Munic. (Persons)	Munic. / County	Munic. (Persons)	Munic. / County	Munic. (Jobs)	Munic. / County	Munic. (Jobs)	Munic. / County
Bolton	971	0.007	0	0.000	160	0.002	-39	-0.002
Buels Gore	12	0.000	10	0.001	0	0.000	0	0.000
Burlington	39,824	0.272	697	0.047	31,424	0.334	623	0.038
Charlotte	3,569	0.024	421	0.028	536	0.006	99	0.006
Colchester	16,986	0.116	2,255	0.152	8,765	0.093	3,850	0.233
Essex	10,035	0.068	1,933	0.131	3,647	0.039	323	0.019
Essex Jct.	8,591	0.059	195	0.013	10,942	0.116	971	0.059
Hinesburg	4,340	0.030	560	0.038	938	0.010	78	0.005
Huntington	1,861	0.013	252	0.017	221	0.002	130	0.008
Jericho	5,015	0.034	713	0.048	748	0.008	210	0.013
Milton	9,479	0.065	1,075	0.073	2,323	0.025	933	0.056
Richmond	4,090	0.028	361	0.024	1,066	0.011	289	0.017
St. George	698	0.005	-7	-0.000	76	0.001	58	0.004
Shelburne	6,944	0.047	1,073	0.072	3,191	0.034	663	0.040
S. Burlington	14,879	0.102	2,070	0.140	16,940	0.180	3,395	0.205
Underhill	2,980	0.020	181	0.012	341	0.004	29	0.002
Westford	2,086	0.014	346	0.023	234	0.002	143	0.009
Williston	7,650	0.052	2,763	0.187	9,976	0.106	5,398	0.326
Winooski	6,561	0.045	-88	-0.006	2,555	0.027	-616	-0.037
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>146,571</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>14,810</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>94,083</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>16,537</b>	<b>1.000</b>

(Continued)

<sup>a</sup> 2000 U.S. Census data obtained from the University of Vermont's Center for Rural Studies' *Vermont Indicators Online Project*. The data for 2000 reflect changes from the original 2000 Census release (for example, 935 people were shifted from South Burlington to Burlington).

<sup>b</sup> VT Department of Employment & Training data that includes workers eligible for unemployment insurance (for example, omits railroad workers, self-employed workers, and agricultural establishments with less than 10 workers). VDET reports municipal-level employment data for towns and cities. Consequently, the Housing Targets Task Force representatives from the Town of Essex and the Village of Essex Junction mutually agreed that the VDET employment data reported for the Town of Essex should be apportioned so that 75 percent of the count is attributed to the Village of Essex Junction and 25 percent is attributed to the Town of Essex.

**Figure 7 Continued**

Municipality	Recent (2000) Year-Round Housing <sup>c</sup>		Undevel., Developable Land Zoned for Devel. <sup>c</sup>		Residential Redevel. Capacity <sup>d</sup>		Regional Devel. Suitability <sup>e</sup>	
	Munic. (Hsg.Units)	Munic. / County	Munic. (Acres)	Munic. / County	Munic. (Hsg.Units)	Munic./ County	Munic. (Acres)	Munic. / County
Bolton	381	0.007	4,224	0.047	1,636	0.035	77	0.006
Buels Gore	7	0.000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Burlington	16,225	0.282	1,372	0.015	7,912	0.168	1,228	0.093
Charlotte	1,326	0.023	4,260	0.047	507	0.011	133	0.010
Colchester	6,259	0.109	5,559	0.062	5,932	0.126	1,740	0.131
Essex	3,647	0.063	6,492	0.072	2,839	0.060	1,075	0.081
Essex Jct.	3,490	0.061	1,128	0.013	2,687	0.057	329	0.025
Hinesburg	1,626	0.028	6,517	0.072	2,012	0.043	184	0.014
Huntington	708	0.012	6,789	0.075	931	0.020	168	0.013
Jericho	1,765	0.031	4,906	0.055	712	0.015	571	0.043
Milton	3,382	0.059	8,223	0.091	3,161	0.067	939	0.071
Richmond	1,519	0.026	5,672	0.063	4,257	0.090	38	0.003
St. George	275	0.005	418	0.005	483	0.010	56	0.004
Shelburne	2,692	0.047	3,840	0.043	1,629	0.035	1,418	0.107
S. Burlington	6,436	0.112	4,717	0.052	4,978	0.106	3,424	0.259
Underhill	1,067	0.019	8,186	0.091	994	0.021	11	0.001
Westford	744	0.013	10,170	0.113	652	0.014	37	0.003
Williston	3,014	0.052	7,345	0.082	4,825	0.102	1,656	0.125
Winooski	3,008	0.052	177	0.002	954	0.020	159	0.012
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>57,571</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>89,997</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>47,101</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>13,245</b>	<b>1.000</b>

