





Dr. Moon Wha Lee

# HOUSING NEW YORK CITY 1999

<sup>by</sup> Dr. Moon Wha Lee

# The City of New York Department of Housing Preservation and Development January 2002

## MICHAEL R. BLOOMBERG Mayor

DANIEL L. DOCTOROFF Deputy Mayor for Economic Development and Rebuilding

### JERILYN PERINE Commissioner

John Warren First Deputy Commissioner Harold Shultz Special Counsel The New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) is the largest survey in the world covering a single city that is designed to gather data on detailed characteristics of persons, households, housing units, and neighborhoods; and the HVS report is the most comprehensive housing market analysis for any city. The Census Bureau's preparation for and completion of the 1999 HVS itself took about a year and a half. After that, the Bureau required many additional months to prepare and test, jointly with HPD, the longitudinal files from the survey. Then, it took HPD about ten months to prepare the report presenting and analyzing the massive amount of HVS data in many forms. Thus, the preparation of the HVS and the HVS report together is an extraordinarily large and immensely complex project in terms of the knowledge and experience required in regard to not only the structure and function of the housing market in New York City, but also the capability and limitations of the data from the HVS, which is a sample survey. Moreover, this work requires the Agency's sustained administrative support throughout the approximately three years of the undertaking.

The 1999 HVS and the 1999 HVS report could not have been successfully completed without HPD Commissioner Jerilyn Perine's sustained support, guidance, and encouragement throughout the three year period of work on both. She provided the resources necessary for the completion of the survey and the report. Starting with designing the questionnaire for the 1999 HVS about three years ago, when, as Deputy Commissioner for Planning and Policy she was my direct supervisor, she made very specific suggestions for the questionnaire that greatly helped improve the content of the survey. Her comments on the draft 1999 report made it more valuable as a policy resource.

Harold Shultz, Special Counsel to the Commissioner and my direct supervisor, provided steady and close guidance throughout the preparation of the report. With his familiarity with legal, political, and policy-important aspects of the HVS and HVS report, he provided me with the most appropriate guidance and advice on many sensitive issues I faced throughout the long period of preparation of the report. He reviewed the draft 1999 report and provided extremely valuable comments. Moreover, I appreciate his understanding of the technical issues involved in the HVS and the HVS report and the support he provided me in our efforts to maintain the integrity of the HVS data.

Joseph Rosenberg, Deputy Commissioner of Planning and Intergovernmental Affairs, should also be acknowledged. As my previous supervisor, he provided me with close guidance and strong support in completing the 1999 HVS and in preparing and submitting to the City Council the legally required report on the initial findings of the 1999 HVS.

The preparation of the report in a publishable form takes a tremendous amount of technical effort and a high level of skill. Under the supervision of Walter Roberts, Assistant Commissioner of Planning Support Services, Lenward Snead, Director of Graphics, HVS report production manager José Quiñones, and Sam Lober, Michael Yong, and Stacy Beatty, Jr. made the report ready for printing in a very effective and precise manner.

Larry Racioppo, HPD's acclaimed photographer, who is highly respected in his profession and has exhibited in a vividly successful form his photographs of many of HPD's nationally recognized housing production works, was responsible for the outstanding photographs appearing on the cover of this report, as well as the covers of previous reports.

Associate Commissioner Luiz Aragon provided valuable insights into HPD's anti-abandonment and related programs and their impacts on breaking the cycle of abandonment. Assistant Commissioner Carol Abrams provided very useful information on HPD's programs and their contributions to the supply and preservation of affordable housing units. As for the previous report, Rubin Wolf, Director of Neighborhood Resources, who has been working for the Agency for almost forty years and is intimately familiar with the changes taking place in many neighborhoods in the City, helped me in understanding unique neighborhood situations that the HVS data alone do not clearly portray. Two staff members of HPD's Division of Policy and Program Analysis, Deanna Feder and Harry Denny, promptly provided precise data on housing units rehabilitated or constructed by HPD's various programs. Lisa Yee, Director of the Tax Incentives Program, provided data on HPD's various incentive programs that I needed to include in the report.

Throughout the work on the 1999 HVS, the staff members of the Financial and Market Characteristics Branch of the HHES Division of the Census Bureau have made special efforts to improve the reliability of the HVS data. During this lengthy process, the Bureau has been open-minded in examining and correcting irregularities. Particularly, Pete Fronzeck, former Director of the Branch, and Robert Callis and Alan Friedman of his staff made painstaking efforts to make the 1999 HVS the most reliable and useful HVS yet. I would also like to thank Pete and Bob for helping me present and analyze the HVS data in this report in the most reliable manner. My appreciation also goes to Connie Beard and Gerald Coleman of the Census Bureau's Geography Division, who prepared the maps showing major findings of the report at the census-tract level.

Each of my five staff members at HPD's Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research should be acknowledged for the extensive contributions they made to this report. Richard Place, the principal programmer for the HVS, generated in a precise manner from various HVS files the massive amount of data requested. Dr. Stephen Werner received the data electronically from Richard, sorted and organized them, and sent them to Sharon Nesbitt, who used them in preparing and/or updating the highly customized analytic tables in a very productive and accurate manner. Sharon worked with me as my secretary and assistant on the five previous HVS reports, starting with the 1984 report. Steve also prepared all of the graphs in a vividly clear manner, presenting data Richard provided to him. Barbara Elstein and Dr. Sheree West reviewed all of the draft chapters, and their reviews improved the report. As she has done for previous reports, Barbara made very useful comments on many of the issues in this report. Sheree, who is my Special Assistant, worked constantly with Richard, Steve, and Sharon on the preparation of the tables of the data needed in the report. Sheree helped me ensure the accuracy of the data in the tables and the text. Sheree, who is extremely careful and thorough, also helped me in preparing the report in a production-ready form in a very well organized and systematic manner.

Finally, my thanks to those others who supported and helped me successfully complete my work on the 1999 HVS and prepare the report on the initial findings of the 1999 HVS submitted to the City Council, as well as this report.

Nevertheless, despite the efforts of all these people, any limitations or errors that may still exist in this report remain entirely my own.

Moon Wha Lee, Ph.D. Assistant Commissioner Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research October 2001

Department of Housing Preservation and Development Cover Photos: Larry Racioppo Cover Design: HPD Graphics Department

### Table of Contents

Acknowledg	gments	
Table of Co	ontents	
List of Figu	ires	
List of Tabl	les	
List of Map	98	X
Housing No	ew York City, 1999: Report Summary	••••
	Introduction	
	Residential Population and Households	•••••
	Household Incomes in New York City	
	New York City's Housing Inventory	•••••
	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
	Variations in Rent Expenditures in New York City	
	Housing Conditions in New York City	
Chapter 1:	Overview of the 1999 Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) and the	
	Housing New York City, 1999 Report	••••
	Purposes of the HVS	•••••
	Content, Design, and Sample Size of the HVS	•••••
	Uses of the HVS Data	•••••
	Relationship of the 1999 HVS to Previous HVSs	
	Differences between Data from the 1999 HVS and Data from the Census 2000	•••••
	Contents and Organization of the Depart	•••••
	Contents and Organization of the Report	•••••
Chapter 2:	Residential Population and Households	••••
	Introduction	•••••
	Residential Population	•••••
	Historical Changes in the Population.	
	Docational Distribution of the Population	•••••
	Accordent Composition of the Population	
	Age and Gender Distribution of the Population.	••••
	Louisekelde	•••••
	Households by Logation	•••••
	Households by Location.	••••
	riousenoids by Tenure	
	Households by Kent Regulation Status	
	Households by Type of Ownership	•••••
	Households by Kace and Ethnicity	•••••
	Race and Ethnicity of Households by Kent Regulation Status	•••••
	Kace and Ethnicity of Households by Type of Ownership	
	Household Size	•••••

	Household Composition: Household Types 10
	Foreign-Born Households (Determined by Birth Place of the Householder) 1
	Immigrant Households
	Recently Moved Households 12
	Doubled-Up Households (Sub-Family and Secondary Individual Households)
Chapter 3:	Household Incomes in New York City
	Introduction 1
	Household Incomes 1
	Changes in Household Incomes by Tenure
	Distribution of Household Incomes
	Distribution of Household Incomes by HUD Income Classification
	Changes in Median Household Income by Borough
	Distribution of Household Income by Borough
	Median Household Incomes by Rent-Regulation Status
	Distribution of Household Income by Rent-Regulation Status
	Median Household Income by Race and Ethnicity
	Household Incomes by Household Size
	Household Income by Number of Employed Persons
	Individual Incomes by Race and Ethnicity, Educational Attainment,
	and Employment
	Household Income by Household Types 1'
	Sources of Household Income by Race and Ethnicity 1'
	Sources of Household Income by Household Type 1
	Poor Households (Households with Incomes below the Federal Poverty Level)
	Cash-Public-Assistance-Recipient Households
	Occupational and Industrial Patterns
	Labor Force Participation 19
	Unemployment
	Occupational Patterns
	Employment by Major Industry Groups
Chapter 4:	New York City's Housing Inventory 2
1	Introduction 2
	Size of the Housing Inventory 22
	Components of Inventory Change 22
	Additions to the Stock 22
	Returning Losses 22
	Tenure and Occupancy Status of Returned Losses 22
	Location of Returned Units 22
	Previous Status of Returned Losses 22
	Newly Constructed Units (Provided by New York City's
	Department of City Planning) 22
	Losses from the Stock 22
	Sources of Losses 22
	Location of Losses 22
	Changes in the Composition of the Inventory 22
	Tenure and Location 22
	Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Structure Class 24

	Inventory Composition by Building Size	242
	Housing Inventory Composition by Size of Units	244
	Rental Housing Inventory (Occupied and Vacant)	245
	Changes in the Number of Units by Rent Regulation Status	247
	Rental Units (Occupied and Vacant) by Rent Regulation Status by Location	251
	Rental and Owner Housing Units in Cooperatives and Condominiums	256
	Size of Rental Units	259
	Rental Units by Building Size	263
	Structure Class of Rental Units	267
	The Owner Housing Inventory	270
	Changes in the Ownership Rate	270
	Changes in the Owner Unit Inventory	273
	Owner Units by Location	275
	Size of Owner Units	
	Owner Units by Year of Home Purchase	
	Owner Units by Estimated Current Value	
	Housing Units Accessible to Physically Disabled Persons	
	Accessible Housing by Location and Structure Class	
Chapter 5:	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	291
	Introduction	291
	Definition of Vacant Rental Units and Estimating the Rental Vacancy Rate	292
	The Overall Rental Vacancy Rate in New York City	295
	Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Location	296
	Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Rent Regulation Categories	298
	Vacancy Rates and Rent Levels	299
	Number of Vacant Rental Units Renting at or below Public Shelter	
	Maximum Allowances	304
	Number of Vacant Rental Units Affordable to Median-Income Renter	
	Households	306
	Number of Vacant Rental Units at Fair Market Rents	307
	Median Asking Rents for Vacant-Available Units by Rent Regulation Categories	308
	Vacancy Rates and Building and Unit Characteristics	311
	Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size	311
	Rental Vacancy Rates by Structure Class	311
	Rental Vacancy Rate by Unit Size	313
	Turnover of Rental Units	315
	Length of Vacancies	315
	Turnover	316
	Vacancies in the Owner Housing Market	321
	Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Type of Owner Units	322
	Vacancy Duration by Types of Owner Units	322
	Vacant Units Unavailable for Rent or Sale	323
Chapter 6:	Variations in Rent Expenditure in New York City	329
=	Introduction	329
	The HVS Data on Rent Expenditures	330
	Definitions of Contract Rent, Gross Rent, and Asking Rent	330
	Use of Imputed Rent Data	330
	-	

	Rent Subsidy Data from the 1996 and 1999 HVSs	330
	Usefulness and Limitations of Rent Subsidy Data	331
	Comparison of 1996 and 1999 HVS Rent Data with Rent Data from 1993 and	
	Previous HVS Years	333
	Patterns of Rent Expenditures	335
	Rent by Location	341
	Rent by Rept Regulation Categories	346
	Differences in Rept by Unit Size	252
	Differences in Kent by Onit Size	)))) 255
	Rent and Housing and Neighborhood Conditions	)))) 250
	Rents for Unregulated Rental Units	))) 271
	Kents of Units in Cooperative and Condominium Buildings	361 262
	Affordability (Rent-Income Ratio) of Rental Housing	363 263
	Affordability for Different Rent-Regulation Categories	366
	Affordability by Different Racial and Ethnic Groups	367
	Affordability of Rental Housing by Household Type	370
	Affordability by Rent-Income Ratio Level	372
	Affordability by Location	374
Chapter 7:	Housing Conditions in New York City	377
	Introduction	377
	Structural Condition of Housing	378
	Occupied Rental Units in Dilapidated Buildings	379
	Occupied Rental Units in Buildings with Structural Defects	382
	Structural Condition of Owner Occupied Units	391
	Maintenance Condition of the Occupied Housing Inventory	392
	Maintenance Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Units	392
	Maintenance Deficiencies in Owner Occupied Units	401
	Physically Poor Occupied Reptal Unite	401
	Characteristics of Dhysically Door Occupied Rental Units	401 401
	Characteristics of Hoysekolds Occupied Rental Onits	+01 400
	National District Condition	+U9 41 0
	Neighborhood Physical Condition	+12 417
	Neighborhood Conditions of Kenter Occupied Housing	<del>1</del> 16
	Residents' Satisfaction with the Physical Condition of Neighborhood	
	Residential Structures	423
	Housing and Neighborhood Conditions of Immigrant Renter Households	428
	Neighborhood Conditions of Owner Occupied Housing	430
	Physical Housing and Neighborhood Conditions and City-Sponsored	
	Rehabilitation and New Construction	430
	Crowded Households	431
Appendix	A:	
	1999 HVS Data for Sub-Borough Areas	439
Appendix	B:	
11	1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary	477
Appendix	С:	
	Definitions of Rent Regulation Status	503
Appendix	D:	
PPendix	1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design Estimation	
	Procedure Accuracy Statement and Topcoding	500
Annondi	F.	509
пррепитх	L. New York City Housing and Vacanay Sugray Oractic mains 1000	521
	New TORK City Housing and vacancy Survey Questionnaire 1999	551

### LIST OF FIGURES

### Chapter 2: Residential Population and Households

Figure 2.1		
0	Population of Individuals in Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	63
Figure 2.2		. 05
0	Population of Individuals by Race/Ethnicity within Borough New York City 1999	71
Figure 2.3		
	Level of Educational Attainment by Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Aged 18 or Over in Renter Households New York City 1999	70
Figure 2.4		. 70
0	Level of Educational Attainment by Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Aged 18 or Over in Owner Households New York City 1999	00
Figure 2.5	INCW TOTK City 1999	. 80
1 18010 2.0	Level of Educational Attainment of Individuals Aged 18 or Over by Borough	
	New York City 1999	. 81
Figure 2.6	Households by Rent Regulation Status within Borough	
D. 0.7	New York City 1999	. 89
Figure 2.7	Households by Form of Ownership within Borough New York City 1999	. 91
Figure 2.8		
	Households by Rent Regulation Status by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999	. 94
Figure 2.9		
	Households by Form of Ownership by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999	. 97
Figure 2.10		
	Number of Individuals and Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999	101
Figure 2.11	New TOLK City 1999	. 101
116010 2.11	Average Household Size by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999	. 102
Figure 2.12		
	Household Type by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999	. 109
Figure 2.13		
<b>D</b> ' <b>0.4</b> (	Renter Households by Household Type within Rent Regulation Status New York City 1999	. 110
Figure 2.14	Households by Birth Region of Householder within Borough New York City 1999	. 116

Figure 2.15	Race/Ethnicity of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago New York City 1999	128
Figure 2.16	Educational Attainment of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago New York City 1999	. 129
Chapter 3:	Household Incomes in New York City	
Figure 3.1	Renter and Owner Households by Income Group	1.4.6
Figure 3.2	New York City 1998	. 146
Figure 3.3	New York City 1998 Percent Distribution of Household Income Categories by Borough	. 151
Figure 3.4	New York City 1998 Distribution of Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1995 and 1998	153
Figure 3.5	Primary Sources of Household Income by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998	175
Figure 3.6	Primary Sources of Income within Household Type New York City 1998	180
Figure 3.7	Reason for Not Participating in Labor Force by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999	
Figure 3.8	Unemployment Rates by Race/Ethnicity and by Level of Education New York City 1999	208
Chapter 4:	New York City's Housing Inventory	
Figure 4.1	Number of Housing Units by Tenure and Availability New York City Selected Years 1987-1999	222
Figure 4.2	New Housing Completions New York City, Selected Years 1981-1999	233
Figure 4.3	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Dwelling Units by Size of Building within Borough New York City 1999	. 238

Figure 4.4		
	Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Selected Rent Regulation Status	
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	251
Figure 4 5		
i iguice ine	Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Rent Regulation Status	
	within Borough	
	Narra Varila Citra 1000	252
	New York City 1999	255
Figure 4.6		
	Occupied and Vacant Available Units in Cooperative/Condominium Buildings	
	by Tenure and Regulatory Status within Borough (Excluding Mitchell-Lama Coops)	
	New York City 1999	259
Figure 4.7		
0	Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Number of	
	Bedrooms within Borough	
	New Vork City 1000	260
Eigen 4.9	New TOTK City 1999	200
Figure 4.0		
	Homeownership Rates by Borough	
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	271
Figure 4.9		
	Homeownership Rates by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	274
Figure 4.10		
0	Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Type of Ownership within Borough	
	New York City 1000	277
	The Tork City 1999	211
Chapter 5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
Chapter 5:	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
Chapter 5:	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
<b>Chapter 5:</b> Figure 5.1	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
<b>Chapter 5:</b> Figure 5.1	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates Net Vacancy Rates	205
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999	295
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999	295
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough	295
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999	295 296
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999	295 296
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level	295 296
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999	295 296 300
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999	295 296 300
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999	295 296 300
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999 Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units	295 296 300
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999	295 296 300 301
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999 Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units New York City 1996 and 1999	295 296 300 301
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999 Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units New York City 1996 and 1999 Number of Vacant Available Units by	295 296 300 301
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999 Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1999 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999 Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units New York City 1996 and 1999 Number of Vacant Available Units by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units	295 296 300 301
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999	295 296 300 301
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999	<ul><li>295</li><li>296</li><li>300</li><li>301</li><li>302</li></ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.5	<ul> <li>Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates</li> <li>Net Rental Vacancy Rates</li> <li>New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999</li> <li>Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough</li> <li>New York City 1999</li> <li>Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level</li> <li>New York City 1999</li> <li>Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units</li> <li>New York City 1996 and 1999</li> <li>Number of Vacant Available Units by</li> <li>Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units</li> <li>New York City 1996 and 1999</li> <li>Number of Vacant Available Units by</li> <li>Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units</li> <li>New York City 1996 and 1999</li> <li>Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized</li> </ul>	<ul><li>295</li><li>296</li><li>300</li><li>301</li><li>302</li></ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unremisted Vacant Units	<ul><li>295</li><li>296</li><li>300</li><li>301</li><li>302</li></ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.5	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unregulated Vacant Units         Num York City 1006 and 1000	<ul> <li>295</li> <li>296</li> <li>300</li> <li>301</li> <li>302</li> <li>310</li> </ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.6	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unregulated Vacant Units         New York City 1996 and 1999	<ul> <li>295</li> <li>296</li> <li>300</li> <li>301</li> <li>302</li> <li>310</li> </ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.6	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unregulated Vacant Units         New York City 1996 and 1999	<ul> <li>295</li> <li>296</li> <li>300</li> <li>301</li> <li>302</li> <li>310</li> </ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.6 Figure 5.7	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unregulated Vacant Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Metian Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unregulated Vacant Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size	<ul> <li>295</li> <li>296</li> <li>300</li> <li>301</li> <li>302</li> <li>310</li> </ul>
Chapter 5: Figure 5.1 Figure 5.2 Figure 5.3 Figure 5.4 Figure 5.5 Figure 5.6 Figure 5.7	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates         Net Rental Vacancy Rates         New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999         Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough         New York City 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level         New York City 1999         Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Number of Vacant Available Units by         Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars of Rent Stabilized         and Unregulated Vacant Units         New York City 1996 and 1999         Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size         New York City 1999	<ul> <li>295</li> <li>296</li> <li>300</li> <li>301</li> <li>302</li> <li>310</li> <li>312</li> </ul>

Figure 5.8	Percentage of Units That Were Renter Occupied in 1996 and 1999 that Turned Over at Least Once between 1996 and 1999 by 1996 Rent Level in 1999 Dollars New York City 1999	320
Figure 5.9	Composition of the Vacant Unavailable Inventory by Reason for Unavailability New York City, Selected Years 1991 - 1999	325
Chapter 6:	Variations in Rent Expenditure in New York City	
Figure 6.1		
	Percent Rent Subsidized and Unsubsidized Households by Contract Rent New York City 1999	341
Figure 6.2		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Categories in 1999 Dollars New York City 1996 and 1999	342
Figure 6.3		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Categories within Borough New York City 1999	344
Figure 6.4		
	Median Contract Rents by Regulatory Status by Borough New York City 1999	351
Figure 6.5		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent within Rent Regulatory Status New York City 1999	353
Figure 6.6		
	New York City and Manhattan 1999	355
Figure 6.7	Median Gross Rent-Income Ratio of All Renter Households, Rent Subsidized Households and Rent Unsubsidized Households by Race/Ethnicity	369
Figure 6.8	New Tork City 1999	
	Distribution of Renter Households by Gross Rent/Income Ratio within Borough New York City 1999	376
Chapter 7:	Housing Conditions in New York City	
Figure 7.1		
	Dilapidation Rate for Renter Occupied Units	381
Figure 7.2	New Tork City, Selected Tears 1970-1999	
	Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies	
	New York City, Selected Years 1978-1999	
Figure 7.3	Number of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Borough	405
	INEW TOTK CITY 1999	403

Figure 7.4		
	Incidence of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units and	
	Specific Physically Poor Conditions by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	412
Figure 7.5		
0	Incidence of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units and	
	Specific Physically Poor Conditions by Income Group	
	New York City 1999	416
Figure 7.6		
0	Incidence of Renter Occupied Units on Same Street	
	as a Building with Broken/Boarded-Up Windows by Borough	
	New York City, Selected Years 1981-1999	420
Figure 7.7		
0	Renter Household Ratings of Physical Condition of Residential Structures in the	
	Neighborhood by Borough	
	New York City 1999	427
Figure 7.8		
0	Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units	
	New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999	433
Figure 7.9		
0	Crowding and Mean Household Size in Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	436

### LIST OF TABLES

### Chapter 2: Residential Population and Households

Table 2.1		
	Number of Individuals by Borough	
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	
	Differences in Number of Individuals from 1999 New York City Housing and	
	Vacancy Survey and Decennial 2000 Census, New York City	59
Table 2.2		
	Number of Individuals by Race/Ethnicity and 1996-1999 Change	
	and Average Annual Percent Change	
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	62
Table 2.3		
	Distribution of Individuals by Kace/Ethnicity	( )
Table 24	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	64
Table 2.4	Distribution of Individuals by Rogoush and by Page /Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	65
Table 2.5	New TOLK City 1777	05
14010 2.5	Distribution of Individuals by Race/Ethnicity within Borough	
	New York City 1999	71
Table 2.6		/ 1
	Mean Age of Individuals by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999.	73
Table 2.7		
	Distribution of Individuals by Age Group within Race/Ethnicity Categories	
	New York City 1999	73
Table 2.8		
	Mean Age of Individuals by Borough	
<b>EIII 2</b> 0	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	74
Table 2.9		
	Distribution of Individuals by Gender and by Age Group	74
Table 2 10	New York City 1999	/4
1able 2.10	Distribution of Educational Attainment among Individuals	
	Aged 18 or Over in All Households by Race / Ethnicity	
	New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999	76
Table 2.11		10
	Distribution of Educational Attainment among Individuals	
	Aged 18 or Over in Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	77
Table 2.12		
	Distribution of Educational Attainment among Individuals	
	Aged 18 or Over in Owner Households by Race/Ethnicity	
T 11 0 12	New York City 1999	79
Table 2.13	Distribution of Educational Attainment among Individuals	
	Aged 18 or Over by Borough	
	New York City 1999	79
	The start start is a start s	, )

Table 2.14		
	Number of Households by Borough and Tenure	
711 045	New York City 1996 and 1999	83
Table 2.15	Number and Distribution of Households by Borough and Tenure	
	New York City 1999	84
Table 2.16	,	
	Number and Percent of Households by Tenure	
77 11 0 17	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	86
Table 2.1 /	Number and Distribution of Repter Households by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	88
Table 2.18		
	Distribution of Renter Households by Regulatory Status within Boroughs	
711 040	New York City 1999	88
Table 2.19	Number and Distribution of Owner Households by Form of Ownership	
	New York City 1999	90
Table 2.20		20
	Distribution of Owner Households by Form of Ownership by Borough	
	New York City 1999	90
Table 2.21	Distribution of Households have Door /Educisity of Households	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	92
Table 2.22	The Fork Only 1990 and 1999	74
	Distribution of Households by Tenure within Race/Ethnic Group of Householder	
	New York City 1999	92
Table 2.23	Distribution of Households have Deer /Educisity of Households, within Transa Course	
	New York City 1999	93
Table 2.24	Tew Tork Ory 1999 and and a second seco	25
	Distribution of Households by Rent Regulation Status within Race/Ethnicity of	
	Householder New York City 1999	93
Table 2.25		
	Distribution of Households by Kace/Ethnicity of Householder within Rept Regulation Status Categories	
	New York City 1999	96
Table 2.26	,	
	Distribution of Owner Households by Type of Ownership within Race/Ethnicity	
TT 1 1 0 07	New York City 1999	97
Table $2.27$	Mean Household Size by Tenure	
	New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999	98
Table 2.28	,,	
	Distribution of the Number of Persons per Household by Tenure	
T 11 0 00	New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999	98
Table 2.29	Distribution of the Number of Persons in Households by Topuro by Borough	
	New York City 1999	99
	,	

Table 2.30		
	Mean Household Size by Tenure by Borough	
	New York City 1999	100
Table 2.31		
	Number and Percentage of Individuals and Households and	
	Mean Household Size by Race/Ethnicity of the Householder	
	New York City 1999	101
Table 2.32		
	Number of Renter Households, Individuals and Mean Household Size	
	by Rent Regulatory Status	100
T 11 0 22	New York City 1999	103
Table 2.33		
	Number of Owner Households, Individuals and Mean Household	
	Size by Form of Ownership	102
Table 2.34	INEW TOPK City 1999	105
Table 2.34	Distribution of Households by Household Type by Tenure	
	New York City Selected Years 1987-1999	105
Table 2.35	The Tork Orly, beletical Teals 1907 1999	105
10010 2000	Number of Households. Change in Number of Households and Mean	
	Household Size by Household Type by Tenure	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	106
Table 2.36		
	Distribution of Households by Household Type and by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	108
Table 2.37		
	Distribution of Renter Households by Regulatory Status by Household Type	
	New York City 1999	109
Table 2.38		
	Distribution of Owner Households by Household Type by Form of Ownership	
TIL 0.00	New York City 1999	110
Table 2.39		
	Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder by Tenure	110
Table 2 40	INEW TORK City, Selected Tears 1991-1999	112
Table 2.40	Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder by Tenure	
	New York City 1999	114
Table 2.41	The Total Oly 1999	111
14510 2.11	Distribution of Households by Borough by Birth Region of Householder	
	New York City 1999	115
Table 2.42		
	Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder by Borough	
	New York City 1999	117
Table 2.43		
	Distribution of Renter Households by Rent Regulation Status by	
	Birth Region of Householder	
	New York City 1999	117
Table 2.44		
	Distribution of Renter Households by Birth Region of Householder	
	by Kent Kegulation Status	440
	INEW YORK CITY 1999	119