<sup>c</sup> 2000 U.S. Census data. To obtain year-round housing, the U.S. Census category "Seasonal, Recreational or Occasional Use" housing was subtracted from the category "Total Housing Units."

<sup>d</sup> Data obtained from the 2003 Chittenden County Regional Build-Out Analysis, prepared by CCRPC.

<sup>e</sup> Data obtained from CCRPC's Geographic Information System; Based on the acres of undeveloped, developable land within a Metropolitan Planning Area, Village Planning Area Transition Planning Area or Special Use Planning Area (except for the Ethan Allen Firing Range), as designated by the 2001 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

**Figure 8  
 CALCULATION FORMULA RESULTS**

Municipality	% recent population	population growth	% recent employment	% recent employment growth	% recent housing	Zoned for development	development capacity	Reg'l Develop. Capacity	Total of 8 Factor Ratios <sup>a</sup>	Ave Total / 8 <sup>a</sup>	calculated Housing Target
Bolton	0.007	0.000	0.002	- 0.002	0.007	0.047	0.035	0.006	0.100	0.0125	125
Buels Gore	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.001	0.0001	1
Burlington	0.272	0.047	0.334	0.038	0.282	0.015	0.168	0.093	1.248	0.1560	1,560
Charlotte	0.024	0.028	0.006	0.006	0.023	0.047	0.011	0.010	0.156	0.0195	195
Colchester	0.116	0.152	0.093	0.233	0.109	0.062	0.126	0.131	1.022	0.1277	1,277
Essex	0.068	0.131	0.039	0.019	0.063	0.072	0.060	0.081	0.533	0.0666	666
Essex Jct.	0.059	0.013	0.116	0.059	0.061	0.013	0.057	0.025	0.403	0.0504	504
Hinesburg	0.030	0.038	0.010	0.005	0.028	0.072	0.043	0.014	0.239	0.0299	299
Huntington	0.013	0.017	0.002	0.008	0.012	0.075	0.020	0.013	0.160	0.0200	200
Jericho	0.034	0.048	0.008	0.013	0.031	0.055	0.015	0.043	0.246	0.0308	308
Milton	0.065	0.073	0.025	0.056	0.059	0.091	0.067	0.071	0.507	0.0633	633
Richmond	0.028	0.024	0.011	0.017	0.026	0.063	0.090	0.003	0.264	0.0330	330
St. George	0.005	-0.000	0.001	0.004	0.005	0.005	0.010	0.004	0.032	0.0041	41
Shelburne	0.047	0.072	0.034	0.040	0.047	0.043	0.035	0.107	0.425	0.0531	531
S. Burlington	0.102	0.140	0.180	0.205	0.112	0.052	0.106	0.259	1.155	0.1444	1,444
Underhill	0.020	0.012	0.004	0.002	0.019	0.091	0.021	0.001	0.169	0.0212	212
Westford	0.014	0.023	0.002	0.009	0.013	0.113	0.014	0.003	0.191	0.0239	239
Williston	0.052	0.187	0.106	0.326	0.052	0.082	0.102	0.125	1.033	0.1291	1,291
Winooski	0.045	- 0.006	0.027	-0.037	0.052	0.002	0.020	0.012	0.115	0.0144	144
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>1.0000</b>	<b>10,000</b>

<sup>a</sup> For Buels Gore, the "Total" and "Average" are based on five factors.

Recommendation 6: The municipal housing targets should be based on the eight-factor formula and incorporate a rule that **each target should not exceed 125 percent of the community's 10-year average growth rate from 1980 to 2000.**

Rationale: To ensure that the municipal housing targets are principled, the Task Force carefully considered the factors that were used in the calculation formula and carefully evaluated the results of the recommended calculation formula (the "Calculated Targets"). The Task Force reviewed graphs for each of 18 municipalities (all but Buels Gore) that display the relative contribution of each of the eight factors to the community's overall average proportion and found that the results display systematic variation that conforms to the development characteristics of the communities.

The Task Force also evaluated the Calculated Targets to ensure that the municipal targets are realistic and fair. The Task Force was guided by two considerations (see Figure 9):

- 1) None of the municipalities had Calculated Targets that exceed the community's estimated remaining residential build-out capacity and
- 2) Eight municipalities had a Calculated Target that exceeds by more than 120 percent of the average 10-year housing growth experienced by that community from 1980 to 2000. A target that greatly exceeds recent housing growth is more likely to be regarded as "unreasonable" (as being out-of-the-ordinary, disruptive to existing community character, and too great a challenge to use as a planning target).

After considering many different approaches, the Task Force decided to institute a "not-to-exceed" rule, rather than give greater weight to one or more factors (principally the "Regional Development Suitability" factor). Employing a not-to-exceed rule specifically adjusts only those housing targets that are deemed to be unfairly excessive and does not affect the housing targets that are not deemed to be unfairly excessive. Such a rule also explicitly establishes the threshold for what constitutes an unfairly excessive target. The Task Force was uncomfortable with weighting different factors differently because the justification of achieving a more reasonable outcome does not provide clear guidance as to what factors and what weights should be used. Employing different factor weights also necessarily adjusts the housing targets of all of the communities, which can introduce new fairness issues. These recommendations are presented in Figure 10.

Figure 10 also notes that the recommended 125-percent cap means that the Task Force expects that an additional 437 housing units (the difference between the total of all of the Calculated Targets and the total of all of the Recommended Municipal Housing Targets) will need to be built in the 12 communities that do not benefit from the 125-percent not-to-exceed rule. The group is confident that these additional units (representing a mere 4.35 percent of the Countywide Housing Target) will be built.

**Figure 9**  
**EVALUATION OF TARGET FORMULA RESULTS**

Municipality	Calculated Municipal Housing Target	Remaining Residential Build-Out Capacity <sup>a</sup>		10-Year Average Housing Growth				Target as a % of 10-Year Average Growth
		Housing Units	Target as a % of Build-Out Capacity	Calculation of 10-Year Average for the Period 1980-2000				
				1980 Housing <sup>b</sup>	2000 Housing <sup>c</sup>	1980-2000 Growth	Ave 10-Year Growth	
Bolton	125	1,636	8%	338	381	43	22	569%
Buels Gore	1	n/a	n/a	4	7	3	2	73%
Burlington	1,560	7,912	20%	13,706	16,225	2,519	1,260	124%
Charlotte	195	507	38%	858	1,326	468	234	83%
Colchester	1,277	5,932	22%	4,001	6,259	2,258	1,129	113%
Essex	666	2,839	24%	2,279	3,647	1,368	684	97%
Essex Jct.	504	2,687	19%	2,547	3,490	943	472	107%
Hinesburg	299	2,012	15%	937	1,626	689	345	87%
Huntington	200	931	22%	391	708	317	159	126%
Jericho	308	712	43%	1,048	1,765	717	359	86%
Milton	633	3,161	20%	2,170	3,382	1,212	606	105%
Richmond	330	4,257	8%	1,072	1,519	447	224	148%
St. George	41	483	8%	247	275	28	14	290%
Shelburne	531	1,629	33%	1,692	2,692	1,000	500	106%
S. Burlington	1,444	4,978	29%	3,949	6,436	2,487	1,244	116%
Underhill	212	994	21%	739	1,067	328	164	129%
Westford	239	652	37%	461	744	283	142	169%
Williston	1,291	4,825	27%	1,266	3,014	1,748	874	148%
Winooski	144	954	15%	2,400	3,008	608	304	47%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>47,101</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>40,105</b>	<b>57,571</b>	<b>17,466</b>	<b>8,735</b>	<b>115%</b>