Table 2.45		
	Distribution of Owner Households by Form of Ownership by Birth Region	
	New York City 1999	119
Table 2.46		
	Number and Rate of Households Responding to Questions	
	Regarding Birthplace of Householder and Immigration by Tenure	
	New York City 1999	121
Table 2.47		
	Percent Distribution of Immigrant Households within New York City	
	by Borough and within Borough by Tenure	
	New York City 1999	122
Table 2.48		
	Percent Distribution of Immigrant Renter Households by	
	Rent Regulation Status within New York City and within Boroughs	
	New York City 1999	123
Table 2.49		
	Percent Distribution of Immigrant Owner Households by Type	
	of Ownership within New York City and within Borough	
	New York City 1999	123
Table 2.50		
	Percent Distribution of Immigrant Households	
	by Race/Ethnicity of Householder by Tenure	
	New York City 1999	124
Table 2.51		
	Percent Distribution of Immigrant Households by Tenure by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	125
Table 2.52		
	Percent Distribution of All Households and Immigrant Households	
	by Number of Persons in the Household and Mean Household Size	
	New York City 1999	125
Table 2.53		
	Distribution of All Households and Immigrant Households by Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1999	125
Table 2.54		
	Distribution by Race/Ethnicity of Householders Who Moved into Current	
	Residence within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders	
	Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago	
	New York City 1999	127
Table 2.55		
10010 2000	Distribution by Educational Attainment of Householders Who Moved into	
	Current Residence within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of	
	Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago	
	New York City 1999	128
Table 2.56	Tew Tork Ony 1777	120
14010 2.50	Selected Characteristics of Households Containing a Doubled-up Sub-family	
	or Secondary Individual by Tenure of the Householder	
	New York City 1006 and 1000	131
Table 2.57	The TOTE City 1770 and 1777	1.51
1 aut 2.J /	Selected Characteristics of Sub-families and Secondary Individuals	
	by Tenure of the Householder	
	New York City 1006 and 1000	127
	INCW TOTA City 1770 and 1777	1.54

Table 2.58		
	Selected Characteristics of Sub-families with Incomes Less than \$20,000	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	133
Table 2.59	Selected Characteristics of Secondary Individuals with Incomes	
	Less than \$20,000 in Crowded Renter Households New York City 1996 and 1999	134
Table 2.60	Solasted Characteristics of Sub Families with Incomes Less than \$20,000	
	in Crowded Renter Households with Very High Rent Burdens New York City 1996 and 1999	135
Chapter 3:	Household Incomes in New York City	
Table 3.1		
	Median Household Income in Constant and Current Dollars by Tenure New York City 1995 and 1998	139
Table 3.2	Median Reported Household Income in Constant and Current Dollars by Tenure	
	New York City, Selected Years 1986-1998	140
Table 3.3	Median Household Income by Household Income Quintile in 1998 Dollars New York City 1995 and 1998	141
Table 3.4		
	Households Distributed into Income Quintiles by Number of Workers in the Household New York City 1998	142
Table 3.5	Households Distributed into Income Quintiles by Number of Workers in the Household	
	New York City 1995	143
Table 3.6	Distribution of Household Income in 1009 Dollars by Tonurs	
	New York City 1995 and 1998	145
Table 3.7	Distribution of Hannahold Income her HUD Conselidated Distributes	
	Categories by Tenure New York City 1998	148
Table 3.8		- 10
	Median Household Incomes in 1998 Dollars of Renters and Owners by Borough New York City 1995 and 1998	149
Table 3.9		
	Distribution of Household Income by Borough New York City 1998	152
Table 3.10	Median Renter Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1995 and 1998	154
Table 3.11	Median 1998 Incomes by Rent Regulatory Status and Unit Turnover 1996-1999 Longitudinal Units, New York City 1999	156
	Longitudina Child, Frew Form Only 1777	150

Table 3.12		
	Vacancy Rate by Rent Regulatory Status and Unit Turnover between 1996 and 1999	
	Longitudinal Units, New York City 1999	157
Table 3.13		
	Percentage Change in Real Median Incomes between 1995 and 1998	
	by Rent Regulatory Status and Unit Turnover	
	Longitudinal Units, New York City 1998	158
Table 3.14		
	Distribution of Renter Household Income within Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1998	160
Table 3.15		
	Median Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity	4.44
TT 1 1 0 4 6	New York City 1995 and 1998	161
Table 3.16		
	Median Kenter Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Kace/Ethnicity	1(2
Table 2.17	New York City 1995 and 1998	103
Table 5.17	Madian Owner Household Income in 1008 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1995 and 1998	164
Table 3.18	New Tork City 1775 and 1776	104
1 abic 5.10	Median Household Income by Household Size and by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1998	165
Table 3.19		105
10010 0117	Median Renter Household Income by Household Size and by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1998	165
Table 3.20		
	Median Owner Household Income by Household Size and by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1998	166
Table 3.21		
	Mean Number of Employed Persons in Household and Median Household	
	Income by Number of Employed Persons in Household by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1998	167
Table 3.22		
	Mean Number of Employed Persons in Renter Household and	
	Median Renter Household Income by Number of Employed	
	Persons in Household by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1998	168
Table 3.23		
	Mean Number of Employed Persons in Owner Household and	
	in Lousshold by Reco/Ethnicity	
	In Household by Race/ Eurificity New York City 1998	168
Table 3.24	New TOIK City 1990	100
1 abic 5.24	Median Individual Income of Persons Aged 18 Years or Over	
	Who Worked 50 or More Weeks Last Year 35 or More Hours per Week	
	by Race/Ethnicity and by Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1998	170
	,	

Table 3.25		
	Median Individual Income of Persons Aged 18 Years or Over	
	Who Worked 50 or More Weeks Last Year, 35 or More Hours per Week	
	in Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity and by Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1998	170
Table 3.26		
	Median Individual Income of Persons Aged 18 Years or Over	
	Who Worked 50 or More Weeks Last Year, 35 or More Hours per Week	
	in Owner Households by Race/Ethnicity and by Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1998	171
Table 3.27		
	Median Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Household Type and Tenure	
T 11 2 20	New York City 1995 and 1998	172
Table 3.28		
	Median Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Primary Source of Income	174
Table 2 20	New Tork City 1995 and 1998	1/4
Table 5.29	Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income by Page/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1008	174
Table 3 30	INCW TOTA City 1990	1/4
14010 5.50	Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1995	176
Table 3.31		170
	Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1998	177
Table 3.32		
	Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1995	178
Table 3.33		
	Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income within Household Type	
	New York City 1998	179
Table 3.34		
	Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income	
	within Household Type	4.04
TT 1 1 2 2 5	New York City 1998	181
Table 5.55	Distribution of Households by Drimary Source of Income within Household Type	
	New York City 1005	182
Table 3 36	INEW TOTK City 1995	102
14010 5.50	Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income within	
	Household Type	
	New York City 1995	183
Table 3.37		
	Number of Poor Households and Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1995 and 1998	184
Table 3.38		
	Number of Poor Households and Poverty Rate by Household Type	
	New York City 1995 and 1998	185
Table 3.39		
	Number of Poor Households and Poverty Rate by Borough and Tenure	
	New York City 1995 and 1998	187

Table 3.40		
	Number and Distribution of Households by Number of Workers	
	in the Household by Poverty Status	
	New York City 1998	188
Table 3 41		
	Selected Characteristics of Poor and Non-Poor Households	
	New York City 1000	100
TT 1 1 0 40	INEW YORK City 1999	
Table 3.42		
	Number of Poor and Non-Poor Female Headed Households	
	New York City 1998	190
Table 3.43		
	Selected Characteristics and Race/Ethnicity of Poor and Non-Poor	
	Single Female Householders	
	New York City 1998	
Table 3.44		
	Number and Distribution of Adult Persons in Poor Households	
	Where Ne Henry hald Marker Warked in 1000 and Care Henry hald	
	where No Household Member worked in 1998 and Some Household	
	Income by Labor Force Status by Age Group	
	New York City 1999	192
Table 3.45		
	Reason Given by Adults in Poor Households with No Workers and	
	Some Household Income for Not Participating in Labor Force by Age Group	
	New York City 1999	
Table 3.46	y	
	Percentage of Poor Households Receiving Cash Public Assistance	
	by Race /Ethnicity	
	Now Vorte City 1000	104
T 11 2 47	New TORK City 1999	194
1able 3.4/		
	Percentage of Households in Receipt of Public Assistance by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	195
Table 3.48		
	Selected Characteristics of Households Receiving/Not Receiving Public Assistance	
	New York City 1999	195
Table 3.49		
	Labor Force Participation and Unemployment Rates of Individuals	
	Aged 16 and Over by Borough	
	New York City 1006 and 1000	107
T-11-250	INCW TOLK City 1990 and 1999	
Table 5.50		
	Reasons Given by Individuals Aged 16 and Over for Not Participating	
	in Labor Force by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	199
Table 3.51		
	Labor Force Participation Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over	
	by Age Group and Gender	
	New York City 1999	
Table 3 52	·/ · · · ·	
-4510 0.01	Labor Force Participation Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over	
	by Age Group and by Rece/Ethnicity	
	Nume Visite Citra 1000	004
	INEW TORK CITY 1999	

Table 3.53		
	Labor Force Participation Rates of Individuals Aged 25-54 by Race/Ethnicity	
	and by Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1999	204
Table 3.54		
	Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Tenure and by Borough	201
T-11-255	New York City 1996 and 1999	204
Table 5.55	Unemployment Pates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Conder	
	New York City 1006 and 1000	205
Table 3.56	New Tork City 1990 and 1999	203
14510 5.50	Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Age Group	
	and by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	205
Table 3.57		
	Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	207
Table 3.58		
	Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 25-54 by Race/Ethnicity	
	and by Level of Educational Attainment	
TI11 0 50	New York City 1999	207
Table 3.59		
	Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Occupational Classification	200
Table 3.60	New Tork City 1990 and 1999	209
Table 5.00	Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Major Industry Group	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	209
Table 3.61	The form only 1990 and 1999 and 1999	207
	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	by Race Ethnicity and Average Weekly Earnings of Individuals Working	
	at Least 35 Hours per Week 50 Weeks or More by Occupational Classification	
	New York City 1999	210
Table 3.62		
	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	by Occupational Classification and by Race/Ethnicity	
7111 2 42	New York City 1999	211
Table 3.63		
	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	212
Table 3.64	New Tork City 1990 and 1999	212
14010 0.01	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	by Occupational Classification and by Borough	
	New York City 1999	213
Table 3.65		
	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	by Occupational Classification and by Level of Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1999	214

Table 3.66		
	Number and Distribution of Employed Individuals Aged 16 and Over	
	by Major Industrial Group	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	216
Table 3.67		
	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	by Major Industrial Group and by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1999	217
Table 3.68		
	Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force	
	by Major Industrial Group and by Level of Educational Attainment	
	New York City 1999	218
Chapter 4:	New York City's Housing Inventory	
77 11 44		
Table 4.1	Since and Commenciations of the University Instantion by Terrore	
	Size and Composition of the Housing Inventory by Tenure,	
	New York City, Selected Very 1001 1000	221
Table 4.2	INEW TOTK City, Selected Tears 1991-1999	221
Table 4.2	Differences in Number of Housing Uniter	
	1000 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey and Decennial 2000 Consus	
	Now York City Housing and Vacancy Survey and Deceminal 2000 Census	222
Table 4.3	New TOIK City	222
Table 4.3	Components of Inventory Change	
	Now York City 1984 87, 1003 96 and 1006 99	224
Table 4.4	INCW TOTK City 1904-07, 1993-90 and 1990-99	224
1 abic 4.4	Units Returned from 1987 Inventory Losses by Occupancy Status	
	New Vork City 1006 1000	226
Table 4.5	New TOTK City 1770-1777	220
	1996 Status of Units Returned to the Inventory in 1999	
	New York City	227
Table 4.6	TVCW TOTA OILY.	
Table 1.0	1996 Status of Units Returned from 1987 Inventory Losses to the Inventory in 1999	
	New York City	228
Table 4.7		220
	New and Returned Losses by Occupancy Status	
	New York City 1996-1999	229
Table 4.8		
	New Losses and Returned Losses by Borough	
	New York City 1996-1999	230
Table 4.9		
	Units Returned from 1987 Inventory Losses by Borough	
	New York City 1996-1999	230
Table 4.10		
	New Housing Construction by Borough	
	New York City 1981-1999	232
Table 4.11		
	Gross Losses from the Inventory for Selected Periods	
	New York City 1981-84, 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99	

Table 4.12		
	Losses from the Inventory by Type of Loss	
	New York City 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99	235
Table 4.13		
	Losses from the Inventory by Borough	
	New York City 1970-81, 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99	236
Table 4.14		
	Inventory Losses by Occupancy Status at the Beginning of the Period	
	New York City 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99	
Table 415		
14510 1110	Size and Composition of the Housing Inventory by Tenure	
	Occupancy Status and Availability by Borough	
	New York City 1999	239
Table 4 16	TWW TOTK City 1777	257
14010 4.10	Number and Distribution of All Occupied and Vacant Available Units	
	by Structure Classification and by Borough	
	Now Vorte City 1000	241
Table 417	INCW TOTK City 1999	241
Table 4.17	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units	
	by Building Sing within Borough	
	Nerry Verde Citre 1000	242
T-1-1- 4 10	New York City 1999	242
Table 4.18		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units	
	by Borough within Building Size	0.42
77.1.1 4.4.0	New York City 1999	243
Table 4.19		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units	
	by Number of Bedrooms within Borough	
	New York City 1999	244
Table 4.20		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units	
	by Borough within Number of Bedrooms	
	New York City 1999	245
Table 4.21		
	Composition of the Housing Inventory in Each Borough	
	by Rent Regulatory Status or Form of Ownership and Type of Vacancy	
	New York City 1999	246
Table 4.22		
	Number and Percent Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available	
	Rental Units by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	248
Table 4.23		
	Distribution of Population by Rent Regulation Status or Form of Ownership	
	New York City 1999	249
Table 4.24		
	Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Selected Regulatory Status	
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	250
	-	

Table 4.25		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Borough within Rent Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	252
Table 4.26		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Rent Regulatory Status within Borough	
	New York City 1999	256
Table $4.27$		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units in Coop/Condominium	
	New York City 1003, 1006 and 1000	257
Table 4 28	INCW TOTK City 1999, 1990 and 1999	231
Table 4.20	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units in Coon/Condominium	
	Buildings (Excluding Mitchell-Lama Coops) by Borough and Tenure/Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	258
Table 4.29		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Number of Bedrooms within Borough	
	New York City 1999	260
Table 4.30		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Borough within Number of Bedrooms	
	New York City 1999	261
Table 4.31		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Number of Bedrooms within Regulatory Status	262
Table 4.32	INEW TOTK City 1999	202
Table 4.32	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Reptal Units	
	by Regulatory Status within Number of Bedrooms	
	New York City 1999	262
Table 4.33		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Building Size within Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	264
Table 4.34		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Borough within Building Size	
	New York City 1999	265
Table 4.35		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Kental Units	
	by building Size within borougn New York City 1000	265
Table 1 36	INCW TOTK CITY 1999	203
14010 4.00	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Reptal Units	
	by Regulatory Status within Building Size	
	New York City 1999	266
	,	

Table 4.37		
	Number and Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Structure Classification and by Borough	
	New York City 1999	268
Table 4.38		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Regulatory Status	
	within Structure Class	2(0
Table 4 20	New York City 1999	269
Table 4.39	Homeownership Rate by Borough	
	New York City Selected Vers 1001 1000	270
Table 4 40	New Tork Only, Selected Tears 1771-1777	270
Table 1.10	Number of Owner Occupied Units and Ownership Rate by	
	Race/Ethnicity of Householder	
	New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999	273
Table 4.41		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units	
	by Legal Form of Ownership	
	New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999	274
Table 4.42		
	Number and Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available	
	Owner Units by Legal Form of Ownership and Borough	
	New York City 1999	276
Table 4.43		
	Number and Distribution of Owner Occupied and Vacant Available	
	Units by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1001, 1000	200
Table 4.44	New Tork City, Selected Tears 1991-1999	260
12010 4.44	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units	
	by Number of Bedrooms within Form of Ownership	
	New York City 1999	280
Table 4.45		000
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Type of	
	Ownership within Number of Bedrooms	
	New York City 1999	281
Table 4.46		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units	
	by Borough within Number of Bedrooms	
	New York City 1999	281
Table 4.47		
	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units	
	by Number of Bedrooms within Borough	000
T-1-1- 4 40	New York City 1999	282
1able 4.48	Number and Distribution of Owner Occupied Units by Length of Tenute	
	Number and Distribution of Owner Occupied Units by Length of Tenure New York City Selected Vers 1001 1000	202
Table 4 40	100 101 City, Science 1010 1771 - 1777	203
14010 7.77	Number and Distribution of the Estimated Current Value of Owner Occupied Units	
	(Excluding Mitchell-Lama Coops) in 1999 Dollars	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	285
	5	

Table 4.50		
	Number and Percent of All Units in Multiple Family Dwellings with	
	Wheelchair Accessibility by Accessibility Criteria and Number and	
	Percent Meeting All Criteria by Borough (Units in Buildings with Elevators)	
	New York City 1999	287
Table 4.51		
	Number and Percent of All Units in Multiple Family Dwellings with	
	Wheelchair Accessibility by Accessibility Criteria and Number and	
	Percent Meeting All Criteria by Borough (Units in Buildings without Elevators)	
	New York City 1999	288
Table 4.52		
	Number and Percent of All Units in Multiple Family Dwellings	
	with Wheelchair Accessibility by Accessibility Criteria and Number and	
	Percent Meeting All Criteria by Structure Class (Units in Buildings with Elevators)	
	New York City 1999	289
Table 4.53		
	Number and Percent of All Units in Multiple Family Dwellings with	
	Wheelchair Accessibility by Accessibility Criteria and Number and	
	Percent Meeting All Criteria by Structure Class (Units in Buildings without Elevators)	
	New York City 1999	290
		220
Chapter 5:	Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
Table 5.1		
	Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units and	
	Net Rental Vacancy Rates	
	New York City Selected Years 1960 - 1999	294
Table 5.2	The Tork Orly, beleeted Tears 1900 - 1999 minimum minimum management	<u> </u>
14510 5.2	Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	297
Table 5.3	The Tork Ory 1990 and 1999 and 1999	
14510 5.5	Number of Occupied Rental Units Vacant Available Rental Units	
	and Not Rontal Vacancy Rates by Reculatory Status of Unit	
	Now York City 1006 and 1000	208
Table 5.4	INCW TOTK City 1990 and 1999	290
Table 3.4	Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Pontal Unite	
	and Vacanay Pates by Monthly Pont Level in 1000 Dollars	
	New Value City 1000 and 1000	200
Τ-1-1- 5 5	New York City 1990 and 1999	299
Table 5.5	Madian Dant Manulan of Warnet Amilable Dantal Haite and	
	Median Rent, Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and	
	Vacancy Kate by Kent Quintile	202
	New York City 1996 and 1999	302
Table 5.6		
	Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and Vacancy Rate	
	by Cumulative Monthly Rent Intervals in 1999 Dollars	• • •
m 1 1 = -	New York City 1996 and 1999	303
Table 5.7		
	Net Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates	
	in Stabilized and Unregulated Housing by Monthly Rent Level	
	New York City 1999	304

Table 5.8		
	Estimate of the Number of Physically Decent Rental Units	
	within the Public Assistance Maximum Shelter Allowance	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	306
Table 5.9		
	Number of Privately Owned Vacant Available Units and	
	Vacant Available Plus Kenter-Occupied Units at Affordable Kent Levels	207
Table 5 10	New TORK City 1990 and 1999	307
Table 5.10	Estimate of the Number of Physically Decent Units	
	that Meet Market-Based Rent Schedule	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	308
Table 5.11		
	Size Distribution of Physically Decent Units Renting at or below	
	Fair Market Rent Level by Occupancy Status	
	New York City 1999	309
Table 5.12		
	Median Asking Rents of Vacant Available Units	
	Now York City 1996 and 1999 Donars	310
Table 5.13	New Tork City 1990 and 1999	510
14010 5.15	Number of Vacant Available Rental Units, Vacancy Rate, and Median Asking Rent	
	in 1999 Dollars by Borough	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	311
Table 5.14		
	Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	312
Table 5.15		
	Number of Vacant Available Rental Units	
	Now York City 1996 and 1999	212
Table 5.16	New Tork City 1990 and 1999	515
14010 5.10	Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates	
	by Regulatory Status, and Median Asking Rent by Number of Bedrooms	
	New York City 1999	314
Table 5.17		
	Number and Percent Distribution of the Length of Vacancies in	
	Rental Units by Borough	
	New York City 1999	315
Table 5.18		
	Number and Distribution of Vacant Available Kental Units	
	New York City 1999	317
Table 5.19	New Tork Ony 1777	517
	Number and Distribution of Vacant Available Rental Units	
	by Regulatory Status by Length of Time Vacant	
	New York City 1996	318
Table 5.20		
	Percentage of Units that were Renter Occupied in both 1996 and 1999 and	
	Turned Over at Least Once Between 1996 and 1999 by 1996 Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	319

Table 5.21		
	Percentage of Units that were Renter Occupied in both 1996 and 1999 and	
	Turned Over at Least Once between 1996 and 1999	
	by 1996 Rent Level in 1999 Dollars	
T 11 5 22	New York City 1999	320
Table 5.22	Number of Owner Occupied Units Vacant for Sale Units	
	Distribution of Vacant Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	
Table 5.23		
	Owner Occupied and Vacant Units and Vacancy Rates by Form of Ownership	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	322
Table 5.24		
	Distribution of the Length of Time that Vacant Owner Units	
	Available for Sale Have Been Vacant by Form of Ownership	202
Table 5 25	New York City 1990 and 1999	323
14010 5.25	Number of Vacant Units Unavailable for Rent or Sale by	
	Reason for Unavailability	
	New York City 1993, 1996, and 1999	324
Table 5.26		
	Distribution of Units that were Vacant Unavailable in 1996	
	by Reason for Unavailability and by 1999 Availability	
T 11 5 27	New York City 1996 and 1999	326
Table 5.27	Vacant Unavailable Units by Borough	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	326
Table 5.28	Tew Tork Ony 1990 and 1999 million	520
	Vacant Unavailable Units by Structure Class	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	327
Table 5.29		
	Vacant Unavailable Units by Building Defects	
T11 520	New York City 1996 and 1999	328
Table 5.30	Number and Dereant Distribution of 1000 Vacant Unavailable Units	
	by Tenure and Regulatory Status or Form of Ownership in 1996	
	New York City 1999	
Chapter 6:	Variations in Rent Expenditure in New York City	
Table 6.1		
	Median Contract Rent and Distribution of Renter Households	
	Receiving and Not Receiving Rent Subsidies	
	New York City 1999	332
Table 6.2	THEW TOTA ONLY 1777	552
	Median Contract Rent and Distribution of Renter Households	
	Receiving Rent Subsidies by Type of Subsidy	
	New York City 1999	334

Table 6.3		
	Median Contract Rent and Median Out-of-Pocket Rent Paid by Renter	
	Households Receiving Rent Subsidies by Type of Rent Subsidy	
	New York City 1999	334
Table 6.4		
	Median Contract Rent and Median Gross Rent	
	in Constant (1999) and in Current Dollars	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	335
Table 6.5		
	Median Contract Rent in Constant (1999) and in Current Dollars	22.4
	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	336
Table 6.6		
	Median Gross Rent in Constant (1999) and in Current Dollars	226
Table 67	New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	330
Table 0.7	Madian Contract Root and Distribution of All Rootor Households	
	Rent Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households.	
	New York City 1999	337
Table 6.8	New Tork City 1777	557
	Median Gross Rent and Distribution of All Renter Households	
	Rent Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households	
	New York City 1999	338
Table 6.9		
	Median Contract Rent by Contract Rent Quintile	
	for All, Subsidized and Unsubsidized Households	
	New York City 1999	338
Table 6.10		
	Contract Rent Distribution (in 1999 dollars) by All Renter Households, Subsidized	
	Households and Unsubsidized Households	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	340
Table 6.11		
	Median Contract Rent and Median Renter Household Income	
	by Borough (in 1999 dollars)	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	342
Table 6.12		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent by Borough	246
T 11 (12	New York City 1999	340
Table 6.13	Median Contrast Dent of All Denter Households, Subsidired Households	
	and Unsubsidized Households and Out of Pocket Rent of Subsidized	
	Households by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1000	347
Table 6.14	New Tork City 1999	
10010 0.1 1	Median Contract Rent (in 1999 dollars) and Median Household Income	
	(in 1998 dollars) and Percent Changes between 1996-99 by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	
Table 6.15	,	5.0
	Median Contract Rents (in 1999 dollars) by Borough and by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	350

Table 6.16		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent and by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	352
Table 6.17		
	Median Contract Rents by Number of Bedrooms and by Borough	
	New York City 1999	354
Table 6.18		
	Median Contract Rents and Number of Units in Manhattan	
	by Rent Regulatory Status and Vear Built, by Number of Bedrooms	
	Now York City 1000	356
Table 6 10	New TOIR City 1999	550
Table 0.19	Median Contract Dente by Decolatory Status and by Number of Deducers	
	Neural Contract Rents by Regulatory Status and by Number of Bedrooms	257
T 11 ( 00	New York City 1999	357
Table 6.20		
	Median Contract Rent by Housing and Neighborhood Conditions	
	New York City 1999	358
Table 6.21		
	Median Contract Rent (in 1999 dollars) of Unregulated Units by Borough	
	and by Type of Building	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	359
Table 6.22		
	Distribution of Unregulated Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Interval	
	(in 1999 dollars) by Type of Building	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	360
Table 6.23		
	Number of Renter Occupied Units in Cooperative and Condominium	
	Buildings by Regulatory Status of Unit	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	361
Table 6.24		
	Median Contract Rent (in 1999 dollars) of Renter Occupied Units in Cooperative or	
	Condominium Buildings by Borough and by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	362
Table 6.25	The Tork City 1990 and 1999	502
1 abic 0.25	Median Contract Rents of Renter Occupied Units in	
	Cooperative of Condominium Buildings by Number of Badrooms	
	Now York City 1000	260
T-1-1- ( )(	New Tork City 1999	302
Table 0.20		
	Median Gross Kent/Income Katio	272
T 11 ( 07	New York City, Selected Years 1960-1999	303
Table $6.2/$		
	Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio, Distribution of All Renter Households,	
	Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households	
	New York City 1999	364
Table 6.28		
	Median Gross Rent/Income Ratios of All Households, Subsidized Households	
	and Unsubsidized Households and Out-of-Pocket Rent/Income Ratios of	
	Subsidized Households by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	366
	-	

Table 6.29		
	Median Gross Rent (in 1999 dollars) and Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio of All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	368
Table 6.30	The work only 1990 and 1999 minimum management of the second se	500
	Median Gross Rent, Median Household Income and Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio of All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households by Household Type New York City 1999	. 371
Table 6.31		
	Distribution of Gross Rent/Income Ratio of All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households New York City 1999	. 373
Table 6.32	Distribution of Renter Households by Gross Rent/Income Ratio within Borough New York City 1999	. 374
Chapter 7:	Housing Conditions in New York City	
Table 7.1		
	Incidence of Dilapidation in Renter Occupied Units	
Table 7.2	New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999	. 380
Table 7.2	Incidence of Renter Occupied Units in Dilapidated Buildings by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999	381
Table 7.3		
	Incidence of Dilapidation in Renter Occupied Housing by Building Structure Classification New York City 1999	382
Table 7.4	New Tork City 1777	502
	Incidence of Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Housing by Type of Defect	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	. 384
Table 7.5	Incidence of One or More Observable Building Defects	
	New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999	. 387
Table 7.6		
	Incidence of One or More Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Housing by Building Structure Classification New York City 1996 and 1999	. 387
Table 7.7		
	Incidence of Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Housing by Regulatory Status New York City 1996 and 1999	. 388
Table 7.8		
	Incidence of Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Units by Building Size Category New York City 1999	. 389