<sup>a</sup> CCRPC *Regional Build-Out Analysis*, December 2002.

<sup>b</sup> Total Year-Round Housing from "Total Year-Round Housing Units by Occupancy Status," 1980 Census of Population and Housing, Characteristics of Persons, Tabulation No. 2.

<sup>c</sup> Total Year-Round Housing taken from "Total Housing Units" minus "Seasonal, Recreational or Occasional Use" housing in 2000 Census.

**Figure 10**  
**RECOMMENDED MUNICIPAL HOUSING TARGETS**

Municipality	Calculated Housing Target	125 % of Average 10-Year Housing Growth	Recommended Municipal Housing Target	Difference between Calculated Target & Recommended Target
Bolton	125	28	<b>28</b>	97
Buels Gore	1	1	<b>1</b>	0
Burlington	1,560	1,575	<b>1,560</b>	0
Charlotte	195	293	<b>195</b>	0
Colchester	1,277	1,411	<b>1,277</b>	0
Essex	666	855	<b>666</b>	0
Essex Jct.	504	590	<b>504</b>	0
Hinesburg	299	431	<b>299</b>	0
Huntington	200	199	<b>199</b>	1
Jericho	308	449	<b>308</b>	0
Milton	633	758	<b>633</b>	0
Richmond	330	280	<b>280</b>	50
St. George	41	18	<b>18</b>	23
Shelburne	531	625	<b>531</b>	0
S. Burlington	1,444	1,555	<b>1,444</b>	0
Underhill	212	205	<b>205</b>	7
Westford	239	178	<b>178</b>	61
Williston	1,291	1,093	<b>1,093</b>	198
Winooski	144	380	<b>144</b>	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,919</b>	<b>9,563</b>	<b>437</b>

Recommendation 7: Each municipality's 2010 **affordable housing target** should be equal to 10 percent of the municipality's adjusted 2010 target for total housing and its 2010 **moderate income housing target** should be equal to 10 percent of the municipality's adjusted 2010 target for total housing.

Rationale: The Task Force deliberated for five months before recommending these approaches. The group met with people who finance and develop affordable and moderate income housing, considered the forecasts, policy recommendations, and regulatory standards of organizations and communities in Vermont and elsewhere, and explored different quantitative approaches to developing principled, realistic, and fair targets for moderate income and affordable housing.

The recommended approaches have the benefit of being simple to calculate, easy to understand, and support the basic principle that households with limited incomes should have opportunities to reside in any community in the County. The resulting targets are not quotas. Rather, they are intended to enable each community to assess for itself in its municipal planning what barriers obstruct achieving these targets and what strategies and actions are most appropriately used to overcome these barriers.

In particular, the Task Force considered the possibility of tailoring the targets for each community based on factors relevant to the location of moderate income and affordable housing. Considerations for locating moderate income housing and affordable housing often begin with the factors that apply generally to siting any housing. These general factors could be supplemented by factors related to the special needs of both household members (access to jobs, services, and facilities) and the community (land use and design compatibility). After reviewing different methods of incorporating different factors, the Task Force decided that the factors used to develop the targets for Total Housing adequately incorporated these concerns.