Table 7.9		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units	
	within Building Size Categories by Year Built	
	New York City 1999	390
Table 7.10		
	Incidence of Observable Building Defects by Number of Building Defect	
	Types Present and by Contract Rent Level for Renter Occupied Units	
77.11.7.44	New York City 1999	390
Table /.11		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units	
	New York City 1000	301
Table 7.12	New Tork City 1999	391
Table 7.12	Incidence of Dilapidation and Observable Building Defects	
	in Owner Occupied Housing	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	
Table 7.13		
	Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies	
	in Renter Occupied Units by Type of Deficiency	
	New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999	392
Table 7.14		
	Incidence of No Deficiencies and of Five or More Maintenance Deficiencies	
	in Renter Occupied Units by Borough	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	396
Table 7.15		
	Incidence of Five or More Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies	
	in Renter Occupied Housing by Building Structure Classification	207
T-11. 716	New York City 1996 and 1999	397
Table /.10	Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies (None and Five or More)	
	in Renter Occupied Units by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	397
Table 7.17	Tew Tork Ony 1990 and 1999 minimum manufacture and the second s	
	Incidence of Five or More Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies	
	in All Renter Occupied Units by Building Size	
	New York City 1999	399
Table 7.18		
	Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies by Number of	
	Deficiencies and by Contract Rent Level for Renter Occupied Units	
	New York City 1999	399
Table 7.19		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Building Condition	
	by Number of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies	400
Table 7 20	INEW TOLK CITY 1999	400
Table 7.20	Distribution of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies	
	in Owner Occupied Units by Form of Ownership	
	New York City 1999	401
Table 7.21		101
	Number and Incidence of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Borough	
	New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999	402

Table 7.22		
	Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Borough by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	406
Table 7.23		
	Number and Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Structure Class by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	407
Table 7.24		
	Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Building Size	100
T-11-7.25	New York City 1999	408
Table 7.25	Distribution of Dhysically Door Donton Occupied Units by Unit Size	
	(Number of Bedrooms) by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	409
Table 7 26	New TOTA City 1777	+07
14510 7.20	Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Rent Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1999	410
Table 7.27	,	
	Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Interval (in 1999 dollars)	
	New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999	411
Table 7.28		
	Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Race/Ethnicity by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	413
Table 7.29		
	Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Household Type by Type of Physically Poor Condition	414
Table 7.30	New York City 1999	414
Table 7.30	Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Income Group by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	415
Table 7.31		
	Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Gross Rent/Income Ratio by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	417
Table 7.32		
	Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units	
	by Birthplace of Household Head by Type of Physically Poor Condition	
	New York City 1999	418
Table 7.33		
	Incidence of Renter Occupied Units on Same Street as a Building with Broken/	
	Boarded-Up Windows, by Borough	110
	New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999	419
Table 7.34		
------------	--	-----
	Percentage of Renter Occupied Units on Same Street	
	as a Building with Broken/Boarded-Up Windows by Contract Rent Level	
	New York City 1999	423
Table 7.35		
	Distribution of Renter Ratings of the Physical Condition of Residential Structures	
	in the Neighborhood by Borough	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	424
Table 7.36		
	Distribution of Renter Ratings of the Physical Condition of Residential	
	Structures in the Neighborhood by Contract Rent Level	
	New York City 1999	427
Table 7.37		
	Distribution of Renter Ratings of the Physical Condition of Residential Buildings	
	in the Renter's Neighborhood by the Presence/Absence	
	of Buildings with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows on Renter's Street	
	New York City 1999	428
Table 7.38		
	Incidence of Unit, Building and Neighborhood Condition Problems	
	by Immigrant Status for Renter Households	
	New York City 1999	429
Table 7.39		
	Incidence of Owner Occupied Units on Same Street as Building with	
	Broken or Boarded-Up Windows and Distribution of Owner Ratings	
	of the Physical Condition of Residential Structures in the Neighborhood	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	430
Table 7.40		
	Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units	
	New York City, Selected Years 1960-1999	432
Table 7.41		
	Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units by Borough	
	New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999	433
Table 7.42		
	Incidence of Crowding in Renter Occupied Units by Borough by Household Size	
	New York City 1999	434
Table 7.43		
	Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding	
	in Renter Occupied Units by Regulatory Status	
	New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999	435
Table 7.44		
	Crowding, Severe Crowding and Mean Household Size of	
	Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity	
	New York City 1996 and 1999	436
Table 7.45		
	Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Crowding Level and	
	Mean Household Size by Household Type	
	New York City 1999	437

Table 7.46		
	Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units	
	by Number of Persons in Household	
	New York City 1999	438
Table 7.47		
	Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Owner Occupied Units	
	by Number of Persons in Household	
	New York City 1999	438

# LIST OF MAPS

Map 2.1		
<sup>*</sup>	White Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population	
	New York City 1999.	66
Map 2.2		
1	Black Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population	
	New York City 1999	67
Map 2.3	Tew Tork Ony Typy	
Map 2.5	Duarta Diana Highania Danulation Dansity of a Demonstrate of Tatal Demulation	
	New Val Circulation Density as a Percentage of Total Population	(0)
	New York City 1999	68
Map 2.4		
	Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic Population Density as a Percentage	
	of Total Population	
	New York City 1999	69
Map 2.5		
1	Asian and Pacific Islander Population Density	
	as a Percentage of Total Population	
	New York City 1999	70
Map 26	Tew Tork Ory 1777	
Map 2.0	Demonstrate of Depulation Ass 19 and Over with Less them 12 Very of Education	
	N N 1 C: 1000	00
	New York City 1999	82
Map 2.7		
	Percentage of Householders Born in Puerto Rico or Outside the United States	
	New York City 1999	113
Map 3.1		
	Median Household Incomes	
	New York City 1999	150
Map 3.2		
p =	Percentage of Households below the Federal Poverty Level	
	New York City 1999	186
Map 33	Tew Tork Ory 1777	100
Map 5.5	Demonstrange of Deputation Age 16 to 64 Nation the Labor Former	
	N N L C: 1000	100
	New York City 1999	198
Map 3.4		
	Percentage of Unemployed Individuals Age 16 to 64	
	New York City 1999	
Map 4.1		
_	Rent Stabilized Units as a Percentage of Total Rental Units	
	New York City 1999	254
Map 4.2	,	
P	Unregulated Rental Units as a Percentage of Total Rental Units	
	New York City 1999	255
Map 12	New Tork City 1777	
Map 4.5		
	Homeownership Kate	070
	New York City 1999	272
Map 4.4		
	Occupied and Vacant Conventional Owner Units	
	as a Percentage of Private Owner Units	
	New York City 1999	278

Map 4.5		
1	Occupied and Vacant Cooperative and Condominium Owner Units	
	as a Percentage of Private Owner Units	
	New York City 1999	279
Map 6.1		
1	Median Contract Rents	
	New York City 1999	. 343
Map 6.2		
1	Renter-Occupied Units with Monthly Contract Rents of Less Than \$500	
	New York City 1999	345
Map 6.3		
1	Median Gross Rent to Income Ratios	
	New York City 1999	375
Map 7.1		
1	Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with One or More Defect Types	
	New York City 1991	. 385
Map 7.2		
T .	Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with One or More Defect Types	
	New York City 1999	
Map 7.3		
p ne	Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with Four or More	
	Maintenance Deficiencies	
	New York City 1991	. 394
Map 7.4		
	Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with Four or More	
	Maintenance Deficiencies	
	New York City 1999	. 395
Map 7.5		
1	Physically Poor Occupied Rental Units as a Percentage of Total Occupied Rental Units	
	New York City 1991	. 403
Map 7.6		
	Physically Poor Occupied Rental Units as a Percentage of Total Occupied Rental Units	
	New York City 1999	404
Мар 7.7		
- I	Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units on the Same Street as a Building with	
	Broken or Boarded-Up Windows	
	New York City 1991	
Map 7.8		
11 <b>11</b> 11	Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units on the Same Street as a Building with	
	Broken or Boarded-Up Windows	
	New York City 1999	422
Map 7.9	The Total Only 1999	
mup /	Percentage of Renters Rating the Physical Condition of Residential Buildings	
	in Their Neighborhood as "Good" or "Excellent"	
	New York City 1991	425
Map 7 10	The work Only 1771	T2J
	Percentage of Renters Rating the Physical Condition of Residential Buildings	
	in Their Neighborhood as "Good" or "Excellent"	
	New York City 1909	426
	The Tork Ory 1777	720

# Housing New York City, 1999: Report Summary

# Introduction

This summary highlights important findings of this report without the details and qualifications included in the sections of the report where they are fully presented and discussed. The primary purpose of this summary is to enable readers to acquire quickly an overview of the salient structural and functional characteristics of New York City's housing market, so that they can familiarize themselves with the prevailing issues the market has faced. However, it is important for readers to recognize that the findings presented in this summary are the result of analyses of detailed evidence of major aspects of the issues; thus, it is necessary for readers to review all of the data and data analyses in order to get a fuller picture of the City's housing market and a thorough understanding of the issues and their policy implications. Findings of each substantive chapter of this report are summarized in the following sections.

# **Residential Population and Households**

# Historical Changes in the Population

The population the HVS reports is the *residential* population because the HVS counts only people living in residential units and excludes those living in group quarters, other types of special places, and on the streets. The 1999 HVS reports that the number of people living in New York City was 7,245,000 in 1999.

On the other hand, according to the Census 2000, there were 8,008,000 people in the City. This level represents an increase of 686,000 over the population of 7,323,000 in the 1990 census. The number of persons and households the Census 2000 counted were significantly more than the count of people in the HVS. The difference is not just because of the one-year's difference in time between the two surveys, but for several other reasons as well: first, for the HVS, data were collected by survey interviewers, while for the Census 2000 data were primarily gathered by mail. In general, the interview method is considered better than the mail method in terms of the response rate. The interview method is also better than the mail or other methods in collecting reliable data on many population, household, and/or housing unit characteristics that the HVS covers. In addition, the Census Bureau uses the interviewer method for the HVS because the HVS's primary purpose is to collect highly reliable data on rental vacancies, based on which the City determines whether or not about 1.1 million rental units should continue to be under rent control or rent stabilization. Vacant units cannot be covered by mail. Although the Census Bureau initially used the mail method for the Census 2000, it also used the interviewer method to complete the Census by sending interviewers to households that did not return the questionnaire to the Census Bureau.

Second, the HVS is a sample survey--that is, only households in the selected sample were interviewed--while the census is a complete count of all people and housing units (although even the Census may undercount people in hard to count neighborhoods). Third, the HVS excludes people in group quarters--such as prisons, nursing homes, dormitories and emergency shelters--as well as people and housing units in other types of special places--such as transient hotels. Thus, according to the Census 2000, 182,000 people in such group quarters or special places were not counted in the 1999 HVS. On the other hand, the census counts all people and housing units.

Fourth, the 1999 HVS sample was selected from the 1990 census, with updating for newly constructed units and converted units that received Certificates of Occupancy. For the Census 2000 the City provided to the Census Bureau more than 370,000 housing unit addresses that were added during the 1990 decade or missed in the 1990 census. The weighting for the 1999 HVS used estimates based on the 1990 census; thus, any of the units at the 370,000 addresses provided to the Census Bureau by the City that were missed in the 1990 census were not reflected in the 1999 HVS.

In the mid to late 1990s, crime rates declined significantly and housing and neighborhood conditions improved visibly, as discussed in Chapter 3, "Household Incomes in New York City" and Chapter 7, "Housing Conditions in New York City." At the same time, as the City's economy grew steadily and solidly, job opportunities expanded and household incomes improved markedly. In addition, New Yorkers were better educated, as discussed in Chapter 2. Consequently, the City became a much better place to live and work, and, thus, apparently attracted more people than other areas. In fact, according to the Census 2000, the City's population grew by 686,000 or 9.4 percent between 1990 and 2000, while several cities in the mid-west lost sizeable population.

Fifth, the Census Bureau made extensive efforts to reduce the undercount in 2000 by making the public aware of the importance of the census through working closely with agencies and groups in the public and private sectors and through paid advertising campaigns and educational programs.

A confluence of the above five reasons, particularly the last three, makes the overall count of number of persons, households, and housing units greater in the Census 2000 than in the 1999 HVS. However, the HVS provides more detailed data on the number and characteristics of population, households, and housing units than the Census 2000. Moreover, the Census 2000 covers fewer characteristics of households and housing units than the HVS and Census 2000 data on many demographic, social, economic and housing characteristics will not be released before this report is published. Furthermore, the Census 2000 does not cover characteristics of housing and households in the same detail as the HVS, nor does it cover housing and neighborhood conditions. Therefore, in presenting and discussing the number and characteristics of population and households in this report, data primarily from the 1999 and previous HVSs will be used. However, data from the Census 2000 will be compared with the HVS data whenever such comparisons are useful.

According to the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, in 1996 the number of people in the City was 7,230,000. Over the nine-year period between 1987 and 1996, population increased by 204,000, or by an average of 0.3 percent annually. This long-term upward trend of population growth in the City was sustained in the following three years through 1999 as the population grew to 7,245,000.

# Locational Distribution of the Population

In 1999, 1,141,000 people, or 15.7 percent of the population in New York City, resided in the Bronx. Brooklyn, with 2,209,000 people, or 30.5 percent of the people in the City, was still the most populous borough. In Manhattan, there were 1,544,000, or 21.3 percent of the people in the City. There were 1,952,000, or 26.9 percent of the City's people in Queens. Staten Island was the least populous borough, with a population of only 399,000, or 5.5 percent of the people in the City.

The Census 2000 provides population counts for each borough that are considerably higher than the HVS counts, except for Manhattan, where the difference appears to be relatively marginal. According to the Census 2000, of the City's population of 8,008,000, there were 1,333,000 people (or 16.7 percent of the City's population) in the Bronx; 2,465,000 people (30.8 percent) in Brooklyn; and 2,229,000 (27.8 percent) people in Queens, while there were 1,537,000 people (19.2 percent) in Manhattan and 444,000 people (5.5 percent) in Staten Island.

# Racial and Ethnic Composition of the Population

The non-Puerto Rican Hispanic population increased tremendously by 160,000, or by 5.0 percent per year, between 1996 and 1999. The size of the increase in non-Puerto Rican Hispanics alone was more than large enough to compensate for the decrease in whites (67,000), blacks (51,000), and Puerto Ricans (40,000) combined. The total number of Hispanics--Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics together--was 1,932,000, or 69,000 more than the number of blacks in 1999. Hispanics as a whole accounted for 26.7 percent of the people in the City, making Hispanics the largest minority group in the City. The comparable proportion from the Census 2000 was 27.0 percent. The Asian population also increased moderately, by 16,000 or by 0.8 percent per year, in the three-year period. The Census 2000 does not provide data on whites, blacks and Asians that are directly comparable to the HVS data on race.

# Educational Attainment of the Population

People in New York City were significantly better educated in 1999 than they were three years previously. In 1999, 77.4 percent of individuals 18 years old or older in all households had finished at least high school, an increase of 2.0 percentage points over 1996. Particularly, when educational attainment is measured by the percentage of individuals with a higher education degree, New Yorkers were substantially better educated during those three years: the percentage of those who had graduated at least from college increased by 3.5 percentage points to 29.2 percent.

All racial and ethnic groups improved in their educational attainment, when judged from data on college graduation, during the three years between 1996 and 1999. In terms of high school graduates, again, improvements were made for all racial and ethnic groups, except Asians. Whites achieved the highest proportion of educational milestones among the racial and ethnic groups as both high school graduates and college graduates. Their achievement in higher education was even more remarkable. Three-quarters of Asians graduated from high school, while more than one-third graduated from

college. Blacks also improved their educational attainment markedly during the three years from 1996 to 1999. Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics also made encouraging improvements over the period, although the educational attainment levels for these groups in 1999 were still significantly lower compared to other racial and ethnic groups.

# Households by Tenure

The number of households in New York City was 2,868,000 in 1999. According to the Census 2000, the number was 3,022,000. The overall number of households from the Census 2000 is more updated and complete than the number from the HVS. However, in presenting not just the number of households but also their detailed characteristics and their relationship to the housing market, the HVS provides a much more comprehensive source of detailed data on characteristics of population, households and housing units.

The number of households from the 1999 HVS represents an increase of at least 88,000 households, or 3.2 percent, over the 2,780,000 households in 1996. More than nine in ten of this increase were owner households. During the nine-year period from 1987 to 1996, the number of owner households in the City increased slightly by 17,000, or by 2.0 percent. But during the most recent three years from 1996 to 1999, the number of owner households increased by 81,000, or 9.7 percent, almost five times the rate of increase during the preceding nine-year period, and amounted to 915,000. This remarkable growth in owner households pulled the ownership rate in the City from 30.0 percent in 1996 to 31.9 percent in 1999. This significant increase resulted from conversions and new construction and was helped notably by the City's effective efforts to expand homeownership opportunities in the City.

# Households by Type of Ownership

In 1999, 915,000 households lived in owner units in New York City. Of these, 62.8 percent were in conventional owner units, while the remainder were in private cooperative units (25.7 percent), condominiums (5.5 percent), or Mitchell-Lama units (6.0 percent).

# Households by Race and Ethnicity

In the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, as vividly reflected by their population growth, non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households soared by 18.1 percent, or by 55,000. This growth represents almost two-thirds of all households added during the period. The number of Asian households also increased substantially, by 11.6 percent, or by 23,000. One out of four households added in the City were Asian households. White households grew by 17,000, or by 1.3 percent, while black households remained virtually unchanged and Puerto Rican households declined slightly by 6,000, or by 2.2 percent.

The ownership rates (owner households as a proportion of all households) for white and Asian households amounted to 42.0 percent and 35.2 percent respectively, substantially higher than the rate of 31.9 percent for all households. The rates for other racial and ethnic household groups--particularly for

Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics--were markedly lower than the rate for all households: a mere 12.7 percent for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, 14.6 percent for Puerto Ricans, and 28.5 percent for blacks.

# Household Size

The mean household size for all households in the City--that is, the average number of persons per household--was 2.53 in 1999, virtually constant with 1996, when it was 2.60. The sizes of renter and owner households were 2.48 and 2.63 respectively in 1999. One-third of households in the City were single-person households in 1999. In Manhattan, one in every two households (48.4 percent) was a single-person household. This pattern of a high concentration of singles in Manhattan remained true regardless of tenure.

At the same time, more than two in ten households in the City were large households with four or more persons. In Queens and Staten Island, close to three in ten of all households were large households.

The household size of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics was the largest, with 3.22 persons per household, followed by 2.97 for Asians, 2.79 for blacks, and 2.68 for Puerto Ricans. The household size of whites was smallest with 2.10 persons per household.

The mean size of households living in *in rem* units was 3.00, markedly larger than the 2.48 mean household size of all renter households in the City, and the largest of households living in units in any rent regulatory status in 1999. The *in rem* household size was almost equal to that of conventional owner units, which was 3.02. The sizes of households in public housing units (2.79) and unregulated rental units (2.65) were also higher than the citywide mean household size. On the other hand, the size of households living in rent-controlled units was only 1.66, the smallest of households in any rent-regulatory status.

The average size of households in private cooperative units was only 1.86, not much larger than the size of households in rent-controlled units, 1.66. The sizes of households in Mitchell-Lama cooperatives and private condominiums were also small, 2.21 and 2.23 respectively, smaller than the size of households in any other rental category other than rent-controlled units.

# Household Composition: Household Types

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of adult households with minor children increased by 60,000, accounting for 68.2 percent of the increase of 88,000 in all households in the City as a whole. As a result of this large increase in a group whose mean household size was 4.31 persons, there was increased need and demand for larger housing units in the City during the three years. Compared to that substantial increase, the numbers of single elderly and single adult households also increased, but by a relatively smaller 13,000 (15.3 percent of the total increase) and 16,000 (18.3 percent of the total increase) respectively. The number of households with minor children headed by a single adult decreased by 8,000.

Of renter households, the number of adult renter households with minor children increased by 29,000 in the three years from 1996 to 1999. However, nine-tenths of this increase was offset by decreases in the number of single-adult-with-minor-children households (16,000) and the number of adult households (9,000).

Four-tenths of the increase of 81,000 owner households between 1996 and 1999 resulted from an increase of 31,000 in the number of adult owner households with minor children. Appreciable increases also occurred in single elderly owner households (13,000), single adult owner households (13,000), adult owner households (12,000), and single owner households with minor children (8,000).

# Foreign-Born Households (Determined by Birth Place of the Householder)

Householders born in Puerto Rico or outside the United States increased significantly from 40.7 percent of the City's householders in 1991 to 45.7 percent in 1999.

One in four of all householders in the City in 1999 were born either in the Caribbean (12.5 percent of all householders), Latin America (7.3 percent of all householders), or Puerto Rico (5.8 percent of all householders). At the same time, one householder in ten was born in Europe, while one in thirteen was born in Asia.

The homeownership rate was 36.7 percent for householders born in the United States (excluding Puerto Rico). It was only 26.7 percent for householders born outside the country. For householders born in Puerto Rico and in countries in the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa, the homeownership rates were extremely low: 15.6 percent, 22.9 percent, 22.1 percent, and 18.8 percent respectively.

# **Immigrant Households**

In 1999, seven in ten immigrant households in the City resided in either Queens (37.0 percent) or Brooklyn (33.3 percent). The remainder lived in Manhattan (14.8 percent) or the Bronx (12.5 percent).

The homeownership rate for immigrant households in 1999 was 29.2 percent, lower than the rate for all households in the City, which was 31.9 percent.

In 1999, six in ten immigrant householders were either non-Puerto Rican Hispanics (30.3 percent) or whites (30.5 percent). Another two in ten were blacks (21.1 percent), and the remainder were Asians (17.3 percent).

In 1999, the average size of immigrant households was 3.06 persons, compared to 2.53 for all households.

In general, immigrant householders (heads of households) were less educated than all householders. Of all immigrant householders in the City, 70.9 percent had completed at least high school, compared to 78.6 percent of all householders. At the same time, 26.2 percent of immigrant householders had graduated at least from college, compared to 32.8 percent of all householders. Of

immigrant householders, those who had recently moved to the City between 1994 and 1999 were substantially better educated than those who had moved to the City over five years ago.

# **Recently Moved Households**

More than four in ten households that recently moved from outside the USA--that is, that moved between 1994 and 1999--into their current residence were either Asian (27.2 percent) or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (18.2 percent). Another more than four in ten were whites, while the remainder were mostly blacks (8.5 percent).

More than seven in ten households that recently moved into their current residence in the City from within the United States but from outside the City were whites, while two in ten were Asians (9.5 percent) or blacks (9.3 percent).

Householders who recently moved into the City from other places in the USA were the best educated among recently-moved households, followed by recently-moved householders from outside the USA and recently-moved households from within the City.

# Doubled-Up Households (Sub-Family and Secondary Individual Households)

Altogether, in 1999 there were 355,000 hidden households in the City, consisting of 137,000 subfamilies and 218,000 secondary individuals, many of which may have needed their own housing units. A sub-family can be either a parent and child(ren) or a couple with or without children. Doubled-up subfamilies may be either related or unrelated to the householder, although the majority are related to the householder. In 1999, 93,000 of the sub-families lived in renter households. The median income of these sub-families in renter households was \$10,000 in 1998. Of all renter sub-families, 47.5 percent were crowded, and 17.1 percent were seriously crowded.

Of the 218,000 secondary individuals in the City in 1999, 86.4 percent were living in renter households. Secondary individuals are unrelated roommates, boarders, or roomers. The median income of these secondary individuals in renter households was \$20,000 in 1998. Of all renter secondary individuals, 17.8 percent were in crowded households.

There were 32,000 sub-families with median incomes below \$20,000 living in crowded renter households in 1999. The median income of these sub-families was only \$6,976 in 1998. Of all these poor sub-families in crowded households, 42.1 percent were not in the labor force. The two major reasons given were, first, responsibility for family/childcare (31.4 percent) and, second, school (24.1 percent). Of all 32,000 poor sub-families in crowded renter households, 18,000 were single-parent families; 16,000, or half of all such poor sub-families, were headed by a single female parent. Of the heads of such poor sub-families, 53.9 percent did not finish high school.

In 1999, there were 25,000 secondary individuals with incomes less than \$20,000 living in crowded renter households in the City. Of these, more than three-quarters were males. The median income of these poor secondary individuals in crowded renter households was only \$9,090; their median

share of household income was 15.0 percent. Near to one in two did not finish high school. The mean size of the crowded households containing such poor secondary individuals was very large, 5.7 persons.

There were 8,000 sub-families with incomes of less than \$20,000 living in crowded renter households with rent-income ratios of 50.0 percent or more in 1999. The median income of these sub-families was \$5,000, while the median income of the households with such high rent burdens containing these poor sub-families was \$10,100. These sub-families' median share of total household income was 33 percent. More than four in ten of such poor sub-families were headed by a single female parent. Of the heads of such poor sub-families, 41.6 percent were not in the labor force, and six in ten did not finish high school.

Most very poor sub-families and secondary individuals in crowded renter households with high rent burdens could be assumed to be "hidden households" since they were not counted as separate households, but actually needed separate housing units. However, they had profoundly insufficient incomes to afford their own units and, as a result, lived doubled-up in crowded households.

# Household Incomes in New York City

# Changes in Household Income by Tenure

The median income in current dollars of households in New York City increased considerably by 11.5 percent, from \$29,600 to \$33,000, or by an annual compound rate of 3.7 percent between 1995 and 1998 (in the HVS, respondents are asked about their previous year's income). Income growth outpaced inflation. The resulting real household income--income after adjusting for inflation--increased by 4.2 percent over the three-year period, or by an annual compound rate of 1.4 percent. This was the first back-to-back growth in real income for New Yorkers in many years.

The back-to-back growth in household income between 1992 and 1998 was a consequence of the steady and solid economic growth in the City, as in the national economy generally, during the period. The labor-force participation rate in the City increased by 2.6 percentage points to 61.9 percent from 1993 to 1999. During the same six-year period, the number of employed persons increased by 317,000, or by 10.9 percent, as the unemployment rate declined by 3.7 percentage points to 6.7 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics's *Status of the Civilian Labor Force in New York City*. This labor-market growth was greatly helped by the City's determined and persistent efforts to make the City a better place in which to live, work, and invest. At the same time, total crimes in the seven major felony categories plunged by 54.4 percent, from 207,794 in January-June 1993 to 94,667 in January-June 1999. In addition, people in New York City were significantly better educated in 1999 than they were three years previously. In 1999, 77.4 percent of individuals 18 years old or older in all households had finished at least high school, an increase of 2.0 percentage points to 29.2 percent. With the remarkable improvement in quality of life, significant economic growth, and better educational attainment, incomes of New Yorkers grew accordingly.

Median renter household income increased by \$2,100, or by 8.8 percent, during the three-year period, reaching \$26,000 in 1998. After inflation, renter income increased by an annual compound rate of 0.6 percent. Median owner household income improved by \$4,400, or by 9.1 percent. In real terms, median owner household income increased by a compound rate of 0.7 percent annually.

Incomes of households in the City improved for all income quintiles, except the middle quintile. The growth rate for the second-lowest quintile was 7.6 percent, the highest of all groups. The growth rate for the lowest quintile was 5.9 percent, while the rate for the highest quintile was 6.2 percent, both considerably higher than the rate of 4.2 percent for all households. On the other hand, the income growth rate for the middle twenty percent was only 3.2 percent, lower than the rate for all households.

# Distribution of Household Incomes

Between 1995 and 1998, in real terms the proportion of low-income households decreased, while the proportion of high-income households increased. This holds true for both renter and owner households. The proportion of households with incomes of less than \$30,000 decreased by 3.0 percentage points, while the proportion of households with incomes of \$70,000 or more increased by the same percentage points.

In 1998, a third of all households had incomes of less than \$20,000 a year; four in ten renter households and fewer than two in ten owner households had such low incomes. Households with incomes of less than \$20,000 a year could afford a maximum of \$555 a month for rent (with one-third of household income as the measure of affordability).

# Changes in Median Household Income by Borough

During the three years between 1995 and 1998, the growth rate of household incomes in real terms in Brooklyn was the highest of any borough. The real median income of all households in Brooklyn grew by 12.1 percent to \$28,800 in 1998, while real median renter household income grew by 8.4 percent, to \$23,200, and median owner household income grew by 14.5 percent, to \$49,000.

Household income in Staten Island, \$50,000, was the highest of all the boroughs in 1998, as it was in 1995. During the three years, the real median household income in the borough increased by 9.2 percent, more than twice the citywide growth rate. Real renter and owner incomes increased by 6.8 percent, to \$32,000, and by 10.3 percent, to \$64,900, respectively.

In Manhattan, real median household incomes for all households and for renter households increased by 6.8 percent, to \$40,000, and by 6.3 percent, to \$34,100, respectively, while real median owner income declined by 7.1 percent, to \$74,600, in 1998.

The real median income for all households in the Bronx increased by only 2.8 percent to \$22,000, which was only 66.7 percent of the income of all households in the City. Real incomes for renter and owner households remained virtually the same.

In Queens, the real median income for all households increased to \$38,000 in 1998, with the growth rate for the three years being only 1.4 percent, the lowest rate of all the boroughs in the City. In Queens, the real median household income decreased for renters by 2.2 percent, to \$30,000, and for owners, by 2.7 percent, to \$50,000, in 1998.

# Distribution of Household Income by Borough

A disproportionately large number of households in the Bronx were low-income households. Close to half of all households in the Bronx had incomes below \$20,000, compared to a third of all households in the City. The income distribution in Brooklyn resembled approximately the distribution citywide, except that there were more households with incomes less than \$20,000 and fewer households with incomes of more than \$50,000 in the borough.

In Manhattan, there were more high-income households and fewer low-income households than in the City as a whole. Close to a fifth of all households in the borough had incomes of more than \$100,000, almost twice the citywide proportion.

In Queens, there were more moderate- and middle-income households. Three in ten households in the borough had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999, while the proportions of households with incomes below \$20,000 and households with incomes over \$100,000 were smaller in comparison to citywide proportions.

In Staten Island, there were more middle- and high-income households: only a fifth of households in the borough had incomes of less than \$20,000, while more than a third had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The proportion of households with incomes over \$100,000 was 15.4 percent.

# Median Household Incomes by Rent-Regulation Status

The real median income of households in unregulated rental units increased substantially by \$3,200, or by 10.1 percent, to \$35,400 during the three years between 1995 and 1998, while the overall real median household income for all renters in the City increased by only 1.7 percent. The incomes of households in unregulated rental units in rental buildings and those in cooperative or condominium buildings showed different increases: by 9.0-percent, to \$35,000, for those in rental buildings, and by 6.6-percent, to \$49,000, for those in cooperatives or condominiums.

The real median income of households in rent-controlled units increased significantly by \$2,600, or by 18.3 percent, to \$17,000, still only 65.4 percent of the overall median renter household income of \$26,000 in 1998.

The real median income of households in *in rem* units increased substantially by \$2,500, or by 27.7 percent, to \$11,500, still extremely low, and only 44.1 percent of the overall median renter household income. The 1998 median income of replacement households in *in rem* units that turned over was only 2.8 percent higher than that of households that remained in place. Thus, the outpacing 27.7-percent increase in *in rem* household income from 1995 to 1998 probably reflects an actual increase in

the incomes of all *in rem* households. The proportion of *in rem* households whose income was higher than \$10,000 increased by 8.4 percentage points, from 46.5 percent in 1995 to 54.9 percent in 1998, mostly the result of an increase in the number of workers in such households. In the same three years, the number of *in rem* households with one or more workers increased by 6.5 percent, and the number of households with two or more workers increased by 4.8 percent.

The real incomes of households in other rent-regulated categories--such as rent-stabilized, Mitchell-Lama, "other-regulated," and public housing units--changed unappreciably between 1995 and 1998. In 1998, the median income of households in rent-stabilized units was \$27,000, slightly higher than that of \$26,000 for all renter households. The median income of households in Mitchell-Lama units was \$21,500, or 82.5 percent of the median renter household income of \$26,000. Median incomes of households in "other-regulated" and public housing units were very low, \$10,200 and \$9,700 respectively, a mere 39.2 and 37.3 percent of the median income of all renter households.

# Distribution of Household Income by Rent-Regulation Status

Almost four in ten households in rent-stabilized units had incomes below \$20,000 in 1998, and 36.3 percent had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999. Another fifth had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999, while the remaining 5.8 percent had incomes of \$100,000 or more.

Of households in unregulated rental units, more had higher incomes and fewer had lower incomes compared to households in other rental categories. Of households in such units, fewer than three in ten had incomes below \$20,000, while about four in ten had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999. A quarter had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The remaining almost one in ten had incomes of \$100,000 or more.

Most rent-controlled units housed low-income households. Of households in such units, six in ten had incomes below \$20,000, while a quarter had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999.

The distribution of income shows clearly that public housing, "other-regulated," and *in rem* units really served the poor, who needed them the most. Of households in public housing, half had incomes below \$10,000, while another little more than a fifth had incomes between \$10,000 and \$19,999. The income distribution of "other-regulated" units and *in rem* units resembled that of public housing units, except that almost no *in rem* households had incomes of \$40,000 or more.

# Median Household Incomes by Race and Ethnicity

The real median income for whites--who made great improvements in educational attainment, particularly in terms of college graduates and more education--increased substantially, by 10.1 percent, to \$43,000 in 1998. Their income remained the highest among the major racial and ethnic groups, as in 1995.

The real income of Puerto Rican households soared by 14.1 percent to \$20,800. This was a back-to-back increase by more than 10.0 percent for this group. Between 1992 and 1995, their real income

surged by 12.5 percent. But despite this growth spurt, their median income was still the lowest of any racial and ethnic group, only 63.0 percent of the income of all households in 1998.

The real income of black households also increased substantially, by 7.6 percent to \$28,000, considerably higher than the rate for all households in the City. The income growth rate for Asian households lagged behind that for all households, with a mere 2.4-percent increase to \$40,000. Their income in 1998 was second highest after whites. The median real income of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics decreased by 4.3 percent to \$24,000.

As for all white households, the median real income of white renter households climbed by 12.1 percent, to \$36,000 in 1998. The real income of Puerto Rican renter households also increased substantially, by 8.7 percent to \$17,000. However, their income was still the lowest among the major racial and ethnic renter households, only 65.4 percent of the income of all renter households. The real income of black renter households also improved, by 2.0 percent to \$21,800. On the other hand, the real income of Asian renter households, at \$32,000 in 1998, did not change meaningfully from three years earlier, while that of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renters dropped by 5.0 percent to \$21,800.

The real median income of Puerto Rican owner households surged by 13.9 percent to \$54,800 in 1998, outpacing the median income of \$53,000 for all owner households and almost reaching the median income level of white owner households, \$55,000, which increased only by 2.8 percent. The real median income of black owner households also climbed substantially, by 6.5 percent, to \$49,000. However, the real median income of Asian owner households dropped by 5.1 percent to \$57,000, although their income was still the highest among the major racial and ethnic groups of owners in 1998. The real income of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic owner households dropped significantly by 4.5 percent to \$46,000.

# Household Income by Household Size

In general, the larger the household, the higher the median household income. The primary reason for this relationship is that, in general, the larger the household size, the more workers in the household, with a mean of 0.57 workers for a one-person household, 1.51 workers for a three-person household, and 2.15 workers for a six-person household. This relationship was maintained even for households with children, albeit less strongly. In turn, the more workers in a household, the higher was the household income. This relationship was maintained for each racial and ethnic group in 1998. A similar relationship emerged from the distributions for both renter and owner households.

# Individual Incomes by Race and Ethnicity, Educational Attainment, and Employment

In 1998, the median income of Asian households was very close to that of white households. However, of individuals 18 years old or older who had full-time jobs in 1998, the median income of Asians was only \$30,000, or 69.8 percent of the comparable white income of \$43,000. On the other hand, the mean number of employed persons in Asian households was 1.54, higher than that of any other major racial and ethnic group, including whites, whose mean number of employed persons was

only 1.09, the second lowest of all racial and ethnic groups. From this, it is reasonable to conclude that the high median income of Asian households resulted mostly from the large number of employed persons in such households.

The median income of Puerto Rican households was the lowest of any racial and ethnic group. However, the median income of Puerto Rican individuals was not. Thus, it is logical to say that their smaller average number of employed persons--0.99, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group—probably contributed most to the lower income of Puerto Rican households.

Furthermore, the median income of Puerto Ricans with the highest level of educational attainment was higher than that of blacks, non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, and equal to Asians with the same levels of education. Of individuals who had full-time jobs, the median income of Puerto Ricans was \$27,697, only 64.4 percent that of whites. However, the median income of Puerto Ricans who had completed at least college and had full-time jobs was \$35,000, or 74.5 percent that of whites with the same level of education and the same as that of blacks with a similar education. Moreover, of individuals who had gone to graduate school and had full-time jobs, the median income of Puerto Ricans was higher than that of either blacks or non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, and was 81.8 percent that of whites. In short, the number of employed persons and the level of their educational attainment are key determinants of the level of household income.

# Household Income by Household Types

The median income of adult households, consisting of two or more adults, increased by 8.0 percent to \$55,000 in 1998, the highest of any household type, as in 1995.

The median income of adult households with minor children increased by 3.7 percent to \$43,600. The median income of households headed by a single adult with minor children soared by 18.7 percent to \$12,200, although this was still extremely low and only 37.0 percent of the median income of all households in 1998.

The median income of single-elderly households also grew, by 6.0 percent to \$10,900, although this was still the lowest income of any household type and only about a third of the median income of all households in 1998. On the other hand, the median income of single-adult households decreased by 3.3 percent to \$30,000. The median income of elderly households, which was \$27,900 in 1998, did not change appreciably during the three-year period.

# Sources of Household Income by Race and Ethnicity

Between 1995 and 1998, the proportion of households relying on Public Assistance as the primary source of income dropped by 3.0 percentage points, to 6.8 percent. The proportion citing earnings as the primary income source rose by a similar 3.2 percentage points to 71.8 percent.

Of white households, the proportion receiving income primarily from earnings increased by 2.4 percentage points to 69.9 percent, while the proportion whose income came primarily from Social

Security declined by 1.9 percentage points to 17.5 percent in the three years between 1995 and 1998. Of black households, the proportion citing Public Assistance as their primary source of income dropped markedly by 4.1 percentage points to 9.1 percent. At the same time, the proportion that cited earnings as their primary source of income climbed by a commensurate 4.0 percentage points to 72.0 percent. Of Puerto Rican households, the proportion that cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income plummeted by 8.0 percentage points to 19.2 percent, while the proportion citing earnings rose by 4.9 percentage points to 62.5 percent. The proportion of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households that cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income dropped substantially by 6.2 percentage points to 10.8 percent, while the proportions that cited earnings or Social Security moved up by 4.5 percentage points to 76.2 percent and by 2.4 percentage points to 8.4 percent respectively. For Asian households, there was no substantial change in the relative importance of various sources of income; close to nine in ten received their income primarily from earnings, the highest proportion of any racial/ethnic group.

# Sources of Household Income by Household Type

The proportion of households with children headed by a single adult citing earnings as their primary source of income soared by 12.1 percentage points, while the proportion that cited Public Assistance plummeted by 16.5 percentage points between 1995 and 1998.

# Poor Households (Households with Incomes below the Federal Poverty Level)

The number of poor households (households with incomes below the federal poverty level) in the City decreased by 6.4 percent, or by 37,000, from 573,000 in 1995 to 537,000 in 1998. Poor households included 533,000 children (under the age of 18) living below the poverty level. The poverty rate (poor households' proportion of all households) declined by 1.9 percentage points from 20.6 percent to 18.7 percent. The poverty rates for renter and owner households were profoundly different: 24.5 percent for renter households and 6.4 percent for owner households.

For black households, the poverty rate dropped by 4.2 percentage points from 26.5 percent in 1995 to 22.3 percent in 1998, as the number of poor black households dropped by 28,000. The poverty rate for Puerto Rican households also dropped substantially, by 4.0 percentage points to 33.6 percent, as the number of poor Puerto Rican households fell by 14,000.

The number of poor non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households increased by 11,000, or by 11.7 percent, between 1996 and 1999. However, their poverty rate still decreased by 1.6 percentage points to 28.7 percent, because the number of non-poor non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households increased by a much larger 45,000, or by 20.9 percent. For white households, the poverty rate decreased by 1.1 percentage points to 11.5 percent. The number of poor Asian households rose by 7,000, with a resulting poverty-rate increase of 1.6 percentage points to 15.5 percent.

For households with children headed by a single adult, the poverty rate was 51.8 percent, the highest of any household type in 1998 and 2.8 times higher than the overall rate, although it dropped substantially by 7.0 percentage points from 1995, when it was 58.8 percent. Single-elderly households

also had an especially high poverty rate at 32.1 percent, 1.7 times the overall rate, although this was also down considerably, by 4.0 percentage points, from 36.1 percent in 1995. On the other hand, adult households had a poverty rate of only 6.6 percent, the lowest of any household type and about one-third the overall rate.

Only a little more than half of poor householders had finished high school, compared to more than eight in ten of non-poor householders. Only 32.2 percent of poor householders participated in the labor force, compared to 72.7 percent of non-poor householders. Only about half (51.5 percent) of the poor households in the City received cash Public Assistance, down from 54.2 percent in 1993. Seven in ten poor Puerto Rican households received it.

# Cash-Public-Assistance-Recipient Households

In 1999, 16.7 percent of households in the City received cash Public Assistance, a 2.5 percentage-point drop from 19.2 percent in 1996. Cash Public Assistance includes money payments under Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or Family Assistance (previously called AFDC), Safety Net (formerly Home Relief), and Supplemental Security Income (SSI), including aid to the blind and the disabled.

Between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of Puerto Rican households receiving Public Assistance plummeted by 5.8 percentage points to 35.9 percent, although this rate was still the highest of any racial/ethnic group. For black households and non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households, the proportions declined by 3.9 percentage points to 22.5 percent and by 3.7 percentage points to 26.8 percent respectively. For white households, the proportion declined slightly to 7.4 percent, while it remained virtually the same for Asian households. Major characteristics of all households receiving Public Assistance mirror those of poor households.

# Labor Force Participation and Occupational and Industrial Patterns

The labor force participation rate in the City stood at 61.9 percent in 1999, a considerable improvement over 1996, when it was 59.2 percent.

Of those not in the labor force, four in ten said it was because they were retired, while two in ten cited schooling or training and another three in ten cited family responsibilities/childcare (16.1 percent) or ill health/physical disability (14.2 percent) as the reason they were not in the labor force.

The labor force participation rates for whites and blacks, 61.6 percent and 62.1 percent respectively, were in parity with the overall citywide rate of 61.9 percent. But the rates for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics and Asians, 64.7 percent and 65.5 percent respectively, were noticeably higher than the citywide rate, while the rate for Puerto Ricans, only 54.5 percent, was the lowest of any racial and ethnic group.

The majority of white individuals (55.4 percent) cited retirement as their major reason for not

working or looking for work, while well below half of the individuals in the other major racial and ethnic groups cited this as the reason.

Of black individuals who were not in the labor force, three in ten cited schooling or training as the reason. For Puerto Ricans, ill health or physical disability was a pervasive reason: 26.9 percent cited this as the reason. On the other hand, a quarter of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics cited family responsibilities or childcare. The two major reasons cited by Asians were family responsibilities/ childcare (26.2 percent) and going to school/getting training (27.1 percent).

The comparatively higher proportions among blacks, Asians, and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics citing schooling or other training as their reason for not currently being in the labor force may bode well for their later participation in the labor force and future earnings ability.

Slightly more New Yorkers had jobs in one of the two best-paid categories, professional or managerial, and slightly fewer had jobs in the lowest-paid category, laborer, in 1999 than in 1996.

# Employment by Major Industrial Groups

The proportional distribution of City residents' employment by industrial groups in 1999 was very similar to what it had been three years earlier. In 1999, the industry of professional services, the largest industry in the City, employed 29.3 percent of the City's workers, or close to a million individuals. As the City's second-largest industry group, the retail trade industry employed 14.1 percent of the City's workers, or 461,000 individuals. The FIRE industry group (Finance, Insurance and Real Estate), the third largest industry in the City, employed 10.7 percent of the City's workers, or another 350,000 individuals. One in ten individuals in the City worked in transportation, while 8.4 percent had jobs in durable or non-durable manufacturing. The proportions of individuals employed in construction, personal services, or government were 4.5 percent each.

Individuals with jobs in entertainment or professional services had the highest educational attainment levels: more than half had at least received college degrees. Individuals employed in the Finance, Insurance, Real Estate or government categories also had relatively higher levels of educational attainment: more than seven in ten had finished at least some college work. Also, residents with jobs in the transportation category had higher than average levels of educational attainment: six in ten had finished high school or had done some college work. On the other hand, individuals who had jobs in construction had the lowest level of educational attainment: two-thirds had finished only high school or less. Individuals in retail or wholesale trade, personal services, and durable or non-durable manufacturing had lower levels of educational attainment as well.

# New York City's Housing Inventory

#### Size of the Housing Inventory

The 1999 HVS reports that the City's total inventory of residential units in 1999 was over 3 million for the first time. Between 1991 and 1993, there was no appreciable change in the number of residential accommodations. But in the next three years, through 1996, the housing inventory began to grow, as the total number of housing units increased by a net of 18,000, from 2,977,000 to 2,995,000. In the following three years, the inventory grew by a net of 44,000 units, or by about 15,000 units per year, to 3,039,000 in 1999, a back-to-back increase and the largest net increase since 1991.

According to the Census 2000, there were 3,201,000 housing units in the City in 2000, or 162,000 more units than the number reported from the 1999 HVS. In addition to the one year's difference in time between the two surveys, there are three other major reasons why the count of housing units is greater in the Census 2000 than in the 1999 HVS. First, the term "housing unit" is defined differently for the two surveys. For the 1999 HVS, which was based on the 1990 census, the U.S. Bureau of the Census defined a housing unit as a house, apartment, single room, or group of rooms occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters were those in which the occupants lived and ate separately from any other persons in the building and which had direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. For vacant units, the criteria of separateness and direct access were applied to the intended occupants. The Census Bureau modified the housing unit definition for the Census 2000 by removing the requirement that occupants had to eat separately in order for the living quarters to be considered a housing unit. Under the new definition, a small number of living quarters not previously considered housing units were counted as housing units in the Census 2000. For the HVS, housing units in "special places" are considered beyond the scope of the survey. Special places include transient hotels, rooming and boarding houses, prisons, dormitories, and nursing homes. In the Census 2000, all such units were counted.

The second reason for the difference is that the City provided the Census Bureau with more than 370,000 housing unit addresses that were missed in the 1990 census or subsequently added following the 1990 census. Third, the Census Bureau made an effort to find and count every housing unit and to reduce the undercount in 2000. The 1999 HVS sample was originally selected from the 1990 census, where the undercount was higher, and the weighting for the HVS used estimates based on the 1990 census. Finally, for the HVS, data were collected by survey interviewers, while, for the Census 2000, data were primarily gathered by mail. Moreover, the HVS is a sample survey--that is, only households in the selected sample were interviewed--while the census is a complete count of all people and housing units in the City. A confluence of the preceding reasons makes the HVS count of housing units different from the Census 2000 count. The first three reasons, and particularly the second, make the count of housing units greater in the Census 2000 than in the 1999 HVS.

The net increase of 44,000 housing units in the City overall between 1996 and 1999 was the net result of the following changes in the three major sectors of the housing stock: a very substantial increase in the number of owner units, which may be occupied or vacant for sale, by 74,000 or 8.7 percent; a decrease of 10,000 in the total number of occupied and vacant available rental units; and a sizeable decrease of 21,000 or 19.2 percent in the total number of vacant units unavailable for sale or rent.

Rental units still accounted for the great majority of the overall housing stock in the City in 1999. Of all 3,039,000 housing units in the City in 1999, 66.4 percent were rental units and 30.7 percent were owner units, while the remaining 2.9 percent were vacant units that were unavailable for sale or rent.

The net decrease of 10,000 rental units in the three years between 1996 and 1999 resulted from the combination of the decrease in vacant units and the increase in occupied rental units. In the three years, the number of vacant units decreased by 17,000, or by 20.7 percent, while the number of occupied rental units increased by only 7,000.

The total number of owner units amounted to 932,000, with a net increase of 74,000 units, in the three years, as the number of occupied owner units increased by 81,000, or by 9.7 percent, while the number of vacant owner units decreased by 7,000.

# Overall Changes in Components of Inventory

The net increase in the total number of housing units is the outcome of the variation between gross additions to and gross losses from each component of the inventory over the period between the two survey years. Over the three years between 1996 and 1999, 87,000 housing units (or 29,000 units per year) were added to and 43,000 units (or 14,000 units per year) were lost from the housing inventory in the City, largely through smaller units being merged into larger ones, as discussed in more detail below.

# Additions to the Stock

Yearly gross additions were about 29,000 between June 1996 and May 1999. This is 2.4 times the annual gross additions for the 1991-1993 period and 1.6 times the annual gross additions for the 1993-1996 period. Almost four in ten of the additions for the 1996-1999 period came from returned losses (34,000 units that had been previously lost but returned to the active housing inventory through gut-rehabilitation or changes in use or physical characteristics), while about a quarter came from newly constructed units (21,000 units). At the same time, a little more than a third came either from conversions within the residential sector (5.7 percent or 5,000 units) or from the non-residential to the residential sector or from other additions (31.0 percent or 27,000 units). "Other additions" identifies units that were not in the housing inventory at the time of the 1990 decennial census but were added, by means not measured, by new construction or conversions. This includes the decoupling of once merged larger units into smaller ones, by which units are added to the inventory, and the rehabilitation of buildings, which results in more units than there were before. The term also reflects changes made to the methodology used to develop "control" estimates between the 1993, 1996, and 1999 surveys. These estimates are developed independently of the survey and are used to control for under- or over-coverage of housing units in the survey.

# **Returning Losses**

Since the 1975-1978 period, when the HVS for the first time provided data on returning losses, returning losses have always accounted for the largest single source of all additions to the housing stock

in New York City reported in each HVS. Specifically, the number of returned units reported by the main 1999 HVS for the 1996-1999 period was 34,000, or 1.6 times the 21,000 newly constructed units during the same three-year period.

The 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses (which is a separate, independent survey from the main 1999 HVS) estimates that an additional 10,000 units lost between 1970 and 1987 and not returned through 1987 were returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999. Most of these units were missed in the 1980 and 1990 censuses due to undercounts in the two censuses. None of the returned units that this 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses found were covered in any components of the housing inventory estimated by the 1999 HVS because they were not part of the housing inventory in the 1990 decennial census, nor were they included in the lists of new construction and conversions from which the remaining sample was drawn.

When the number of returned units from the 1999 HVS is combined with the number of returned units from the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses, the total number of returned units is 44,000, more than double the number of newly constructed units between 1996 and 1999 that the 1999 HVS reports.

Of the 34,000 units returned between 1996 and 1999, from the main 1999 HVS, 24.1 percent had been either vacant, boarded-up/burned-out (13.2 percent) or condemned or undergoing renovation (10.9 percent) in 1996. Thus, it is reasonable to infer that only 24.1 percent, or about 8,000, of the 34,000 returned units could have been returned through gut-rehabilitation, major renovation, or other housing-creation mechanisms, rather than the decoupling of once-merged units, which provided 59.5 percent of the City's returning losses.

In the meantime, 70.0 percent of the 10,000 returned units from the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses that were lost between 1970 and 1987 and not returned through 1987 but returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999 were either vacant, boarded-up/burned-out (42.0 percent) or in the process of rehabilitation or construction (28.0 percent) in 1996. Therefore, 70.0 percent, or 7,000, of the 10,000 returned units from the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses were likely to have been returned through rehabilitation or new construction, rather than through decoupling. Combining the 21,000 newly constructed units and the 15,000 units returned (8,000 units plus 7,000), a total of 36,000 units were added to the housing inventory through rehabilitation or new construction.

Between the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, HPD created 9,574 affordable units through new construction and gut-rehabilitation programs. In addition, 12,666 new units were constructed through HPD's tax incentive programs (421A and 421B). Altogether, 22,240 units were created with HPD's assistance. This is 61.8 percent of the 36,000 units added to the City's housing inventory by new construction, rehabilitation, or other housing-creation mechanisms (excluding decoupling) over the three years. In other words, about six in ten of the new units created through new construction or rehabilitation in the City over this period of time were added with HPD's assistance.

# Losses from the Stock

During the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, 43,000 units, or 14,000 units annually, were lost from the active housing inventory. This is 16.7 percent higher than the annual gross loss of 12,000 for the previous three years between 1993 and 1996. Mergers (the consolidation of smaller units into larger ones) have been the preponderate source of losses in the City. In the 1996-1999 period, 56.7 percent of losses were through mergers. As household income has grown steadily in the City, demand for larger units has increased. As a result, activities to create larger units through the merger of smaller units into larger ones have expanded. On the other hand, if the demand for smaller units becomes greater than the demand for larger units, most of the units lost through mergers could return to the inventory. Another 21.1 percent of losses came through units that were converted to non-residential units, such as commercial units.

The proportion of losses through units that were boarded-up/damaged by fire, usually termed "abandoned," was only one in ten for the period between 1996 and 1999, half the proportion for the previous period between 1993 and 1996. From this, it is clear that the increase in losses between 1996 and 1999, compared to the previous three-year period, was primarily the result of more mergers, not abandonment.

In this regard, HPD has developed and implemented a comprehensive anti-abandonment program to break the cycle of abandonment. The agency has prevented abandonment through providing low-interest loans, at an early stage, to owners whose buildings are at risk of abandonment. It has also developed and conducted education programs designed to teach owners how to maintain buildings, build and keep good relationships with tenants, and manage building finances. In addition, it has expanded housing maintenance code inspections and litigation efforts and support for tenant-initiated actions. Together with the Police Department, the Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office, LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation), and local development groups, HPD launched the Safe at Home initiative to combat illegal drug activity and to improve quality of life in targeted neighborhoods. All of these programs have apparently helped prevent abandonment and, thus, improve the condition of privately owned housing in the City.

# Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Structure Class

Of all occupied and vacant-available units, three in ten, or 859,000 units, were in either Old-Law tenement (7.0 percent or 197,000 units) or New-Law tenement (23.5 percent or 661,000 units) multi-family structures. Almost all Old-Law tenements were in two boroughs: Manhattan (121,000 units or 61.3 percent) and Brooklyn (70,000 units or 35.5 percent).

Almost nine in ten New-Law tenements were located in three boroughs: Manhattan (209,000 units or 31.7 percent), Brooklyn (204,000 units or 30.8 percent), and the Bronx (163,000 units or 24.7 percent).

In 1999, three-quarters of the 788,000 units in one- and two-family houses in the City were located in either Queens (333,000 units or 42.2 percent) or Brooklyn (256,000 units or 32.5 percent).

# Inventory Composition by Building and Unit Size

Close to half of all occupied and vacant-available units in the City were located in small buildings with fewer than twenty units (48.1 percent), with 26.7 percent in buildings with one or two units. Another about three in ten of all units were in buildings with 20-99 units (17.2 percent in buildings with 20-49 units and 14.6 percent in buildings with 50-99 units), while the remaining one in five were in the largest buildings with 100 or more units (20.1 percent).

Two-thirds of all 2,950,000 occupied and vacant-available units in the City were either units with one bedroom (33.9 percent) or units with two bedrooms (33.8 percent). Another quarter had three or more bedrooms (25.3 percent). The remaining 7.0 percent of units were studios.

#### Change in Number of Units by Rent Regulation Status

In 1999, the number of rent-controlled units was 53,000, or 2.6 percent of the total number of rental units in the City. These units housed 87,000 people. During the five-year period between 1991 and 1996, the number of rent-controlled units in the City declined by 54,000, or by 43.3 percent, from 124,000 to 71,000. In the next three years, this downward trend continued, with an additional decline of 18,000 units, or 25.5 percent.

The number of rent-stabilized units in the City totaled 1,046,000 in 1999. This was the largest single rent-regulation category, covering 51.9 percent of all rental units in the City. These units housed 2,430,000 individuals, or one in every three people in the City. The number of rent-stabilized units increased by 42,000, or 4.1 percent, from 1,011,000 to 1,052,000, during the five-year period between 1991 and 1996 but declined slightly by 6,000, or by 0.6 percent, in the following three years.

The number of unregulated rental units increased by 27,000, or by 4.7 percent, to 603,000 units between 1996 and 1999. This increase was the exclusive consequence of an increase of 27,000 in the number of unregulated rental units in rental buildings, while the number of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings remained practically unchanged.

The number of *in rem* units fell by 9,000, or by 34.2 percent, from 25,000 units in 1996 to 17,000 units in 1999. This was a back-to-back major reduction in such units. Between 1993 and 1996, the number of *in rem* units dropped by 11,000, or by 30.4 percent, from 36,247. Thus, during the six-year period from 1993 to 1999, the number of *in rem* units decreased by 20,000, or by 54.3 percent. This drop in the number of *in rem* units was the result of HPD's effective implementation of programs designed to halt and reverse the deterioration and abandonment of the existing housing stock, while returning properties acquired by the City through tax-foreclosures to responsible private owners and building public-private partnerships and programs that help revitalize neighborhoods by promoting investment and involving neighborhood resources.

# Rental and Owner Housing Units in Cooperatives and Condominiums

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of occupied and vacant-available units in cooperatives

(excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives) and condominium buildings in the City grew by 37,000, or by 9.1 percent, to 447,000 in 1999. This was 15.2 percent of the total number of occupied and vacant-available units in the City. Of units in cooperatives and condominium buildings, two-thirds, or 296,000 units, were owner units (66.3 percent), while the remaining 151,000 were rental units, evenly divided into rent-regulated units and unregulated rental units.

More than three-quarters of all units in cooperative and condominium buildings were concentrated in two boroughs: 207,000 units in Manhattan (46.2 percent) and 135,000 units in Queens (30.2 percent).

Of all 296,000 owner units in cooperative and condominium buildings, eight in ten were concentrated in Manhattan (152,000 units or 51.1 percent) and Queens (84,000 or 28.2 percent).

Of the 75,000 rent-regulated units and another 75,000 unregulated rental units in such buildings, seven in ten were concentrated in Manhattan (36.6 percent) and Queens (34.0 percent).

# Size of Rental Units

Of the 2,018,000 occupied and vacant-available rental units in the City, half were smaller units, either studio units with no bedroom (8.8 percent) or one-bedroom units (41.0 percent), and half were larger units, either units with two bedrooms (35.9 percent) or units with three or more bedrooms (14.3 percent).

The public housing, *in rem*, and rent-unregulated categories provide more larger units than either all rental categories as a whole or other rent-regulation categories. Of public housing units, 72.7 percent were either two-bedroom units (47.6 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (25.1 percent). Of *in rem* units, 67.8 percent were either two-bedroom units (39.1 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (28.7 percent).

Of unregulated rental units, 63.5 percent were either two-bedroom units (41.0 percent) or threeor-more-bedroom units (22.5 percent). On the other hand, proportionately more rent-stabilized units were smaller units. Of all rent-stabilized units, six in ten were either studios (12.3 percent) or onebedroom units (48.7 percent).

# Changes in the Ownership Rate and Owner Unit Inventory

The homeownership rate in New York City increased by 1.9 percent in the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, from 30.0 percent to 31.9 percent.

The homeownership rate for white households increased from 40.1 percent in 1996 to 42.0 percent, the highest of any racial and ethnic group and 1.3 times the city-wide rate of 31.9 percent. The rate for Asian households was 35.2 percent, a substantial improvement from 31.7 percent in 1996. This rate was the second highest of all racial and ethnic groups and considerably higher than the citywide rate.

The rates for the other racial and ethnic groups were lower than the city-wide rate. For black households, the rate was 28.5 percent in 1999, after back-to-back improvements from 22.5 percent in 1993 to 25.1 percent in 1996. The rate for Puerto Rican households also had back-to-back improvements, rising from 12.0 percent in 1993 to 13.2 percent in 1996 and 14.6 percent in 1999, although it was still extremely low. The rate for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was disproportionately low, only 12.7 percent, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group and just 39.8 percent of the citywide rate; this homeownership rate was the same as in 1991.

The number of occupied and vacant-available owner units in the City increased back-to-back, from 825,000 in 1993 to 858,000 in 1996 and to 932,000 in 1999. Particularly during the three years between 1996 and 1999, the number of owner units soared by 74,000, or by 8.7 percent. In the six years between the 1993 HVS and the 1999 HVS--that is, from June 1993 to May 1999--the number of owner units jumped by 107,000, or by 12.9 percent. During the similar six-year period between July 1993 and June 1999, 10,644 families became owners through HPD's various programs to offer more affordable owner-housing units in the City.

Owner units, occupied and vacant-available together, consisted of the following four legal forms of ownership: conventional (62.2 percent), private cooperatives (26.2 percent), Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (6.0 percent), and condominiums (5.6 percent).

The number has increased in each legal form of ownership since 1993, although the rate of increase has varied from one form of ownership to another. The number of private cooperative units increased considerably between 1996 and 1999 by 40,000 units, or 19.8 percent, to 244,000 units. The number of condominium units increased by 6,000 units, or by 13.8 percent, to 52,000 in 1999. At the same time, the number of conventional owner units increased by 25,000, or by 4.5 percent, to 580,000 units.

# Owner Units by Year of Home Purchase

Of all owners in the City, 87,000, or 9.5 percent, had bought the units they were occupying within the previous eighteen months, between January 1998 and June 1999, when the Census Bureau completed interviewing the sample-unit households for the 1999. This was an increase of 29,000, or 50.7 percent, over the 58,000 units owners bought during the equivalent eighteen-month period between January 1995 and June 1996, when the 1996 HVS interviews were completed.

In addition, 189,000 owners, or 20.7 percent of all owners in the City, purchased their units during the three-year period between January 1995 and December 1997. This is an increase of 18,300 owner units over the 171,000 units that owners bought during the three-year period between January 1992 and December 1994. In sum, a total of 276,000 owners, or 30.2 percent of all owners in the City, had bought their units between January 1995 and June 1999.

This increase in home purchases in the City was likely the result of growth in the owner housing market in recent years, as households' incomes, even after inflation, increased considerably. Labor force participation and education levels rose while the incidence of major crimes plunged. HPD's expanded programs to create affordable owner housing and educate the public on homeownership opportunities

in the City undoubtedly contributed greatly to the increase in home purchases. As the owner housing market improved, many owner units that were previously rented out could also have been sold.

# Owner Units by Estimated Market Value

The proportion of owner units with higher estimated market values increased, while the proportion with lower market values decreased. In 1999, 20.6 percent of the owner units in the City, excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, had an estimated market value of \$300,000 or more, a 5.9 percentage-point-increase over 1996, when the figure was 14.7 percent. On the other hand, the proportion of owner units with a market value of less than \$150,000 was 25.4 percent in 1999, an almost equivalent 5.2 percentage-point-decrease from 1996, when the figure was 30.6 percent.

In 1999, 128,000 owner units, or one in seven of the owner units in the City (excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives) were valued at less than \$100,000. Almost eight in ten of these units were private cooperatives; 48.6 percent were located in Queens and another 38.4 percent were distributed in the two boroughs of Brooklyn and Manhattan. Although they were the least expensive and smallest of owner units, they were not in much poorer condition, compared to owner units in the City overall.

# Housing Units Accessible to Physically Disabled Persons

In 1999, only 469,000 units, or 42.4 percent of all units in multiple dwellings with elevators in the City, were determined to be accessible to people with physical disabilities requiring the use of a wheelchair, when all five accessibility criteria covered in the 1999 HVS are applied at once. This is an increase of 54,000, or 13.0 percent, over the number of such units in 1996.

Of units in multiple dwellings without elevators, the number of accessible units was very small. In 1999, of the 827,000 units in such buildings, for which there was full information about each accessibility criterion, only 19,000 units, or 2.3 percent, met all three HVS accessibility criteria for buildings without elevators, a slight increase over the 14,000 such units in 1996.

# Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates

# The Overall Rental Vacancy Rate in New York City

The 1999 HVS reports that, between 1996 and 1999, the number of vacant-for-rent units decreased by 17,000, or by 20.7 percent, bringing the number of vacant rental units down to 64,000 in 1999 and lowering the vacancy rate for units available for rent in the City from 4.01 percent in 1996 to 3.19 percent in 1999. The 1999 rental vacancy rate is the lowest reported by the HVS since 1991 and is significantly lower than 5.0 percent and, thus, meets the legal definition of a housing emergency in the City, as defined by New York State and City rent-regulation laws, requiring a continuation of both rent-control and rent stabilization in the City.

# Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Location

The rental vacancy rate declined in all boroughs, except Staten Island, between 1996 and 1999. In the Bronx in 1999, the number of vacant rental units was 17,000, and the rental vacancy rate was 5.04 percent, while it was 5.43 percent in 1996. Thus, in two consecutive survey years, the vacancy rate in the borough remained at or above 5.00 percent.

The rental vacancy rate in Staten Island was 5.82 percent in 1999, but the number of rental units in the borough was very small: only 56,000 occupied and vacant-available rental units.

The rental vacancy rate in Brooklyn was 3.26 percent in 1999; the number of vacant rental units was 20,000. In Manhattan, the rate was 2.57 percent; the number was 15,000. In Queens, the rate was the lowest, at 2.11 percent; the number was 9,000.

# Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Rent-Regulation Categories

The vacancy rate for rent-stabilized units decreased considerably, from 3.57 percent to 2.46 percent, as the number of vacant rent-stabilized units dropped from 38,000 in 1996 to 26,000 in 1999.

The rental vacancy rate for vacant unregulated rental units declined slightly from 5.29 percent to 4.98 percent. The number of vacant units in this category, 30,000 in 1996, remained virtually unchanged three years later, while the number of occupied units in the category increased considerably by 28,000 units during the three-year period.

The vacancy rate for unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings was disproportionately higher than the other sector of this category in 1999--13.25 percent, as opposed to 3.79 percent for unregulated rental units in rental buildings--and more than four times the city-wide rate of 3.19 percent.

Vacant rent-stabilized units and vacant unregulated rental units together accounted for close to nine in ten of all vacant rental units in the City in 1999.

The rental vacancy rate for public housing units decreased substantially, from 3.75 percent in 1996 to 1.92 percent in 1999, as the number of vacant public housing units was cut in half, from 6,000 to 3,000. At the same time, the number of vacant *in rem* units further declined from 1996, becoming negligibly small in 1999.

# Vacancy Rates and Rent Levels

The impact of the shrinkage in availability of vacant rental units in the City was much more seriously felt by low-rent units and gradually receded as rent levels moved up. Between 1996 and 1999, the number of occupied and vacant rental units with rents of less than \$400 declined by 50,000, or by 13.9 percent, while the number of vacant rental units in the same rent level declined by 8,000, or by 66.3 percent. Commensurately, the rental vacancy rate for units in this asking-rent level dropped sharply from 3.21 percent to 1.26 percent in the three years.

The number of occupied and vacant rental units with a rent level of \$400 to \$699 declined by 67,000, or by 7.5 percent, from 896,000 to 829,000, while the number of vacant rental units in the same rent level declined also, by 11,000 units or 30.6 percent. As a result, the rental vacancy rate for units in this rent level declined considerably, from 4.00 percent to 3.00 percent.

The number of occupied and vacant units with rents from \$700 to \$999 increased by 56,000, or by 11.4 percent, while the number of vacant rental units in this rent level decreased by 2,000, or by 8.3 percent. Consequently, the rental vacancy rate dropped from 5.21 percent to 4.29 percent.

The number of occupied and vacant rental units with rents of \$1,000 or more increased by 60,000, or by 24.1 percent; at the same time, the number of vacant rental units in this rent level increased by 4,000, or by 47.3 percent. As a result, the rental vacancy rate for this level increased from 3.33 percent in 1996 to 3.95 percent in 1999.

Vacancy rates in every rent quintile declined. But the rates dropped the most substantially for units with very low rents. Specifically, the vacancy rate for units with rents in the lowest 20 percent was cut by more than half, from 3.06 percent to 1.47 percent, as the number of vacant units in the quintile declined by about half.

As the rental vacancy rate for each cumulative rent interval declined, the level of the decline was most serious for the very low rent levels, gradually receding in seriousness as rent levels move up. For units with asking rents of less than \$300, the rental vacancy rate was 1.02 percent in 1999, dropping from 2.66 percent in 1996. It plummeted from 3.21 percent to 1.26 percent for units renting for less than \$400 and from 3.25 percent to 1.76 percent for units renting for less than \$500. The rental vacancy rates for all of the very low rent levels-less than \$300, less than \$400, and less than \$500-were less than 2.00 percent in 1999.

The rental vacancy rate for all rent-stabilized units was 2.46 percent in 1999. Close to nine in ten vacant rent-stabilized units had asking rents of either \$400-\$599 (29.0 percent), \$600-\$699 (23.2 percent), or \$700-\$899 (34.4 percent). The rental vacancy rate for such units in the lowest of these three rent levels, \$400-\$599, was the lowest at 2.35 percent, rising as the rent-level rose to 3.10 percent for units renting for \$600 to \$699 and 3.97 percent for units renting for \$700-\$899.

Seven in ten vacant unregulated rental units had middle or high levels of rent: \$700-\$899 (32.9 percent), \$900-\$1,249 (17.8 percent), and \$1,250 and over (19.7 percent). The rental vacancy rate for all unregulated rental units was 4.98 percent in 1999. However, the rates for such units with higher rent levels were higher than 5.00 percent: 5.45 percent for units with rents of \$700-\$899, 5.04 percent for units with rents of \$900-\$1,249, and 7.47 percent for units with rents of \$1,250 and over.

# Number of Vacant Rental Units Renting at or below Public Shelter Maximum Allowances

In 1999, the number of rental units renting at or below the Public Assistance Maximum Shelter Allowance that met definitions of quality of housing was estimated to be 187,000--that is, 19,000 units fewer, or 9.3 percent less, than the number of such units three years earlier. (Housing units in the following quality categories are considered to be physically inadequate and were excluded in estimating

the number of physically decent housing units: units with incomplete kitchen and/or bathroom facilities, units in dilapidated buildings, units in buildings with three or more building defects, and units with four or more maintenance deficiencies.) For these 187,000 physically decent low-rent units, the vacancy rate was only 1.35 percent, less than half the rate of 2.85 percent in 1996, as the number such vacant units (6,000) in 1996 was cut in half three years later. Moreover, more than half of this very small number of vacant, physically decent, low-rent units were public housing units. This compelling finding indicates that the pervasive shortage of physically decent housing units that very-low-income households can afford was further accentuated over the three-year period. Thus, very poor households seeking affordable, decent housing had even more difficulty finding it in 1999 than in 1996.

#### Number of Vacant Rental Units Affordable to Median-Income Renter Households

By counting the number of vacant units available for rent at or below 30 percent of the city-wide median income of \$26,000 for renters, it is estimated that the number of privately owned vacant rental units (rent-controlled, rent-stabilized, and rent-unregulated) affordable by households with incomes at least equal to the median renter household income was 21,000 in 1999, 16.3 percent less than the 25,000 such units available in 1996. This decrease is a consequence of the following overlapping situations: there were 17,000 fewer vacant rental units overall in 1999 than in 1996, some of which could well have been units that median-income households could have afforded; rent increases were higher than income increases, as the median asking-rent for vacant units increased by 6.7 percent between 1996 and 1999 (median gross rent for occupied units increased by 3.1 percent), while the median renter household income increased by only 1.7 percent between 1995 and 1998; and there was a decrease in the proportion of vacancies relative to occupancies for units with lower-than-middle levels of rent. However, the number of such vacant and occupied units together stood at 793,000 in 1999. This was 9.6 percent more than the number in 1996. In the meantime, the rental vacancy rate for units that households with incomes at least equal to the median renter household income could afford was 2.61 percent in 1999, a considerable decline over the rate of 3.42 percent in 1996. In short, during the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, the shortage of rental units that even median-income households in the City could afford grew more severe.

# Number of Vacant Rental Units at Fair Market Rents

Applying Fair Market Rents for Existing Section 8, effective October 1998, it is estimated that 1,377,000 physically decent units met the Fair Market Rent limits in 1999; this was 46,000, or 3.5 percent, more than the 1,331,000 such units in 1996. Of this number, 46,000 units were vacant and available for rent; the corresponding vacancy rate was 3.35 percent, considerably lower than three years earlier, when it was 4.39 percent. A little more than half of these vacant units were either studios (7.6 percent) or one-bedroom units (46.8 percent), while the remainder were two-bedroom (33.3 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom (12.3 percent) units. As the overall housing inventory in the City improved significantly, the number of units, occupied and vacant together, at Fair Market Rents expanded. But the availability of vacant units at such rents contracted considerably.

#### Median Asking Rents for Vacant-Available Units by Rent-Regulation Categories

As a result of fewer choices among vacant-available units for most rent levels, inflation-adjusted median asking rents for vacant available units as a whole and for units in most rental categories (except public housing) increased during the 1996-1999 period, although the level of increase varied for different categories. The real median asking rent for a vacant unit increased by 6.7 percent from \$656 to \$700 between 1996 and 1999.

The sharpest asking-rent increase between 1996 and 1999 was the 25.8-percent increase for "other" rent-regulated units, a category that covers publicly-assisted units whose rents are regulated by the federal, state, and/or city governments. The median asking rent for vacant rent-stabilized units as a whole increased by 4.4 percent: 2.2 percent for units in pre-1947 buildings and 8.9 percent for units in post-1947 buildings.

The median asking rents for vacant unregulated rental units as a whole and for such units in rental buildings remained practically unchanged, while the asking rent for such units in cooperatives and condominiums increased by 6.9 percent.

The median asking rent for vacant public housing units declined by 18.8 percent between 1996 and 1999, while the change in the median asking rent for *in rem* units was unappreciably small.

# Vacancy Rates and Building and Unit Characteristics

Between 1996 and 1999, the vacancy rates for units in the various sizes of buildings declined, except for units in buildings with 50 or more units. The rate declined the most sharply for units in small buildings with 6-19 units: from 5.47 percent in 1996 to 2.12 percent in 1999, as the number of vacant units in such buildings declined by 10,000, or by 61.6 percent.

# Rental Vacancy Rates by Structure Class

The rental vacancy rates for units in all structure classes declined between 1996 and 1999, except for units in one- or two-family buildings converted to apartments, the number of which remained unchanged during the three years. The decline was most visible for units in New-Law tenement buildings, where the vacancy rate dropped by 1.23 percentage points to 2.95 percent in 1999, as the number of rental units in such buildings declined by 7,000, or by 30.0 percent.

# Rental Vacancy Rates by Unit Size

The citywide rental vacancy rate for units without a bedroom (studios) was 4.45 percent in 1999, 1.26 percentage points higher than the overall rate of 3.19 percent. However, the rate declines as the size of the unit increases: 3.60 percent for one-bedroom units, 2.83 percent for two-bedroom units, and 2.16 percent for three-or-more-bedroom units. In the City, larger vacant-available rental units were very scarce.

# Length of Vacancies

In 1999, 38,000, or six in ten of the 64,000 vacant rental units in the City, were available on the market only for a short term (less than three months), while the remaining 23,000 vacant rental units were available for a long term (three months or more). Housing and neighborhood conditions of vacant rental units available for a long term were substantially inferior to those of occupied rental units. In 1999, the proportion of long-term vacant rental units in buildings with no building defects was 79.1 percent, compared to 89.1 percent for occupied rental units in the City. At the same time, 21.5 percent of long-term vacant rental units were on streets with boarded-up buildings, while only 8.8 percent of occupied rental units were on streets with such buildings.

Of the 38,000 vacant rental units which were available for a short term, almost nine in ten were either rent-stabilized (44.9 percent) or rent-unregulated (43.3 percent). Of the 23,000 vacant rental units that were available for a long term, half were rent-unregulated, while about a third were rent-stabilized (34.0 percent).

# Turnover

It is estimated that 35.8 percent of occupied rental units in both 1996 and 1999 turned over at least once during the three-year period. Among rental categories, the proportion was highest, 46.9 percent, for unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings. The proportion of turned-over unregulated rental units in rental buildings was 44.5 percent. For rent-stabilized units, it was 36.2 percent. The lowest proportion of turned-over units was in the *in rem* category, 20.5 percent; but the proportion for public housing units was also very low, 21.5 percent.

The proportion of rental units that turned over at least once between 1996 and 1999 was lowest for units in the lowest rent level (less than \$400): 25.3 percent. The proportion moved up steadily to 47.7 percent for the highest rent level (\$1,250 or more) as the level of rent increased.

# Number of Owner Unit Vacancies and Vacancy Rates

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of vacant-available owner units decreased by 7,000, or by 27.9 percent, to 17,000, while the number of occupied owner units increased by 81,000, or by 9.7 percent, to 915,000 units. Consequently, the owner vacancy rate declined from 2.75 percent to 1.82 percent.

# Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Types of Owner Units

In 1996, when the owner vacancy rate was 2.75 percent, half of all vacant owner units were conventional one- or two-family units. In the expanded but relatively tight owner housing market in 1999, with the owner vacancy rate at 1.82 percent, only little more than a third of vacant owner units were conventional units (34.3 percent), while more than half were private cooperative units (52.3 percent). The vacancy rate for conventional owner units was 1.00 percent; for private cooperatives it was 3.64 percent.

# Vacancy Duration by Types of Owner Units

In 1999, 47.0 percent of vacant owner units were available on the market for less than three months, while 53.0 percent were available for three months or more. In 1996, the proportions were equal: half were available for a short term and half were available for a long term.

As in 1996, the vacancy duration of conventional units was much longer than it was for units in other forms of ownership in 1999. Six in ten of the vacant conventional owner units were available for a long term, while half of the vacant private cooperative or condominium units were available for a long term.

#### Vacant Units Unavailable for Rent or Sale

As the utilization of housing units, particularly owner units, increased markedly while the consequent availability of vacant units decreased considerably, the number of vacant units unavailable for rent or sale, for a variety of reasons, plummeted by 21,000, or by 19.2 percent, in the three years between 1996 and 1999.

During the three-year period, the number of vacant units unavailable because they were occupied only for occasional, seasonal, or recreational purposes, rather than as a permanent residence, dropped disproportionately by 16,000, or by 47.7 percent, to 17,000 in 1999. Of all unavailable vacant units, the proportion of unavailable units in this category was 19.6 percent in 1999, compared to 30.8 percent in 1996. Of units in this category, 63.3 percent were in cooperative or condominium buildings, and about 80.0 percent of these were located in Manhattan. The decrease in this category accounts for three-quarters of the decrease of 21,000 in the total number of unavailable vacant units in the City.

During the same three-year period, the proportion of vacant units unavailable because they were either undergoing or awaiting renovation increased from 29.1 percent in 1996 to 36.4 percent in 1999, although the number of such units was relatively stable: 32,000 in 1999, compared to 31,000 in 1996.

Of the 89,000 unavailable vacant units in 1999, close to two-thirds were concentrated in either Manhattan (38.1 percent) or Brooklyn (26.7 percent). The remainder were located mostly in either Queens (18.0 percent) or the Bronx (13.1 percent).

Three in ten of the vacant units unavailable for rent or sale in 1999 were either Old-Law tenements (21.7 percent) or New-Law tenements (9.1 percent), while another three in ten were units in multiple dwellings built after 1929 (29.8 percent). Another close to three in ten were one- or two-family housing units (27.2 percent).

Compared to all occupied and vacant housing units, the physical condition of vacant units unavailable for rent or sale was markedly inferior. Specifically, the dilapidation rate (the proportion of units in dilapidated buildings) for unavailable vacant units was 5.2 percent, compared to 0.8 percent for all occupied and vacant-available units in the City in 1999. Also, 82.1 percent of the unavailable vacant units in 1999 were in buildings with no building defects, while 91.0 percent of all occupied and vacant units were in buildings with no building defects.

Of the 89,000 unavailable vacant units in 1999, 41,000 (or 45.9 percent) were rental units, 17,000 (or 18.7 percent) were owner units, and 17,000 (or 18.9 percent) were unavailable vacant units in 1996. The remaining 15,000 (or 16.5 percent) were units that were not linked to units in 1996, either because they were non-interviews, were newly constructed or gut-rehabilitated, or they were units added to the sample between 1996 and 1999.

# Variations in Rent Expenditure in New York City

# Patterns of Rent Expenditures

In New York City, according to the 1999 HVS, the median monthly contract rent, which excludes tenant payments for utilities and fuel, was \$648, while the median monthly gross rent, which includes utility and fuel payments, was \$700.

From 1996 to 1999, the median contract rent increased by 2.6 percent annually, a 0.6-percent increase after adjusting for inflation. In the same three years, the median gross rent increased by 3.0 percent annually, an inflation-adjusted increase of 1.0 percent annually.

Of renter households, 11.0 percent received various rent subsidies from any of four types of government programs: Section 8, other federal programs, the SCRIE program, and other state and city housing programs. (In this report, the PA shelter allowance is not treated as a rent subsidy, since the Census Bureau covered it in estimating income.)

In 1999, the median contract rent of rent-subsidized units was \$570. This was \$78, or 12.0 percent, lower than the overall median rent of \$648 for all rental units and \$80, or 12.3 percent, lower than the median rent of \$650 for rent-unsubsidized units.

In 1999, of the \$570 median rent for units occupied by subsidized households, only a median of \$181, or 31.8 percent, was paid by the households out of pocket, while more than two-thirds (68.2 percent) was paid by a government rent subsidy. The difference between the median rent and out-of-pocket rent was \$389, more than double the households' out-of-pocket rent. Based on this, it seems reasonable to say that many rent-subsidized households, particularly very poor households, could not have afforded the units they occupied without the rent subsidies they received.

In the three years between 1996 and 1999, after inflation, the numbers of rental units with contract rents between \$1 and \$399 and between \$400 and \$699 decreased by 42,000 units (or by 12.2 percent) and 56,000 units (or by 6.5 percent) respectively. At the same time, the number of rental units with rents between \$700 and \$999 increased by 58,000 units (or by 12.5 percent), while the number of rental units with rents of \$1,000 or more increased by 56,000 units (or by 23.3 percent). A similar pattern was repeated for the rent distributions of both rent-subsidized and rent-unsubsidized units.

# Rents by Location

The real median contract rent increased by 1.9 percent to \$648 between 1996 and 1999, while the

real median household income increased by 1.7 percent between 1995 and 1998. (Income data are for the year before the survey year, while rent data are for the survey year.) In 1999, the median rent in Manhattan was \$727, the highest of any of the boroughs and 12.2 percent higher than the city-wide median of \$648. This was a 5.5-percent increase after inflation, while the real median income in the borough increased by 6.3 percent.

Between 1996 and 1999, the real median rent in Queens increased by 2.0 percent to \$700, the second-highest in the City and 8.0 percent higher than the city-wide median. On the other hand, the real median income in the borough decreased by 2.2 percent between 1995 and 1998. In Staten Island, the median rent, which was \$642 in 1999, did not change much over the three years and remained very close to the city-wide median, while the real median income in the borough increased by 6.8 percent.

The real median rent in Brooklyn increased by 3.8 percent during the three-year period to \$605, which was 6.6 percent lower than the city-wide median in 1999, while the real median income increased by 8.4 percent between 1995 and 1998. The real median rent in the Bronx increased by 2.0 percent to \$550, the lowest of any of the boroughs and 15.1 percent lower than the city-wide median. The real median income in the borough remained practically unchanged.

In 1999, more rental units in the Bronx were lower-rent units, compared to the city-wide pattern. In the borough, six in ten rental units rented for a contract rent between \$1 and \$399 (22.7 percent) or between \$400 and \$599 (36.9 percent), compared to 15.8 percent and 25.4 percent respectively of all rental units in the City. On the other hand, less than 4.0 percent of all units in the borough rented for \$1,000 or more; and less than 1.0 percent rented for \$1,500 or more.

Rental units in Manhattan were distributed in a somewhat bipolar manner among the rent levels in 1999. Of all rental units in the borough, the rents of more than a third (34.8 percent) were \$1,000 or more, while the rents of 17.7 percent were \$1,500 or more. On the other hand, 37.2 percent of all rental units in the borough were low-rent units with rents between \$1 and \$599; the rents for 18.5 percent were between \$1 and \$399.

In Queens, more units had middle-level rents in 1999. In the borough, the rents of six in ten of all rental units were \$600 to \$999, while the proportion of rental units with rents between \$1 and \$399 was only 8.5 percent and the proportion of units with rents of \$1,500 or more was only 1.3 percent.

Of rental units in Brooklyn in 1999, close to two-thirds rented for \$400-\$799 (64.5 percent), while 6.0 percent rented for \$1,000 or more and only 1.0 percent rented for \$1,500 or more. In Staten Island, as in Brooklyn, almost two-thirds of rental units rented for \$400 to \$799 (65.1 percent), while only about one in ten rented for between \$1 and \$399, and another one in ten rented for \$1,000 or more.

# **Rent by Rent-Regulation Categories**

Public housing and *in rem* units were without question more affordable for the poor than units in other rental categories in the City in 1999. The median contract rents of public housing units and *in rem*
units were \$250 and \$280 respectively, the lowest of any rental categories and only 38.6 percent and 43.2 percent of the median rent of \$648 for all rental units in the City.

In 1999, eight in ten *in rem* units rented for a contract rent between \$1 and \$399, while 57.0 percent rented for between \$1 and \$299. At the same time, more than seven in ten public housing units rented for between \$1 and \$399, while six in ten rented for between \$1 and \$299.

The median contract rents of public housing units and *in rem* units rose by 4.6 percent and 5.7 percent respectively between 1996 and 1999. The income of households in *in rem* units increased by 27.7 percent, while the income of public housing households remained virtually unchanged between 1995 and 1998.

In 1999, the rent of rent-controlled units was also very low, \$477 and only 73.6 percent of the overall median rent. A substantially larger proportion of rent-controlled units were low-rent units: of all rent-controlled units in the City, seven in ten rented for between \$1 and \$599; of these, 37.6 percent rented for between \$1 and \$399 and 31.6 percent for \$400 to \$599. Between 1996 and 1999, the rent of rent-controlled units rose by 5.1 percent, from \$454 to \$477, while household income in these units increased by 18.3 percent between 1995 and 1998.

Units in the "other" rent-regulated category--which includes units whose rents are regulated by HUD, the Loft Board, or the provisions of the Article 4 program--were also much more affordable than the average rental units in the City. The median contract rent of units in this category was \$350, or 54.0 percent of the city-wide median.

Of the 1,953,000 occupied rental units in the City in 1999, 573,000, or 29.3 percent, were rentunregulated. Of all occupied unregulated rental units, 507,000, or 88.6 percent, were in rental buildings, while 65,000 were in cooperative or condominium buildings.

In 1999, the median contract rent of all unregulated units was \$750. The rent of such units in private cooperative and condominium buildings was \$860, \$212 or 32.7 percent higher than the city-wide median and the highest of all rent-regulation categories, while the rent of such units in rental buildings was \$750, \$102 or 15.7 percent higher than the city-wide median.

A substantially larger proportion of unregulated rental units rented for middle or higher rents. Eight in ten of all such units rented for a contract rent of \$600 or more: 56.9 percent for \$600 to \$999 and 22.5 percent for \$1,000 or more. One in ten rented for \$1,500 or more.

The median contract rent of unregulated rental units in rental buildings rose by 7.1 percent between 1996 and 1999, from \$700 to \$750, the highest rate of change of any rental category, while the median income of households in these units increased by 9.0 percent between 1995 and 1998. During the periods, the rent of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings increased by 1.4 percent, while the income of those households increased by 6.6 percent.

From 1996 to 1999, the proportion of unregulated rental units renting for between \$1 and \$799 declined, while the proportion of such units renting for \$800 and over increased. Particularly, the proportion of unregulated rental units renting at the highest rent level (\$2,000 and over) soared by 5.0 percentage points for all unregulated rental units, by 3.9 percentage points for such units in cooperative and condominium buildings, and by 5.1 percentage points for such units in rental buildings.

Of all 41,000 rent-unregulated units renting for \$2,000 or more in 1999, 80.8 percent were in rental buildings, while only 19.2 percent were in cooperative or condominium buildings. The number of unregulated units in rental buildings renting for \$2,000 or more soared by 26,000 units--or 3.6 times--from 7,200 in 1996 to 33,300 in 1999. This increase of 26,000 units does not appear to have resulted merely from increases in the rents of units at the next lower rent level, since the entire number of unregulated units renting for \$1,500-\$1,999 in 1996 was only 7,800. Much of the increase appears to consist of units rent-stabilized at the highest levels of rent in 1996 that, between 1996 and 1999, became unregulated rental units as their rents rose above the \$2,000 level. In fact, the 1999 HVS reports that, of the 29,000 unregulated rental units in rental buildings with six or more units renting for \$2,000 or more in 1999, 20,000 units, or 75.0 percent, were rent-stabilized units in 1996.

In 1999, the median contract rent for all unregulated rental units in Manhattan was \$1,995, or 2.7 times the rent for all such units in the City. Unregulated rental units in rental buildings in Manhattan were the most expensive in the City: the 1999 rent for such units was \$2,040, or 2.7 times the rent of all unregulated rental units in rental buildings in the City, which was \$750. The rent of unregulated rental units in cooperatives and condominiums in Manhattan was the second most expensive in the City, \$1,470, or 1.7 times the rent for all such units in the City, which was \$860.

In Manhattan, real median rents for unregulated rental units as a whole and such units in rental buildings jumped extraordinarily by 56.8 percent and 63.7 percent respectively, compared to increases of 2.5 percent and 7.1 percent respectively for the City as a whole.

In 1999, the median rent of rent-stabilized units was \$650, not meaningfully different from the city-wide median. However, the rent for post-1947 rent-stabilized units was much higher than that of pre-1947 rent-stabilized units: \$700 compared to \$620. Of all rent-stabilized units, more than six in ten rented for \$400 to \$799: 30.8 percent for \$400 to \$599 and 31.3 percent for \$600 to \$799. In addition, another three in ten rented for \$800 or more: 13.8 percent for \$800 to \$999 and 15.3 percent for \$1,000 or more (10.2 percent for \$1,000 to \$1,499 and 5.1 percent for \$1,500 or more). Of post-1947 rent-stabilized units, close to a fifth rented for \$1,000 or more: 11.7 percent for \$1,000 to \$1,499 and 6.8 percent for \$1,500 or more.

The median rent of rent-stabilized units rose by 2.2 percent between 1996 and 1999, while household income in those units decreased by 0.5 percent between 1995 and 1998. The rent increase for pre-1947 rent-stabilized units was 2.3 percent, while the income decrease for households in such units was 0.3 percent. At the same time, the rent of post-1947 rent-stabilized units rose by 1.6 percent, while the income of households in those units decreased by 6.9 percent.

The median contract rent for subsidized unregulated rental units in rental buildings was higher than that of all rental units and that of unsubsidized units in this rent-regulation category, while, in most other rental categories, the rent of subsidized units was lower than that of all rental units and that of unsubsidized rental units. The primary reason for the higher rent of subsidized rental units in this category was the fact that a large proportion of households in these units received Section 8 subsidies, the highest of all rent subsidies covered in the 1999 HVS.

The pattern of rent distribution by rent-regulation category in 1996 was repeated in 1999, except

that, in 1999, the number of units renting for between \$1 and \$799 declined, while the number of units renting for \$800 and above increased consequently.

### Rent and Housing and Neighborhood Conditions

A clearly positive relationship between rents and housing and/or neighborhood conditions exists in the City. In 1999, the median contract rent of units in buildings that were not dilapidated was \$650, or \$150 higher than that of units in dilapidated buildings. The rent of units in buildings without any building defects was \$650, but the level of rent decreased steadily as the number of defects increased: \$592 for units in buildings with one building defect type, \$567 for units in buildings with two building defect types, and \$470 for units in buildings with three or more building defect types.

A positive relationship between housing maintenance condition and rent was also vividly displayed. The rent of units without maintenance deficiencies was \$675, falling to \$627, \$595, and \$525 respectively for units with 1-2, 3-4, and 5 or more maintenance deficiencies.

A solidly positive relationship also existed between neighborhood conditions and rent. The rent for units on a street where there were no boarded-up buildings was \$650, while it was \$550 for units on a street where boarded-up buildings were present. The rent level was highest, \$800, for units in neighborhoods rated "excellent" by survey respondents and declined as the neighborhood rating declined: \$650 for units in neighborhoods rated "good"; \$579 for units in neighborhoods rated "fair"; and \$508 for units in neighborhoods rated "poor."

### Rents of Units in Cooperative and Condominium Buildings

The number of all occupied rental units in cooperative or condominium buildings was 141,000 in 1999. This was 10,000, or 6.7 percent, less than the number three years earlier. Most of this reduction came from the rent-regulated category. During the three-year period, the number of rent-regulated units in such buildings dropped by 9,000, or by 11.0 percent, to 75,000 in 1999. This drop represents nine in ten of the rental units in such buildings lost over the three years. As a result, the share of rent-regulated units in such buildings declined from 56.1 percent in 1996 to 53.5 percent in 1999.

In 1999 as in 1996, the rent of unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings was substantially higher than that of rent-regulated units in such buildings. In 1999, the median contract rent of unregulated rental units in such buildings was \$860, which was \$160 or 22.9 percent higher than the rent of rent-regulated units in such buildings. The difference was exceptionally large in Manhattan, where the rent of unregulated rental units in such buildings was \$1,470--that is, \$475, or 47.7 percent, higher than the rent for rent-regulated units.

### Affordability (Rent-Income Ratio) of Rental Housing

The median gross rent-income ratio, or the proportion of income that households spend for the

gross rent of the units they occupy, was 29.4 percent in 1999. This was a slight decline, but the first since 1993, when, as in 1996, the ratio was 30.0 percent.

The overall median gross rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized households was 58.8 percent in 1999. On the other hand, the out-of-pocket rent-income ratio--that is, the portion of the household's income that was actually spent out of pocket for the rent of the subsidized unit--was only 27.8 percent of the household's income. The difference between the rents landlords received, as a proportion of these households' incomes, and the portion of the rent the households actually paid out of pocket, as a proportion of their household income, was extremely large: 31.0 percentage points. Even applying the standard of thirty percent of household income for rent, the affordability gap here was 28.8 percentage points. Thus, many of these subsidized households could not have afforded the apartments they occupied without the subsidy they received.

### Affordability for Different Rent-Regulation Categories

The median gross rent-income ratio for households in rent-controlled units, most of which were elderly households with low incomes, was 33.8 percent, the highest of any rent-regulatory category and 4.4 percentage points higher than the ratio of 29.4 percent for all renter households in 1999.

The rent-income ratio for households in rent-stabilized units was 30.1 percent in 1999, slightly higher than the city-wide ratio. However, the ratio for households in post-1947 rent-stabilized units was 28.7 percent, considerably lower than the city-wide ratio, while the ratio for households in pre-1947 rent-stabilized units was 30.6 percent.

The ratio for unregulated rental units as a whole was 28.4 percent, again considerably lower than the city-wide ratio, while the ratio for unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings was only 24.6 percent, the lowest of any rent regulation category in 1999.

The gross rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized renter households as a whole was 58.8 percent in 1999, while it was 27.8 percent for unsubsidized households. Thus, without subsidies, subsidized households would have had to pay more than twice the proportion of their income for rent that the average renter household or unsubsidized household paid.

The rent burden for subsidized households in unregulated rental units was particularly unbearable. The total rent, as the sum of out-of-pocket rent plus rent subsidy, for rent-subsidized households in rent unregulated units was 86.6 percent of their income in 1999, while the proportion of rent paid out of their own pockets was only 26.2 percent. The resulting difference between their overall rent-income ratio and their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was 60.4 percentage points, and the affordability gap between their overall rent-income ratio and the standard rent-income ratio of 30.0 percent was 56.6 percentage points. As a result, without the subsidies they received, most of these households could not have afforded to rent the units they occupied. This situation of such a high overall rent-income ratio, a lower out-of-pocket rent-income ratio, and a high affordability gap was repeated for subsidized households in rent unregulated units in rental buildings.

In 1999, a high affordability gap situation also occurred for subsidized households in pre-1947

rent stabilized units. The rent-income ratio and the out-of-pocket rent-income ratio for subsidized households in this rent-regulation category were 77.1 percent and 27.5 percent respectively, with an affordability gap of 47.1 percentage points.

From the above, it can be inferred that, in 1999, the affordability gap was so large that subsidized households in general--and subsidized households in unregulated rental units and in pre-1947 rent-stabilized units in particular--were in housing poverty and, without the rent subsidies they received, could not have afforded their apartments and could, thus, have been at great risk of homelessness.

### Affordability by Different Racial and Ethnic Groups

In 1999, the gross rent-income ratio for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was 33.2 percent, 3.8 percentage points higher than the rent-income ratio of 29.4 percent for all renter households and 1.1 percentage points higher than it was for the group in 1996. The reason for the high rent-income ratio for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was not their high rent level, but their low household income level. Their median household income was only \$21,840, the second-lowest household income of any racial and ethnic group and only 84.0 percent of the median household income of all renter households, while their median gross rent was \$670, 95.7 percent of the city-wide median.

The rent-income ratio for Puerto Rican households was 30.6 percent in 1999, slightly higher than the overall ratio but 4.0 percentage points lower than it was for the group three years earlier. The ratio for black households was 29.2 percent in 1999, down 1.4 percentage points from 1996. The ratios for white and Asian households in 1999, 27.5 percent and 28.7 percent respectively, were lower than the citywide ratio and remained virtually unchanged from what they were in 1996.

For non-Puerto Rican Hispanic rent-subsidized households, the median gross rent-income ratio was 68.4 percent, while their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was only 29.2 percent. The difference was 39.2 percentage points. Using thirty percent of household income as the affordability standard, the affordability gap here was 38.4 percent. Based on this, it can be said that, without the rent subsidies they received, most non-Puerto Rican Hispanic rent-subsidized households could not have afforded the apartments they occupied. The rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized white households was also extremely high, 64.6 percent, while their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was 29.8 percent, an affordability gap of 34.6 percentage points.

Other racial and ethnic groups that received some kind of rent subsidy also had to pay a high proportion of their income for rent. It was 58.8 percent for Puerto Rican households, 52.9 percent for Asian households, and 49.2 percent for black households. These groups' out-of-pocket rent-income ratios were 26.9 percent, 28.8 percent, and 26.2 percent respectively. The affordability gaps were 28.8 percentage points, 22.9 percentage points, and 19.2 percentage points respectively.

### Affordability of Rental Housing by Household Type

Single households with minor children paid the highest proportion of their income for rent of

any household group: a seriously high 51.8 percent in 1999, 22.4 percentage points higher than the average renter household in the City. The affordability gap for these households was 21.8 percentage points. The rent burden for single elderly households was also very serious: their median gross rent-income ratio of 51.4 percent was 22.0 percentage points higher than the median rent-income ratio for the City. The affordability gap for these households was 21.4 percentage points. The rent-income ratio for the City approximately for these households was 21.4 percentage points. The rent-income ratio for elderly households was 32.0 percent, 2.6 percentage points higher than the city-wide ratio.

The median gross rent-income ratio for subsidized single households with minor children was unbearably high: 88.3 percent. If these households had had to pay their total rent without any rent subsidy, they would have had to spend almost all of their household income for rent. But because these households received a rent subsidy, the proportion of rent they actually paid out of pocket was only 28.1 percent of their income. The affordability gap was 58.3 percentage points. These households, which were in housing poverty, would have been too poor to afford the rent of the units they occupied, without the subsidy they received, and they might have been at great risk of homelessness, unless they had doubled up with other households.

The total median gross rent-income ratios for rent-subsidized single-elderly and single-adult households were also extremely high: 64.3 percent and 60.0 percent respectively of their household income in 1999. But the proportions of their income that went out of pocket toward rent were 30.6 percent and 27.8 percent respectively, producing affordability gaps of 34.3 and 30.0 percentage points. Again, most of these single-elderly and single-adult households could not have afforded the apartments in which they lived without the rent subsidy they received.

The median gross rent-income ratios for other subsidized household types were lower than the ratio of 58.8 percent for all subsidized households in the City. However, the differences between rent-income ratios and out-of-pocket rent-income ratios and the affordability gaps for these other subsidized households were considerably large. Particularly, the rent-income ratio for subsidized adult households with minor children was 45.4 percent, while their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was 23.0 percent. Their affordability gap was 15.4 percentage points.

It is not high median gross rents that create the very high median gross rent-income ratios for subsidized households. Rather, it is because of the very low incomes of subsidized households that their gross rent-income ratios are so high. The median income of all subsidized households was only \$9,400 in 1998, a mere 36.3 percent of the median household income of all renter households. Subsidized single households with minor children, the household type with the highest affordability gap, were the poorest. Their median income was only \$7,000, a mere 27.1 percent of all renter households' median income and the lowest household income of any household type in 1998. The median incomes of subsidized single adult and single elderly households were also extremely low, \$7,000 and \$7,300 respectively.

In general, the proportion of income that rent-unsubsidized household groups paid for rent was considerably smaller than that paid by subsidized household groups. However, unsubsidized single households with minor children and single-elderly households, in particular, paid disproportionately high proportions of their income for rent: 43.8 percent and 43.2 percent respectively. Again, the cause of this high rent-income ratio for these two unsubsidized household types was their extremely low incomes, not their high rents. The median incomes of these two household types were \$12,000 and \$9,800, only 46.2

percent and 37.6 percent respectively of the median income of all renter households in 1998. Many of these unsubsidized single adult households with minor children and single elderly households needed to receive some kind of rent subsidy in order to lower their seriously high rent burdens.

### Affordability by Rent-Income Ratio Level

In 1999, half of all renter households paid 29.4 percent or more of their income for rent; 21.9 percent paid between 30.0 and 49.9 percent, and 27.1 percent paid 50.0 percent or more.

Of rent-subsidized households in 1999, 75.1 percent paid 30.0 percent or more of their income for rent: 20.1 percent paid between 30.0 percent and 49.9 percent, and the remaining 55.0 percent paid 50.0 percent or more. However, 42.0 percent of subsidized households had out-of-pocket rent-income ratios higher than 30.0 percent. Of this proportion, 25.9 percent had out-of-pocket rent-income ratios between 30.0 percent and 49.9 percent, and the remaining 16.1 percent had ratios of 50.0 percent or more.

The majority of unsubsidized households, 54.8 percent, had rent-income ratios below 30.0 percent in 1999. On the other hand, 45.2 percent had ratios of 30.0 percent or more: 22.3 percent had ratios between 30.0 percent and 49.9 percent; and 22.8 percent had ratios of 50.0 percent or more.

### Affordability by Location

Rental units in Staten Island were the most affordable of all those in the five boroughs in 1999 for the households that occupied them. In Staten Island, where the median gross rent-income ratio was only 26.4 percent, 56.8 percent of renters paid less than 30.0 percent of their income for rent, compared to 50.9 percent of renter households in the City as a whole.

Compared to those in the Bronx and Brooklyn, rental units in Manhattan and Queens were also relatively more affordable overall for their occupants in 1999. In the two boroughs, where the median gross rent-income ratios were 27.7 percent and 28.2 percent respectively, 55.0 percent and 53.5 percent respectively of renter households paid less than 30.0 percent of their income for rent.

Renters in the Bronx paid 33.9 percent of their household income for rent, the highest proportion of any of the boroughs in 1999. The rent-income ratio in Brooklyn was 30.6 percent, higher than the city-wide ratio. In the Bronx and Brooklyn, 43.8 percent and 48.9 percent respectively of renter households paid less than 30.0 percent of their income for rent.

### Housing Conditions in New York City

### Occupied Rental Units in Dilapidated Buildings

The 1999 HVS reports that the dilapidation rate, the proportion of renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings, was just 1.0 percent in 1999, a further improvement over 1996, when the rate was 1.3 percent. The 1999 dilapidation rate was the lowest in the thirty-four-year period since the first HVS in 1965.

The dilapidation rate in Manhattan was 1.6 percent in 1999, while it was 1.8 percent in 1996. The 1999 rate in the borough was still considerably higher than the city-wide rate of 1.0 percent and the highest of any of the boroughs. Of the 19,000 renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings in the City in 1999, close to half were in Manhattan (46.9 percent). Brooklyn accounted for close to a quarter (23.4 percent) of renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings in the City in 1999, but the dilapidation rate in the borough was 0.8 percent, lower than the city-wide rate and an improvement over 1996.

In general, structural condition is closely related to a building's structural type and age. In 1999, almost three-quarters of renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings in the City were either in Old-Law tenements (41.0 percent), which were built before 1901 and where the dilapidation rate was a disproportionately high 4.0 percent, or in New-Law tenements (33.7 percent), which were built between 1901 and 1929 and where the rate was 1.0 percent.

### Occupied Rental Units in Buildings with Structural Defects

The proportion of renter-occupied units in buildings with any of the thirteen building defects was 10.9 percent in 1999, while it was 11.4 percent in 1996.

Between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of renter-occupied units in buildings with one or more building defects declined from 12.0 percent to 9.2 percent in Manhattan and from 9.1 percent to 3.9 percent in Staten Island, while it increased from 14.3 percent to 15.8 percent in the Bronx.

Structural condition, as measured by building defects, is associated with building structure class and age. In 1999, of occupied renter units in Old-Law tenement buildings, 21.8 percent were in buildings with one or more building defects, the highest percentage of any structure class, as in 1996, when it was 23.0 percent, and twice the city-wide proportion. Of occupied rental units in New-Law tenement buildings, 17.6 percent were in buildings with one or more defects.

Of rent-stabilized units in buildings built in or before 1947, one in six were in buildings with one or more building defects, compared to one in thirty such units in buildings built after 1947. The proportion of rent-controlled units in buildings with building defects was also high: 12.8 percent compared to the city-wide proportion of 10.9 percent.

The structure of public housing in the City was very good. Only a little more than one in twenty public housing units were in buildings with one or more building defects. The proportion of units in *in rem* buildings with one or more defects was 54.8 percent in 1999. The proportion remains high because, first, *in rem* units are in tax-delinquent buildings that were not properly maintained or repaired by the owner for a long period of time, and improvements to a building's structural condition after the City takes over also require a long period of time; and, second, HPD returns to responsible private owners *in rem* buildings that have been upgraded for the good of tenants to a better overall condition (by repairing or replacing critical building systems), at which time the buildings are no longer classified as *in rem*. Nevertheless, the number of *in rem* units in structurally poor buildings was cut by 36.6 percent, or more than 4,000 units, between 1996 and 1999.

The larger the building, the better the structural condition, except for the smallest buildings with one to five units. In 1999, 19.6 percent of renter-occupied units in buildings with 6-19 units had one or more building defects, the highest proportion of any size building in the City. This relationship between structural condition and building size derives largely from the fact that smaller buildings are older. In 1999, 85.5 percent of units in buildings with 6-19 units were built in or before 1947. The proportion of such older units declined as the size of the building increased.

The higher the rent, the lower the proportion of units in buildings with defects. This inverse relationship was maintained throughout the rent intervals, except for the lowest level (\$1-\$399), where many units were public housing units. Of units renting for less than \$400, 40.6 percent were public housing units, a structurally well-maintained sector of the housing stock.

The two measurements of the structural condition of buildings--the dilapidation rate and the proportion of building defects--appear to supplement each other. The 1999 HVS reports that, of occupied rental units in non-dilapidated buildings, nine in ten were in buildings with zero defects, while of such units in dilapidated buildings, only one in four were in buildings with zero defects. On the other hand, of occupied rental units in non-dilapidated buildings, only one in a hundred were in buildings with three or more defects, while of such units in dilapidated buildings, almost one in two had as many defects.

### Structural Condition of Owner Occupied Units

In 1999, only 0.6 percent of owner-occupied units were in dilapidated buildings, compared to 1.0 percent of renter-occupied units. At the same time, 4.4 percent of owner-occupied units were in buildings with one or more defects in 1999, compared to 10.9 percent of renter units.

### Maintenance Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Units

Housing maintenance conditions improved considerably: between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of renter-occupied units with no maintenance deficiencies increased from 42.1 percent to 45.5 percent.

Maintenance conditions improved greatly in Staten Island: the proportion of occupied renter units with no maintenance deficiencies climbed 10.1 percentage points, from 58.3 percent in 1996 to 68.4 percent in 1999. In 1999 as in 1996, maintenance conditions in Staten Island were the best of any of the boroughs. In the Bronx, the proportion of renter-occupied units with no maintenance deficiencies increased from 30.4 percent to 36.7 percent, while, in Manhattan, it increased from 37.9 percent to 44.7 percent. Maintenance conditions also improved in Queens.

Maintenance conditions in all structural categories, particularly units in Old-Law and New-Law tenements, improved markedly. The proportion of renter units with five or more maintenance deficiencies in Old-Law tenement buildings was cut by 40.5 percent (from 11.1 percent to 6.6 percent), while the proportion of such units in New-Law tenement buildings was cut by 36.1 percent (from 9.7

percent to 6.2 percent). However, the proportions of units with five or more maintenance deficiencies in Old-Law and New-Law tenement buildings were still considerably higher than either the city-wide proportion or the proportion in any other structural category.

The maintenance condition of unregulated rental units was the best of all categories in 1999, as in 1996. Of such units in 1999, 59.1 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, a 3.2-percentage-point improvement over 1996. The condition of unregulated rental units in rental buildings was noticeably better than the condition of those in cooperative and condominium buildings: 59.6 percent compared to 55.2 percent had no maintenance deficiencies. The condition of such units in rental buildings improved by 3.5 percentage points between 1996 and 1999, while the condition of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings remained virtually the same.

The maintenance conditions of rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947 and Mitchell-Lama rental units were also very good. Of post-1947 rent-stabilized units, 53.4 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while only 40.0 percent of all stabilized units had no maintenance deficiencies. The condition of post-1947 rent-stabilized units improved by 5.1 percentage points over the three years, while the condition of all rent-stabilized units made a 3.4-percentage-point improvement. Of Mitchell-Lama rental units, 48.9 percent were free of maintenance deficiencies, a 4.3-percentage-point decline from 1996.

The maintenance conditions of rent-controlled units, rent-stabilized units in buildings built in or before 1947, and public housing units were relatively poor in 1999: 41.5 percent of rent-controlled units and 35.4 percent of pre-1947 rent-stabilized units had no maintenance deficiencies. The proportion of public housing units with no maintenance deficiencies was still only 36.1 percent, although this was a 6.1 percentage point improvement over 1996.

The maintenance condition of *in rem* units also improved during the three-year period. The proportion of *in rem* units with five or more maintenance deficiencies declined by 5.9 percentage points, from 26.3 percent to 20.4 percent between 1996 and 1999. However, in 1999 still only 13.5 percent of *in rem* units were free of maintenance deficiencies.

Maintenance condition improves as the size of a building increases, except for the smallest buildings of 1 to 5 units. In 1999, of units in buildings with 6-19 units, 7.0 percent had five or more maintenance deficiencies. The proportion declined as the size of the building increased.

The higher the rent, the better the maintenance condition. In 1999, the maintenance condition of rental units with contract rents of \$1-\$399 was very poor: only 35.5 percent of such units had no maintenance deficiencies, compared to 45.5 percent of all rental units in the City. The proportion climbs as the rent level increases. For units with rents of \$400-\$599, it was 40.4 percent, still lower than the city-wide proportion, while, for units with rents of \$600-\$699, it was 45.8 percent, practically the same as the city-wide proportion. The proportion of renter units with no deficiencies passed the city-wide proportion as rents passed the city-wide median rent of \$648. Of units with rents of \$700-\$899 and \$900-\$1,249, 49.2 percent and 49.9 percent respectively had no maintenance deficiencies; the proportion for units with rents of \$1,250 or more was 61.2 percent.

In 1999, of rental units in dilapidated buildings, only 19.3 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while 30.9 percent had five or more deficiencies. On the other hand, of rental units in non-

dilapidated buildings, 45.8 percent had no deficiencies, while only 4.1 percent had five or more deficiencies. A similar inverse relationship existed between building defects and maintenance conditions in 1999. Of rental units in buildings with no defects, 47.7 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while only 3.3 percent had five or more maintenance deficiencies. On the other hand, of rental units in buildings with three or more defect types, only 15.8 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while 23.7 percent had five or more defect types.

### Maintenance Deficiencies in Owner Occupied Units

Maintenance conditions of owner units were substantially better than those of rental units. In 1999, 70.2 percent of owner units, compared to 45.5 percent of renter units, had no maintenance deficiencies. Of owner units, Mitchell-Lama cooperatives had the best maintenance condition: 74.8 percent had no maintenance deficiencies. Conventional owner units were the next best at 71.3 percent, followed by private cooperatives at 67.2 percent, and condominiums at 63.6 percent.

### Characteristics of Physically Poor Occupied Rental Units

The definition of a physically poor housing unit used by the City for many years in the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) and Consolidated Plan, which have been required by and submitted to HUD, is "a housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bath for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects." Applying this definition, the 1999 HVS reports that the physical condition of housing units in the City improved markedly. There were 203,000 physically poor renter-occupied units in 1999, a 23.1-percent decline from 1996, when the number was 264,000, and a 37.9-percent decline from 1991, when the number was 327,000. Physically poor occupied renter units' share of all occupied rental units in the City declined by 6.4 percentage points from 16.8 percent in 1991 to 10.4 percent in 1999.

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of physically poor units in the Bronx dropped by 23.8 percent, or by 15,000, to 47,000 units in 1999. However, in 1999 the number of physically poor renteroccupied units in the borough was still 23.4 percent of the 203,000 such units in the City, while only 16.8 percent of all renter-occupied units in the City were located in the borough. At 14.5 percent, the Bronx still had the highest incidence of physically poor housing of any borough. In Manhattan, the number of physically poor units also declined, by 30.1 percent, or 26,000, to 61,000 units in 1999; but the borough still had a higher proportion of physically poor units than its share of renter-occupied units, 30.1 percent compared to 28.7 percent. The number of physically poor units dropped as well in Brooklyn (by 17.0 percent, or 14,000, to 70,000 units in 1999), where 34.6 percent of the physically poor renter units in the City were located, compared to the borough's share of 30.1 percent of the City's renter-occupied units.

Queens' proportionate share of physically poor units, compared to its share of renter-occupied units, was low. In 1999, of all the physically poor renter-occupied units in the City, 22,000, or 10.7 percent, were located in Queens, while 21.7 percent of all renter-occupied units in the City were in the borough.

Physical housing condition is most closely related to the age of the dwelling. Of all physically poor occupied renter units in 1999, close to six in ten were in either Old-Law tenement buildings (13.8 percent) or New-Law tenement buildings (41.8 percent), a much higher share than their proportion of renter-occupied units in these two structure classes (9.4 percent and 31.0 percent respectively).

In 1999, in *in rem* housing, 42.0 percent of units were physically poor. Rent-stabilized housing built in or before 1947 also had a higher incidence of physically poor housing, with 14.8 percent of its units in poor condition, compared to 10.4 percent of all renter units in the City. In fact, because a very high proportion of the City's rental units were in pre-1947 stabilized housing, this category contained more than half (54.7 percent) of the units in poor condition in the City.

In 1999, the majority of physically poor occupied renter units were low-rent units: six in ten had contract rents of either \$1-\$399 (27.1 percent) or \$400-\$599 (34.1 percent).

### Characteristics of Households Occupying Physically Poor Rental Units

Of households living in physically poor rental units in 1999, blacks accounted for 36.5 percent, compared to 24.5 percent of all renter households. Puerto Ricans' and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics' shares of households in physically poor rental units were 18.5 percent and 19.9 percent respectively, while their corresponding shares of all renter households were 12.3 percent and 16.2 percent respectively.

Compared to their share of all renter households, proportionately more households with children lived in physically poor rental units. In 1999, of households in such units, 17.4 percent were single adults with minor children, while this household type's share of all renter households in the City was only 10.2 percent. At the same time, 29.7 percent of households in physically poor rental units were adults with minor children, while this household type's share of all renter households was 24.6 percent.

Of households in physically poor rental units, six in ten had incomes of less than \$25,000 in 1998, while a little fewer than five in ten of all renter households had incomes at that level. Of households in physically poor rental units, a markedly high 43.0 percent had incomes below \$15,000.

Among households with incomes below the poverty level in 1998, 15.3 percent lived in physically poor housing, and 19.5 percent of households receiving public assistance lived in physically poor housing, compared to 10.4 percent of all renter households in 1999.

Of heads of all renter households in the City in 1999, 21.4 percent were born in Puerto Rico or the rest of the Caribbean. But 29.7 percent of the heads of households living in physically poor rental units were born in Puerto Rico or the rest of the Caribbean. On the other hand, 9.3 percent of renter household heads in the City were from Europe, while only 4.1 percent of the household heads living in physically poor rental units were from Europe.

### Neighborhood Conditions of Renter-Occupied Housing

The 1999 HVS reports that neighborhood physical conditions in New York City improved markedly between 1996 and 1999. The proportion of renter-occupied units on the same street as a

building with broken or boarded-up windows (boarded-up buildings) declined by 2.6 percentage points (from 11.4 percent to 8.8 percent) during the three-year period. Since 1991, this indicator of boarded-up buildings has improved steadily, going from 15.7 percent in 1991 to 13.7 percent in 1993, 11.4 percent in 1996, and 8.8 percent in 1999.

Between 1996 and 1999, neighborhood physical condition improved in every borough. The greatest improvement was in Staten Island, where the proportion of units on streets with boarded-up buildings declined by 7.3 percentage points to 2.1 percent in 1999. Neighborhood physical condition also improved in the Bronx and Brooklyn: by 3.1 percentage points to 6.9 percent and by 3.3 percentage points to 12.7 percent respectively. After a substantial 9.4-percentage-point improvement during the previous three years, neighborhood condition in Manhattan improved further by another 1.3 percentage points to 11.3 percent between 1996 and 1999. Between 1993 and 1999, neighborhood condition in the borough improved altogether by 10.7 percentage points. This represents a 48.6-percent improvement over the six years.

The proportion of renter-occupied units on streets with boarded-up buildings declined steadily as the level of contract rent increased. Of renter-occupied units with contract rents of \$1-\$399, 14.0 percent were on streets with boarded-up buildings. For units with contract rents of \$400-\$599, the rate was 11.2 percent. The proportion continued to decline as rents grew, dropping to 4.7 percent for units with rents of \$900-\$1,249; but it did not decrease further for units in the highest rent level, \$1,250 and above.

### Residents' Satisfaction with the Physical Condition of Neighborhood Residential Structures

The opinions of the City's residents supported the Census Bureau's observation of considerable improvement in neighborhood physical conditions between 1996 and 1999. Of renter households in the City, 68.6 percent rated the condition of their neighborhoods' residential structures as either "good" (54.0 percent) or "excellent" (14.6 percent), an improvement of 4.7 percentage points over the three-year period.

In 1999, renter residents in each of the five boroughs gave higher ratings of neighborhood conditions in their borough than they did three years earlier. Particularly, tenants' ratings of the physical condition of their neighborhoods increased considerably in Manhattan, Queens, and Staten Island over the three years. In Manhattan, the proportion of renters who rated the physical condition of their neighborhood as "good" or "excellent" increased by 6.8 percentage points to 73.6 percent. This increase derived mostly from a 5.7-percentage-point increase (from 17.0 percent to 22.7 percent) in those rating the physical condition of their Manhattan neighborhood as "excellent." A similar improvement occurred in Staten Island, where 83.6 percent of renters rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "good" or "excellent," a 5.2-percentage-point improvement over the three-year period. All of this improvement resulted from a 5.3-percentage-point increase in those rating the condition of their neighborhood as "excellent." Of renters in Queens, 74.6 percent rated the condition of their neighborhood as either "good" or "excellent" in 1999. Almost all of this 3.3-percentage-point improvement over the three years was a consequence of a 3.2-percentage-point improvement in those rating the condition of their neighborhood as "excellent."

In general, in neighborhoods where the rent was higher, renters' ratings of neighborhood physical condition were also higher. Of renters who paid contract rents of \$1-\$399, only 7.1 percent

rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "excellent." But the rating moved up steadily as rent levels moved up.

Interviewers' observations of the existence of buildings with broken or boarded-up windows on the streets where sample units were located and residents' ratings of the physical condition of their neighborhoods supported each other. Specifically, of renters in units on streets with boarded-up buildings, 15.6 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "poor," while of renters in units on streets without boarded-up buildings, only 4.6 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "poor." Conversely, of renters who lived on streets without boarded-up buildings, 71.2 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as either "good" or "excellent," while only 4.6 percent rated it as "poor."

### Housing and Neighborhood Conditions of Immigrant Renter Households

Housing unit and building conditions, as well as neighborhood condition, for immigrant renter households were slightly poorer than for all renter households. In 1999, of renter units occupied by immigrant households, 12.6 percent were in buildings with one or more building defect types, compared to 10.8 percent for non-immigrant renter households. The percent of immigrant-household rental units with no maintenance deficiencies was 43.4 percent, compared to 45.8 percent for non-immigrant renter households.

In 1999, 7.3 percent of immigrant renter households lived on the same street as any buildings with broken or boarded-up windows, compared to 9.8 percent for non-immigrant renters. At the same time, 65.8 percent of immigrant renter households rated the physical condition of their neighborhood's residential structures as "good" or "excellent," compared to 70.0 percent of non-immigrant renter households.

### Neighborhood Conditions of Owner Occupied Housing

The physical condition of the neighborhoods of owner housing units was substantially better than that of renters. In 1999, of all owners, the proportion living on a street with a boarded-up building was only 4.1 percent, less than half the 8.8 percent for renters and a 2.5-percentage-point improvement over the three years. At the same time, owner ratings of the physical condition of residential structures in their neighborhoods as "good" or "excellent" were 18.7 percentage points higher than the corresponding rate for renters: 87.3 percent of owners rated the condition of their neighborhood as "good" (57.9 percent) or "excellent" (29.4 percent), compared to 68.6 percent of renters.

### Physical Housing and Neighborhood Conditions and City-Sponsored Rehabilitation and New Construction

With concerted efforts to meet the increased demand for housing, break the cycle of abandonment, and focus on preservation, the City completely rehabilitated or newly constructed a total of 24,528 units through various City-funded housing programs between June 1996 and May 1999, the

three-year period between the 1996 HVS and the 1999 HVS. Of these units, 14,954 were moderately rehabilitated, 9,574 were gut-rehabilitated or newly constructed. In addition, the City made another remarkable contribution to maintaining good housing conditions and further improving neighborhood conditions by approving J-51 tax abatements in the amount of \$365,701,000 for improving the physical conditions of buildings containing 276,920 housing units in the City. Along with remarkable improvements in the quality of life and significant economic growth, the City's housing efforts contributed not only to meeting the increased demand for housing but also to improving the conditions of existing affordable housing and neighborhoods.

Additionally, the City supported and/or worked with quasi-public agencies (such as HDC, which creates new housing with financial support from the City and private financial institutions) and non-profit and private groups in their efforts to preserve and create affordable new housing.

### **Crowded Households**

In New York City, as population and households continued to increase faster than the number of newly created housing units, the proportion of renter households that were crowded (more than one person per room) increased from 10.3 percent in 1996 to 11.0 percent in 1999. The 1999 crowding rate for renter households was the highest since 1965, when it was also 11.0 percent. At the same time, 3.9 percent of renter households were severely crowded (more than 1.5 persons per room) in 1999, also the highest since 1965.

Between 1996 and 1999, the crowding rate for renters in Queens increased markedly by 2.4 percentage points, from 11.8 percent to 14.2 percent. The borough's 1999 rate was the highest of any borough and 3.2 percentage points higher than the city-wide rate of 11.0 percent. The rates in the Bronx and Brooklyn in 1999 were also high at 12.0 percent and 11.1 percent respectively. The crowding rate in Manhattan was 7.4 percent in 1996, while it was 8.3 percent in 1999, but that was still 2.7 percentage points lower than the city-wide rate. The crowding rate in Staten Island in 1999 was 6.2 percent, the lowest of any of the borough's 4.8 percentage points lower than the city-wide rate, and 2.1 percentage points lower than the borough's rate three years earlier.

Crowding is, in general, a phenomenon of big households: the larger the number of big households, the larger the number of crowded households. In the City as a whole, 9.2 percent of renter households had five or more persons. Of these large households, 66.1 percent were crowded. From a different perspective, 55.3 percent of crowded renter households in the City housed five or more persons.

The source of such a high crowding rate in Queens was the relatively high proportion of big households in the borough. In 1999, 11.9 percent of renter households in Queens had five or more persons, compared to 9.2 percent city-wide. Of these big renter households in Queens, 63.0 percent were crowded. Of all crowded renter households in the borough, 52.8 percent were such big households. In addition, the proportion of renter households with three to four persons in the borough was also relatively high, 32.4 percent, compared to 28.2 percent city-wide. Of these households with three or four persons in Queens, 16.8 percent were crowded; and 38.2 percent of the crowded renter households in the borough were households with three or four persons.

The source of the high crowding rate in the Bronx appears also to be the high proportion of big households. Of renter households there, 11.2 percent housed five or more persons. The crowding rate for these big households was 67.2 percent, and 62.8 percent of crowded households in the borough were such big households.

On the other hand, the lower crowding rate in Manhattan appears to be the result of its very low proportion of big households: only 4.9 percent of renter households in the borough had five or more persons, while 48.8 percent consisted of one person only.

The crowding rate for rent-stabilized units as a whole was 13.2 percent, considerably higher than the city-wide rate of 11.0 percent. This was due largely to the rate of 13.6 percent for pre-1947 units, compared to 11.9 percent for the category's post-1947 units. Crowding did not exist in rent-controlled units, where 78.3 percent of units were occupied at the rate of 0.50 person-per-room, or less, which means one person for two or more rooms. At the same time, over half of "other regulated" and public housing units were also occupied at the rate of 0.50 person-per-room, or less.

In 1999, crowding was a phenomenon of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic and Asian renter households. The crowding rates for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renters and Asian renters--whose populations have increased markedly in recent years, as discussed in Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households"--were extraordinarily high: 23.9 percent and 21.4 percent respectively. Again, the source of these high crowding rates appears to be large household size. The mean household sizes of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renters and Asian renters were 3.25 and 2.80 respectively, considerably larger than the city-wide average of 2.48. The crowding rate for white renters was only 5.4 percent, half the city-wide rate of 11.0 percent. The rates declined noticeably from 10.6 percent to 9.6 percent for black renter households and from 10.1 percent to 8.5 percent for Puerto Rican renter households.

No renter household type had a crowding rate higher than the city-wide average of 11.0 percent, except for adult households with minor children. The crowding rate for this household type was 32.2 percent in 1999. That is to say, almost one in every three households of this type was crowded. The source of this extremely high crowding rate was the household type's relatively large mean household size of 4.30, compared to 2.48 for renter households overall.

Crowding is a phenomenon of big households. The distribution of the crowding rate by household size vividly confirms this relationship. For renter households in 1999, the crowding rate for two-person households was only 4.4 percent, and the rate for three-person households was 6.7 percent. However, the rate for four-person households was 22.2 percent, twice the city-wide rate. The rate climbed further as household size increased, jumping to 51.6 percent for five-person households and 79.0 percent for six-person households. The rate for households with seven or more persons was an incredibly high 94.2 percent. In other words, almost all such large renter households were crowded.

A much larger proportion of immigrant renter households were crowded: 21.2 percent, more than three times the proportion of non-immigrant households. Again, this is attributable to the larger mean household size of 3.02 for immigrant households.

# 1

### Overview of the 1999 Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) and the *Housing New York City*, 1999 Report

### Purposes of the HVS

It is the City's responsibility to determine whether a housing emergency exists, as a condition for the continuation of rent control and rent stabilization in New York City, according to the following State and City rent regulation laws: the Local Emergency Housing Rent Control Act of 1962,<sup>1</sup> the subsequent Local Rent Stabilization Law of 1969,<sup>2</sup> and the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974.<sup>3</sup> The City Council's determination as to whether a housing emergency continues to exist depends on an analysis of data collected in the New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) on the rental vacancy rate, the supply of housing accommodations, the condition of such accommodations, and the need for continuing the regulation and control of residential rents and evictions in the City. This survey must be taken at least once every three years, as required by State and City rent regulation laws.

To fulfill this responsibility, the City retained the U.S. Bureau of the Census to design and carry out the 1999 HVS, as it has done for all previous HVSs since the first in 1965. The 1999 HVS is the ninth HVS to have been carried out, although eleven reports have been prepared over the 35-year period from 1964 to 1999. In this regard, the 1964 report was based on a survey which differed from the HVS in both content and procedures and relied on special tabulations from the 1960 decennial census; the 1973 report was based on special tabulations from the 1970 decennial census.

### Content, Design, and Sample Size of the HVS

As for all previous HVSs, the 1999 HVS, as a comprehensive housing market survey, was designed to collect information on the major elements of demand for and supply of housing units, interventions of government, and the dynamic interactions of all these forces in the City's housing market. For the 1999 HVS, as for all previous HVSs, the demand elements cover the number and characteristics of persons and households in occupied units, while the supply elements include the number and characteristics of the occupied and vacant housing stock, vacancies and vacancy rates, and the condition of the housing inventory. The elements of government interventions include rent regulation status; housing units owned, developed, and/or managed through major types of government

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Section 1(3) of the Local Emergency Housing Rent Control Act, Section 8603 of the Unconsolidated Laws.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Section 26-501 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Section 3 of the Emergency Tenant Protection Act, Section 8623 of the Unconsolidated Laws.

programs; and rent subsidies.<sup>4</sup> The interactions of all major forces in the market include, among other things, affordability, as measured by the rent-income ratio.

The HVS is a sample survey of occupied and vacant housing units. Approximately 18,000 housing units throughout the City were selected as a representative sample of housing in the five boroughs of the City. Because of the critical importance of the reliability of the HVS data, particularly as regards the rental vacancy rate as a principal determinant of the continuation of rent control and rent stabilization for more than a million rental units in the City, the 1999 HVS and previous HVSs were designed so that the standard error of estimate, the measure of sampling variance, would not exceed 0.25 percent if the rental vacancy rate in the City were 3 percent. Since the HVS is a sample survey, obviously each of the estimated figures in the survey results has its own specific degree of reliability.<sup>5</sup> As has been the case for all previous HVSs, the 1999 HVS data are available for the City and each of the five boroughs and, since 1991, for each of the 55 sub-borough areas.

As was the case for the 1996 and two previous HVSs, sample units for the 1999 HVS came from two primary sources: units selected from the 1990 decennial census address file for the 1991 HVS, and a sample of addresses resulting from certificates of occupancy for newly constructed units and gut-rehabilitated units, issued from April 1990 through October 1998, for each borough. In addition, a list of previously nonresidential addresses that had been converted to residential housing units since the 1990 census and a list of *in rem* units were also used to select sample cases.

### Uses of the HVS Data

As a comprehensive housing market survey of one of the largest and most complex housing markets in metropolitan cities in the world, the HVS is the source of a massive amount of data on population, households, and housing units in New York City. Proper use of the data requires an adequate understanding of the content of the HVS and the methods and techniques used for collecting and organizing the data. For this reason, this report presents detailed information on the survey design and estimation procedures, as well as the survey's accuracy statement and the complete questionnaire for the 1999 HVS.<sup>6</sup>

Of course, the most significant use of HVS data is to justify the extension of rent protection legislation. However, the HVS data have also been used extensively by all sides, both public and private, on housing and housing-related issues in developing, analyzing, assessing, and evaluating policies, programs, and projects. Also, HVS data are often used by public and private agencies and individuals to prepare applications for funds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For detailed information on the content of the survey, see Appendix E, "New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Questionnaire, 1999."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Detailed tables of the various standard errors and other technical information on the survey design are presented in Appendix D of this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Information on the sample, survey method and procedure, and the accuracy statement are presented in Appendix D of this report. The questionnaire is covered in Appendix E.

### Relationship of the 1999 HVS to Previous HVSs

A precise understanding of the similarities and differences in the meaning and organization of the data among the HVSs in different survey years is an important prerequisite for the proper presentation and interpretation of the HVS data.

- 1. Housing unit and population counts from the 1999 HVS were derived using a new weighting methodology and, thus, are not completely comparable to data from the 1996 and 1993 surveys. As a final step in the weighting of the 1999 HVS, the Census Bureau applied factors to the survey estimates of population and housing units to adjust for missed units and missed people in units. These factors were developed by controlling survey estimates to independently derived estimates of population and housing. In March 1991, as part of a Census 2000 project, the Census Bureau, first, reviewed 1990 housing unit estimates; second, reviewed administrative records related to the housing stock; and, third, began research and development on methods to improve population and housing unit control estimates. The Census Bureau then developed and implemented a new methodology that integrated housing and population estimates. The Census Bureau introduced this new methodology for the first time for the 1999 HVS. Therefore, comparisons of the 1999 data with data from earlier surveys should be done with caution.
- 2. In 1991, persons of Hispanic origin who did not classify themselves in one of the major race categories were classified in the "other" category. In 1999, as in 1996, all persons reporting "other" race were allocated to one of the major race categories, as were persons not reporting race. These changes were first done for the 1996 survey and have been maintained for the 1999 HVS. They have also been used for the 1993 HVS data in the preparation of the longitudinal file used for this report. As a result, the counts of persons and households classified as "other" race are nonexistent in 1999, as in 1993 and 1996, and there is a corresponding increase in the number of persons and households classified in specific race categories, particularly the white and black or African-American categories. Thus, some data on specific race categories for 1993 used in the 1993 report are different from the respective data covered in this report, and caution should be used when comparing data on race between the 1991 and later survey years.
- 3. For 1996, the question on receipt of a Senior Citizen Rent Increase Exemption (SCRIE) was incorporated into a more detailed question on rent subsidy: whether government programs paid part of the household's rent. Similarly, in 1996, the question on receipt of public assistance was also modified. In addition, the question on the receipt of Section 8 certificate or voucher programs was covered in the rent subsidy question. Also, the following two questions were added to the rent subsidy question: first, the question on the receipt of another State or City housing subsidy program; and, second, the question on the receipt of another federal housing subsidy program. For the 1999 HVS, this rent subsidy question was expanded to ask about each of the five programs separately. Moreover, the question was reformulated to ask the year since when the household had received or since when it had not received a subsidy from each of the five programs. The purpose of these changes was to help survey interviewers and respondents understand better the intent of the question and, thus, enable interviewers to gather more reliable information on the issue.

As a result of these changes, the 1999 HVS was expected to provide more reliable data on the rent subsidy question than the 1996 HVS did. However, these changes may make the data from the 1999 HVS less comparable with the data from the 1996 HVS. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting changes in data on rent-subsidy issues between 1996 and 1999.

- 4. The 1999 HVS included a set of questions to estimate the number and characteristics of immigrant households: first, householders (heads of households) were asked to identify the country or region where they were born; then, those born outside the United States were asked if they had moved to this country as immigrants. Based on the answers to these two questions, the 1999 HVS reports the number and characteristics of immigrant households and their housing and neighborhood characteristics in the City in 1999.
- 5. For the 1999 HVS, reflecting changes in welfare reform, cash Public Assistance included money payments under Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or Family Assistance (previously called AFDC), Safety Net (formerly Home Relief), and Supplemental Security Income (SSI), including aid to the blind and the disabled. On the other hand, for the 1996 and previous HVSs, cash Public Assistance included money payments under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Home Relief, and SSI programs or other assistance programs, including the Shelter Allowance program.
- 6. For the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, the Census Bureau maintained a series of questions designed to collect data on the following: rent, rent subsidy, and out-of-pocket rent. First, immediately after asking what the monthly rent was, interviewers asked if any part of the monthly rent was paid by any of the following specific government programs, either to a member of the household or directly to the landlord: the federal Section 8 certificate or voucher program, the public assistance shelter allowance program, the City's Senior Citizen Rent Increase Exemption (SCRIE) program, another federal housing subsidy program, or another state or city housing subsidy program. Second, the Census Bureau asked how much of the rent reported by the household.<sup>7</sup>

Because the 1996 and 1999 HVS rent and rent subsidy questions are significantly different from the 1993 questions, it is impossible to develop one definition of "rent subsidy" that can be applied to all the years for which the data are compared, although it is necessary to use such a definition if the rent data are to be compared in a reliable manner. Thus, in comparing rent data from the 1996 or 1999 HVSs with rent data from the 1993 or previous HVSs, the limitations that are incurred by applying inconsistent definitions should be taken into consideration.

The 1996 and 1999 rent questions were designed to differentiate out-of-pocket rent from total contract rent, while the 1993 and previous HVS questions were not. Therefore, it is possible that the 1993 contract rent reported for rent-subsidized households may not in all cases have been the full contract rent, since it may have included out-of-pocket rent only and excluded the rent subsidy. Thus, comparisons of rent data from the 1993 or previous HVSs with data from the 1996 and/or 1999 HVSs will be done only for the City as a whole and for a very few selected

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Appendix E, "New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Questionnaire, 1999."

segments in which the proportion of households receiving subsidies is relatively low and for which the impacts of the differences in the rent and rent subsidy questions between the 1993 or any previous HVSs and the 1996 or 1999 HVSs are, thus, expected to be small enough not to cause differences in rent values to be beyond the bounds of reasonableness.<sup>8</sup>

### Differences between Data from the 1999 HVS and Data from the Census 2000

1. The numbers of persons and households in New York City reported from the 1999 HVS are different from those reported from the 2000 decennial census. The difference is not just because of the one year's difference in time between the two surveys, but for the following several other reasons as well.

First, for the HVS, the Census Bureau used survey interviewers to collect data, while, for the Census 2000, the Census Bureau initially gathered data by mail and then sent interviewers to households that did not return their questionnaires to the Census Bureau.

Second, the HVS is a sample survey--that is, only households in the selected sample were interviewed--while the census is a complete count of all people and housing units (although even the census may undercount people in hard-to-count neighborhoods).

Third, the HVS excludes people in group quarters--such as prisons, nursing homes, dormitories, and emergency shelters--as well as people and housing units in other types of special places--such as transient hotels.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, the census counts all people and housing units.

Fourth, the 1999 HVS sample was selected from the 1990 census, with updating for newly constructed units and converted units that received certificates of occupancy. For the Census 2000, the City provided to the Census Bureau more than 370,000 housing unit addresses that were added during the 1990 decade or missed in the 1990 census.<sup>10</sup> The weighting for the 1999 HVS used estimates based on the 1990 census; thus, any of the units at the 370,000 addresses provided to the Census Bureau by the City that were missed in the 1990 census were not reflected in the 1999 HVS.<sup>11</sup>

Fifth, the Census Bureau made extensive efforts to reduce the undercount in the Census 2000 by making the public aware of the importance of the census, through working closely with agencies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For further information on the comparison of 1996 and 1999 HVS rent data with data from the 1993 or previous HVS years, see Chapter 6, "Variations in Rent Expenditures in New York City," of this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For a complete definition of a housing unit, see Appendix B, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary." For information on living quarters excluded from the 1999 and previous HVSs, see Appendix D, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design, Estimation Procedure, Accuracy Statement, and Topcoding."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Joseph Salvo, Wendy Smith, Drew Minert, and A. Peter Lobo, New York City Department of City Planning, LUCA98 Case Study, New York, NY.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Since the sample for the 2002 HVS will be selected from the Census 2000, these addresses will be covered.

and groups in the public and private sectors and through paid advertising campaigns and educational programs.

A confluence of the above reasons, particularly the last three, makes the overall count of the number of persons, households, and housing units greater in the Census 2000 than in the 1999 HVS.<sup>12</sup>

- 2. According to the Census 2000, there were more housing units in the City than the number reported from the 1999 HVS. Again, the difference is not just because of the one year's difference in time between the two surveys. Of the five the reasons explained above, the following, in particular, should be noted in detail in explaining the difference: The term "housing unit" is defined differently for the two surveys. For the 1999 HVS, which was based on the 1990 census, the Census Bureau defined a housing unit as a house, apartment, single room, or group of rooms occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters were those in which the occupants lived and ate separately from any other persons in the building and which had direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. The Census Bureau modified this housing unit definition for the Census 2000 by removing the requirement that occupants had to eat separately in order for the living quarters to be considered a housing unit. Under the new definition, a small number of living quarters not previously considered housing units were counted as housing units in the Census 2000. For the HVS, housing units in "special places" are considered beyond the scope of the survey. Special places include transient hotels, rooming and boarding houses, prisons, dormitories, and nursing homes. In the Census 2000, all housing units were counted.<sup>13</sup>
- 3. The HVS provides more detailed data on the number and characteristics of population, households, and housing units than the Census 2000. Moreover, the Census 2000 covers fewer characteristics of households and housing units than the HVS, and Census 2000 data on many demographic, social, economic, and housing characteristics will not be released before this report is published. Furthermore, the Census 2000 does not cover neighborhood conditions. Therefore, in presenting and discussing the number and characteristics of population, households, and housing units, data primarily from the 1999 and previous HVSs will be used. However, data from the Census 2000 will be compared with the HVS data whenever such comparisons are useful.

### Presentation and Interpretation of the HVS Data in the 1999 Report

Almost all the findings of this report are based on data from the HVS, which is a sample survey; they are, thus, subject to sampling and non-sampling errors. For this reason, it is generally appropriate to qualify such findings by noting that they are "estimates" of the true values of variables, which are unknown. For example, we should refer to the rental vacancy rate as the "estimated rental vacancy rate" and to median household income as "estimated median household income."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> For further information on the differences between population data from the 1999 HVS and the data from the Census 2000, see Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households," of this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> For further information on the differences between housing data from the 1999 HVS and the data from the Census 2000, see Chapter 4, "New York City's Housing Inventory," of this report.

practical to do so in this report, since tens of thousands of figures from the 1999 and previous HVSs are covered in this report and repeated use of the word "estimated" for these many figures would make this already data-intensive report unreasonably cumbersome.

Ideally, since the HVS is a sample survey, the reader of this report should be provided with the standard errors of estimated values, as measures of statistical reliability. This has, for the most part, not been done in this or previous reports, since such a practice would have more than doubled the already extremely large number of statistics presented and would, thus, have made the report more difficult for readers to understand. It would also have reduced the scope of the report's use in everyday policy-making and analysis work. Consequently, standard errors have been provided only for critically important findings. For example, because of its statutory importance, the standard error and confidence interval of the 1999 net rental vacancy rate are presented, as they have been in previous reports. But in regard to other data, as has been done in the last several reports, the practice of limiting the use of numbers and percentages that are very small has again been adopted in this report. Figures, such as the number of housing units or households, that are less than 2,000 are not reported in either the tables or the text; and numbers between 2,000 and 2,999 are qualified by warning the reader to interpret the numbers with caution. Dollar figures, such as rents and incomes, based on a small number of cases are treated following the same guideline. Similarly, percentages in which the numerator is less than 1,000 are not reported, and percentages in which the numerator is between 1,000 and 1,999 are qualified by warning the reader to interpret them with caution. Moreover, no conclusive or definitive statements based on such small numbers, even those that are somewhat larger than 3,000, have been made anywhere in this report.

### Contents and Organization of the Report

Compared to previous reports, discussions of the following issues have been either newly included or expanded in this report. First, reasons for differences in the data on the number of persons, households, and housing units from the 1999 HVS and the Census 2000 are covered in Chapter 2, where population and household issues are discussed, and in Chapter 4, where issues relating to the housing inventory are discussed. Second, for the first time, data on immigrant households and their household and housing unit characteristics are presented and discussed, particularly in chapters 2 and 7, where issues relating to the conditions of housing and neighborhoods and to crowding are covered. Third, throughout the report, wherever it is appropriate, discussions of owner housing and ownership issues have been expanded. Fourth, the discussion of previously lost units that have returned to the active housing inventory through gut-rehabilitation or new construction and of HPD's contribution to such units appears in Chapter 4. Fifth, issues pertaining to crowding, which has been an increasingly serious problem in the City as the number of households has increased, are discussed more extensively in Chapter 7.

There are six chapters in this report, covering the major structural and functional components of New York City's housing market. These six substantive chapters cover all major issues legally mandated by rent regulation laws: residential population and households, incomes, inventory, vacancies, rents, and housing conditions. In addition, there are five appendices covering 1999 HVS data for sub-borough areas and the technical specifications and content of the 1999 HVS.

Chapter 2 provides, first, a description of the number and characteristics of the population in 1999 and a review of the historical population trends in the City and, second, a discussion of the number and composition of households and the changes in them over time. Both population and households are covered by location, tenure, rent regulation status, and type of ownership. The situation of doubled-up households is also discussed in this chapter.

In Chapter 3, all major issues covered in the HVS that are relevant to determining the capabilities of households to pay housing costs are discussed. The chapter covers changes in and patterns of household income by tenure, location, rent regulation or ownership status, race and ethnicity, and other variables. Then, the chapter discusses households with incomes below various income levels that are policy-important in assessing changes in the magnitude of households with incomes below the federal poverty level and in the number of households receiving public assistance. Finally, the chapter analyzes employment characteristics of households--such as labor force participation, unemployment, and occupational and industrial patterns--which largely determine household incomes.

Chapter 4 first covers the number and composition of housing units, in terms of tenure and occupancy. It then analyzes components of inventory change: additions (new construction, conversions, and returning losses) and gross losses. Next, the chapter presents and analyzes the marginal variations in recent patterns and trends. Data on the rental housing inventory and changes in rental housing in cooperatives and condominiums are analyzed. Also, the owner housing inventory, including the ownership rate, is discussed. Finally, the chapter discusses housing units that are accessible to physically disabled persons.

In the first part of Chapter 5, overall rental vacancies and vacancy rates for the City as a whole are presented and discussed. Then, data on the characteristics of vacant available units that the HVS provides are analyzed separately for renter and owner units. In the final part of the chapter, the number and characteristics of vacant units unavailable for rent or sale, including reasons for unavailability and the previous status of these units, are presented and discussed.

Chapter 6 covers most issues relating to rent as a housing cost that tenants pay for the housing units they occupy. The chapter first presents and discusses changes in and patterns of rent levels; then, the following issues are discussed: rent and housing condition, rents in the unregulated rental market, and rents in cooperative and condominium buildings. The final section of this chapter analyzes the affordability (the rent-income ratio) of rental housing.

In Chapter 7, data that the HVS provides on major housing and neighborhood conditions are covered. At the beginning of the chapter, the structural condition of buildings where residential units are located is discussed. The second part of the chapter analyzes a set of data on maintenance and equipment deficiencies. The third part of the chapter deals with neighborhood conditions. The fourth part presents and analyzes data on the aggregate number and characteristics of physically poor rental units and the characteristics of households residing in them. At the end of the analysis of physical housing conditions, the impact of City-sponsored new construction, rehabilitation, and other efforts to improve housing conditions in the City is reviewed. The final part of the chapter discusses the crowding situation in the City.

## 2 Residential Population and Households

### Introduction

This chapter provides, first, a description of the number and characteristics of the population of New York City in 1999 and a review of the historical population trends in the city and, second, a discussion of the number and composition of households and the changes in them over time. Population and households determine the requirements for housing. A household is all the persons occupying a housing unit, whether they be a family, unrelated individuals, or a single person. Thus, households equate to occupied housing units. But sometimes more than a single person, or more than two or more unrelated individuals, or more than a family live in a housing unit as "hidden" households. For this reason, in order to estimate housing requirements, the number and characteristics of persons and the number and composition of households should be analyzed.

In addition, some household characteristics--such as household income, age, race and ethnicitydetermine or modify housing demands. Specifically, household income is a leading determinant of what housing units households can actually rent or buy, while other household characteristics modify household income as a housing demand indicator. Thus, in the context of housing need and demand, all major household characteristics other than household income are covered in this chapter; household income and related household characteristics will be covered in the next chapter, "Household Incomes in New York City."

This chapter begins with discussions of the current population in 1999, changes in the population since 1987, and characteristics of the population, such as race and ethnicity, age and gender, and educational attainment. Next, the chapter covers the number and characteristics of households, including household size, household composition, foreign-born households, immigrant households, and recently-moved households. Both population and households are covered by location, tenure, rent regulation status, and type of ownership. The number of doubled-up households (sub-families and secondary individuals) and their household and housing unit characteristics that have much bearing on housing need are discussed at the end of the chapter.

### **Residential Population**

#### Historical Changes in the Population

The population the HVS reports is the *residential* population because the HVS counts only people living in residential units and excludes those living in group quarters, other types of special places, and on the streets. Thus, counting only persons living in residential units, the 1999 HVS reported that the

number of people living in New York City was 7,245,000 in 1999 (Table 2.1). On the other hand, according to the Census 2000, there were 8,008,000 people in the City (Table 2.1). This represents an increase of 686,000 over the population of 7,323,000 in 1990.<sup>1</sup> The numbers of persons and households in New York City reported from the 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) are different from those reported from the 2000 decennial census. The difference is not just because of the one-year's difference in time between the two surveys, but for several other reasons as well.

First, for the HVS, data were collected by survey interviewers, while, for the Census 2000, data were primarily gathered by mail. In general, the interviewer method is considered better than the mail method in terms of the response rate. The interviewer method is also better than the mail or other methods (such as telephone) in collecting reliable data on many population, household, and/or housing unit characteristics that the HVS collects. In addition, the Census Bureau uses the interviewer method for the HVS because the HVS's primary purpose is to collect highly reliable data on rental vacancies, based on which the City determines whether or not about 1.1 million rental units should continue to be under rent control or rent stabilization. Vacant units cannot be covered by mail. Moreover, although the Census Bureau initially used the mail method for the Census 2000, it also used the interviewer method to complete the Census by sending interviewers to households that did not return the questionnaire to the Census Bureau.

Second, the HVS is a sample survey--that is, only households in the selected sample were interviewed--while the census is a complete count of all people and housing units (although even the Census may undercount people in hard to count neighborhoods). Third, the HVS excludes people in group quarters--such as prisons, nursing homes, dormitories and emergency shelters--as well as people and housing units in other types of special places--such as transient hotels.<sup>2</sup> Thus, according to the Census 2000, 182,000 people in such group quarters or special places were not counted in the 1999 HVS. On the other hand, the census counts all people and housing units.

Fourth, the 1999 HVS sample was selected from the 1990 census, with updating for newly constructed units and converted units that received Certificates of Occupancy. For the Census 2000 the City provided to the Census Bureau more than 370,000 housing unit addresses that were added during the 1990 decade or missed in the 1990 census.<sup>3</sup> The weighting for the 1999 HVS used estimates based on the 1990 census; thus, any of the units at the 370,000 addresses provided to the Census Bureau by the City that were missed in the 1990 census were not reflected in the 1999 HVS.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000, Redistricting Data Summary Data File.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For a complete definition of a housing unit, see Appendix B, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary." For information on living quarters excluded from the 1999 and previous HVSs, see Appendix D "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design, Estimation Procedure, Accuracy Statement, and Topcoding."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Joseph Salvo, Wendy Smith, Drew Minert, and A. Peter Lobo, New York City Department of City Planning, LUCA98 Case Study, New York, NY.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Since the sample for the 2002 HVS will be selected from the Census 2000, these addresses will be covered.

						Average Annual Compound Growth Rate	
Borough	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999	1987-96	1996-99
All <sup>a,b</sup>	7,026,474	7,144,977	7,118,738	7,230,479	7,245,251	0.32%	0.07%
Bronx <sup>c</sup>	1,123,299	1,161,616	1,141,165	1,158,598	1,140,777	0.34%	-0.52%
Brooklyn	2,221,487	2,269,863	2,240,106	2,196,827	2,209,196	-0.12%	0.19%
Manhattan <sup>c</sup>	1,404,646	1,411,757	1,434,902	1,505,198	1,544,428	0.77%	0.86%
Queens	1,904,428	1,927,443	1,920,396	1,975,114	1,952,182	0.41%	-0.39%
Staten Island	372,614	374,299	382,170	394,742	398,668	0.64%	0.33%

### Table 2.1 Number of Individuals by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Estimates of the size and characteristics of the population reported from the HVS cover individuals residing in housing units. For a complete definition of housing, see Appendix B, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary." For information on living quarters excluded from the 1999 and previous HVSs, see Appendix D, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design, Estimation Procedure, Accuracy Statement, and Topcoding."

b The sample for the 1999, 1996, 1993, and 1991 HVSs was based on the 1990 decennial census; between 1975 and 1987 the sample was based on the 1970 decennial census.

c Marble Hill in the Bronx.

### Differences in Number of Individuals from 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey and Decennial 2000 Census New York City

		_	Difference between 1999 HVS and 2000 Census		
Borough	1999 HVS	2000 Census	Number	Percent	
All	7,245,251	8,008,278	763,027	10.5	
Bronx	1,140,777	1,332,650	191,873	16.8	
Brooklyn	2,209,196	2,465,326	256,130	11.6	
Manhattan	1,544,428	1,537,195	(7,233)	-0.5	
Queens	1,952,182	2,229,379	277,197	14.2	
Staten Island	398,668	443,728	45,060	11.3	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey and 2000 Census.

In the mid to late 1990s, crime rates declined significantly and housing and neighborhood conditions in the City improved visibly, as discussed in Chapter 3, "Household Incomes in New York City" and Chapter 7, "Housing Conditions in New York City." At the same time, as the City's economy grew steadily and solidly, job opportunities expanded and household incomes improved markedly. In addition, New Yorkers were better educated, as discussed later in this Chapter. Consequently, the City became a much better place to live and work, and, thus, apparently attracted more people than other areas. In fact, according to the Census 2000, the City's population grew by 686,000 or 9.4 percent between 1990 and 2000, while other cities, such as Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse in New York state and Philadelphia, Detroit, and Baltimore in the middle-Atlantic and mid-west lost sizeable population.<sup>5</sup>

Fifth, the Census Bureau made extensive efforts to reduce the undercount in 2000 by making the public aware of the importance of the census through working closely with agencies and groups in the public and private sectors and through paid advertising campaigns and educational programs.

A confluence of the above five reasons, particularly the last three, makes the overall count of number of persons, households, and housing units greater in the Census 2000 than in the 1999 HVS. However, the HVS provides more detailed data on the number and characteristics of population, households, and housing units than the Census 2000. Moreover, the Census 2000 covers fewer characteristics of households and housing units than the HVS and Census 2000 data on many demographic, social, economic and housing characteristics will not be released before this report is published. Furthermore, the Census 2000 does not cover characteristics of housing and households in the same detail as the HVS, nor does it cover neighborhood conditions. Therefore, in presenting and discussing the number and characteristics of population and households in this chapter, data primarily from the 1999 and previous HVSs will be used. However, data from the Census 2000 will be compared with the HVS data whenever such comparisons are useful.

In 1996, the number of people in the City was 7,230,000, according to the 1996 HVS. Over the nine-year period between 1987 and 1996, population increased by 204,000, or by an average of 0.3 percent annually (Table 2.1). The long-term upward trend of population growth in the City was sustained in the following three years through 1999.

### Locational Distribution of the Population

The 1999 HVS reports that 1,141,000 people, or 15.7 percent of the population in New York City, resided in the Bronx (Table 2.1). Brooklyn, with 2,209,000 people, or 30.5 percent of the people in the City, was still the most populous borough. In Manhattan, there were 1,544,000 people, or 21.3 percent of the people in the City. There were 1,952,000 people in Queens, 26.9 percent of the people in the City. Staten Island was the least populous borough, with a population of only 399,000, or 5.5 percent of the people in the City.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Data on crime, education, employment and incomes are from Chapter 3, "Household Incomes in New York City." Data on housing and neighborhood conditions are from Chapter 7, "Housing Conditions in New York City." Data on Population change between 1990 and 2000 are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 and 2000 Censuses.

The Census 2000 counts of people in each borough were higher than the HVS count, except for Manhattan, where the difference appears to be statistically not very meaningful. The Census 2000 reports that, of the City's population of 8,008,000, there were 1,333,000 people (or 16.7 percent of the City's population) in the Bronx; 2,465,000 people (30.8 percent) in Brooklyn; and 2,229,000 (27.8 percent) people in Queens, while there were 1,537,000 people (19.2 percent) in Manhattan and 444,000 people (5.5 percent) in Staten Island (Table 2.1).<sup>6</sup>

Population change has varied from borough to borough over the three years between 1996 and 1999. The population in Manhattan grew at a high rate of 0.8 percent per year, or by 101,000 people, between 1987 and 1996. This sharp long-term upward trend continued in the following three years, showing a high rate of increase of 0.9 percent per year, or 39,000 people, between 1996 and 1999 (Table 2.1). On the other hand, during this three-year period, population changes in three boroughs--the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens--reversed their long-term trends shown during the previous nine-year period between 1987 and 1996. In the Bronx, the population increased by 0.3 percent per year in the nine-year period but declined by 0.5 percent per year in the succeeding three years. In Queens, the population grew by 0.4 percent annually in the earlier nine-year period, however, the population in Brooklyn declined slightly by 0.1 percent annually; but, in the following three years, this trend was reversed to an increase of 0.2 percent annually.<sup>7</sup>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of the Population

The distribution of the City's population disaggregated by race and ethnicity for the last several survey years reveals a significant trend taking place in the racial and ethnic composition of the population in the City. Over the three years since 1996, the white non-Hispanic population (hereinafter referred to as the "white" population), the black/African American non-Hispanic population (hereinafter referred to as the "black" population), and the Puerto-Rican population declined by 67,000, 51,000, and 40,000 respectively (Table 2.2). However, during the same period, the non-Puerto Rican Hispanic population increased tremendously by 160,000, or by 5.0 percent per year. The size of the increase in non-Puerto Rican Hispanics alone was more than large enough to compensate for the size of the decrease in whites, blacks, and Puerto Ricans combined. Moreover, the total number of Hispanics--Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics together--was 1,932,000, or 69,000 more than the number of blacks in 1999. The Asian population also increased moderately, by 16,000 or by 0.8 percent per year, in the same three-year period (Figure 2.1).

<sup>6</sup> Reasons for the differences between the 1999 HVS and the Census 2000 in the number of people in each borough are the same as those cited for the City as a whole.

<sup>7</sup>Some of the changes in population, households, and housing units between 1999 and any of the previous survey years could be the result of the application of different weighting methods, as explained below. Prior to 1997, published population estimates and housing unit estimates made by the Census Bureau, including HVS estimates, were derived independently. However, as part of the Census 2000 project, the Census Bureau developed a methodology to integrate housing and population estimates, in an effort to improve housing estimates. Specifically, this new method was designed to treat, among other things, situations in which household and housing unit estimates are inconsistent. The Census Bureau used this methodology for the first time for the 1999 HVS in weighting the data. For further information on the weighting method used for the 1999 HVS, see Appendix D, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design, Estimation Procedure, Accuracy Statement, and Topcoding."

Table 2.2
Number of Individuals by Race/Ethnicity
and 1996-1999 Change and Average Annual Percent Change
New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

					Change	Average Annual Compound Growth Rate
Race/Ethnicity <sup>a</sup>	1987	1993	1996	<u> </u>	1996-99	1996-99
All	7,026,474	7,118,738	7,230,479	7,245,251	+14,772	+0.07%
White (non-Hispanic) <sup>b</sup>	2,942,771	2,893,358	2,829,811	2,762,931	-66,880	-0.79%
Black/African American (non-Hispanic) <sup>b</sup>	1,532,366	1,975,637	1,913,580	1,863,065	-50,515	-0.89%
Puerto Rican	741,696	760,640	783,692	743,818	-39,874	-1.73%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	744,412	919,346	1,028,047	1,188,225	+160,178	+4.95%
Asian (non-Hispanic) <sup>b,c</sup>	281,152	554,542	643,902	660,029	+16,127	+0.83%
Other <sup>c</sup>	138,050	15,215	31,448	27,182	-4,266	-4.74%
Unreported	646,026					

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

In 1987 the race/ethnicity of each household member was classified the same as that of the householder, while in 1991, 1993, а 1996, and 1999 the respondent identified the race and ethnicity of each household member individually.

Throughout this report, white non-Hispanics, black/African-American non-Hispanics, and Asian non-Hispanics will be referred to as "white," "black/African-American," and "Asian" respectively. In 1987 "Other" included American Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and all others identified as "Other race." For 1993, 1996, and h

с 1999 "Other" includes only American Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

A review of each racial and ethnic group's proportional share of the City's population confirms a remarkable growth in the number of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics in the City relative to other racial and ethnic groups in recent years. In 1987, only 11.7 percent of the people in the City were non-Puerto Rican Hispanics. Later, in 1999, it was 16.4 percent (Table 2.3). The Census 2000 reports this ethnic group's comparable share was 17.1 percent in 2000.8

Asians' proportionate share of the City's population also increased significantly during the twelve-year period, from only 4.4 percent in 1987 to 9.1 percent in 1999. On the other hand, whites' share of the population has been declining persistently, shrinking from 46.1 percent in 1987 to 41.1 percent in 1991 and 38.1 percent in 1999. Blacks' share of the population has also declined, from 27.2 percent in 1991 to 25.7 percent in 1999. (The Census 2000 does not provide data on whites, blacks, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000 Demographic Profile.



Figure 2.1 Population of Individuals in Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

Asians that are directly comparable to the HVS data on race.<sup>9</sup>) Puerto Ricans' share of the City's population declined from 11.6 percent in 1987 to 10.3 percent in 1999. The comparable proportion from the Census 2000 was 9.9 percent. Hispanics as a whole--Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics together--accounted for 26.7 percent of the people in the City, larger than the share of blacks, thus making Hispanics the largest minority group in 1999. The comparable proportion from the Census 2000 was 27.0 percent.<sup>10</sup>

In terms of residential location, each racial and ethnic group tended to cluster in certain boroughs, compared to the distribution of the general population. Almost eight in ten people in the City lived in three boroughs: Brooklyn (30.5 percent), Queens (26.9 percent), and Manhattan (21.3 percent). The remaining two in ten lived in the Bronx (15.7 percent) and Staten Island (5.5 percent). Similarly, more than eight in ten whites in the City resided in either Brooklyn (30.3 percent), Manhattan (26.3

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Census 2000 allowed respondents to select from 15 race-related response categories and to write in their race if the 15 categories were not adequate. In addition, for the first time respondents were allowed to select multiple race categories to describe themselves. On the other hand in the 1999 HVS, respondents selected one race from a list of 10 race categories.

	Year					
Race/Ethnicity <sup>a</sup>	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999	
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
White <sup>b</sup>	46.1%	41.1%	40.6%	39.1%	38.1%	
Black/African American <sup>b</sup>	24.0%	27.2%	27.8%	26.5%	25.7%	
Puerto Rican	11.6%	11.3%	10.7%	10.8%	10.3%	
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	11.7%	11.9%	12.9%	14.2%	16.4%	
Asian <sup>b,c</sup>	4.4%	6.7%	7.8%	8.9%	9.1%	
Other <sup>c</sup>	2.2%	1.7%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	

## Table 2.3Distribution of Individuals by Race/EthnicityNew York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a In 1987 race/ethnicity of each household member was classified the same as that of the householder, while in 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 the respondent identified the race and ethnicity of each household member individually.

b Throughout this report, white non-Hispanics, black/African-American non-Hispanics, and Asian non-Hispanics will be referred to as "white," "black/African American," and "Asian" respectively.

In 1987 and 1991 "Other" included American Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and all others identified as "Other race." For 1993, 1996, and 1999 "Other" includes only American Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos. Individuals identified by the respondent as "Other race" and those for whom no race was reported were allocated among the race categories.

percent), or Queens (26.1 percent), as did approximately the same proportion of people in the City as a whole (Table 2.4). Most of the remaining whites lived in Staten Island. The proportion of whites living in Staten Island (11.1 percent) was substantially higher than the proportion of other racial and ethnic groups living in the borough. On the other hand, the proportion of whites living in the Bronx (6.2 percent) was significantly lower than the proportion of the overall population and other racial and ethnic groups, except for Asians.

Whites in Brooklyn were highly concentrated in the southern part of the borough (Map 2.1). In most census tracts in sub-borough areas 10 (Bay Ridge), 11 (Bensonhurst), 12 (Borough Park), 13 (Coney Island), and 15 (Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend), a very high proportion of people were white. Whites were also concentrated in many census tracts in the eastern portion of sub-borough area 1 (Williamsburg/Green Point), the eastern and western portions of sub-borough area 6 (Park Slope/Carroll Gardens), and the southern portion of sub-borough area 14 (Flatbush). In Manhattan, whites were markedly concentrated in the middle and southwestern parts of the borough. In most census tracts in sub-borough areas 1 (Greenwich Village/Financial District) and 6 (Upper East Side) and in many census tracts in sub-borough area 4 (Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay) and the southern part of sub-borough area 1 (Astoria), the middle part of sub-borough area 5 (Middle Village/Ridgewood), the northern parts of sub-borough area 1 (Astoria), the middle part of sub-borough area 5 (Forest Hill/Rego Park) and 7 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 5 (Upper Vest Side) and 7 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 5 (Upper Vest Side) and 7 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 5 (Upper Vest Side) and 7 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 6 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough areas 6 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 6 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 7 (Flushing/Whitestone), the southern part of sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 5 sub-borough area 5 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 5 sub-borough area 5 sub-borough areas 6 sub-borough area 5 sub-boroug

Race/Ethnicity	All	<b>Bron</b> x <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	15.7%	30.5%	21.3%	26.9%	5.5%
White	100.0%	6.2%	30.3%	26.3%	26.1%	11.1%
Black/African American	100.0%	20.9%	42.3%	13.7%	21.6%	1.6%
Puerto Rican	100.0%	39.0%	28.6%	16.2%	13.6%	2.6%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	21.8%	19.2%	26.6%	30.6%	1.8%
Asian	100.0%	4.1%	20.4%	18.2%	54.1%	3.2%
Native American	100.0%	16.2%	31.5%	20.8%	31.0%	*

### Table 2.4 Distribution of Individuals by Borough and by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Too few individuals to report.

borough area 10 (Howard Beach/South Ozone Park), and the western part of sub-borough area 14 (The Rockaways). Whites in the Bronx were clustered in sub-borough area 6 (Riverdale/Kingsbridge), the middle part of sub-borough area 8 (Throgs Neck/Co-op City), and the south-central part of sub-borough area 9 (Pelham Parkway). In Staten Island, whites made up eight or more in ten of all people living in almost all census tracts in sub-borough areas 2 (Mid-Island) and 3 (South Shore); in most census tracts in the southern part of sub-borough area 1, most of the people were white.

More than four in ten blacks lived in Brooklyn (42.3 percent), making the proportion of blacks in the borough substantially higher than that of any other racial and ethnic group (Table 2.4). Another two in ten blacks lived in the Bronx (20.9 percent). Most of the remaining blacks lived in Queens (21.6 percent) and Manhattan (13.7 percent).

Blacks were highly concentrated in four geographically well-defined, relatively small areas in the City: first, the area in Manhattan that covers sub-borough area 8 (Central Harlem) and the northern part of sub-borough area 9 (East Harlem); second, the area in Brooklyn that covers the following seven sub-borough areas or portions thereof: the eastern part of 2 (Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene), all of 3 (Bedford Stuyvesant), the midwestern part of 5 (East New York/Starrett City), and all of 8 (North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights), 9 (South Crown Heights), 16 (Brownsville/Ocean Hill), and 17 (East Flatbush); third, relatively small areas in Queens that cover sub-borough area 12 (Jamaica) and the central part of sub-borough area 13 (Bellerose/Rosedale) in Queens; and, fourth, sub-borough area 10 (Williamsbridge/Baychester) in the Bronx. In most census tracts in these areas, eight or more in ten people were black (Map 2.2).

Almost four in ten Puerto Ricans in the City lived in the Bronx, more than twice the proportion of the City's general population in the borough and substantially higher than that of other racial and

Map 2.1 White Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population New York City 1999



ethnic groups in the borough (Table 2.4). Consequently, the proportion of Puerto Ricans living in other boroughs was significantly lower than that of other racial and ethnic groups as well as that of the City's general population. The proportions of Puerto Ricans living in Queens (13.6 percent) and Staten Island (2.6 percent) were particularly low, only about half of the overall population's proportion in the borough (Map 2.3).

The City's non-Puerto Rican Hispanics lived throughout the City's four populous boroughs--Queens (30.6 percent), Manhattan (26.6 percent), the Bronx (21.8 percent), or Brooklyn (19.2 percent)-but there were relatively fewer in Brooklyn than the rest of the population (Table 2.4) (Map 2.4).

Hispanics--which includes both Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics together--were scattered throughout the City, although their proportion of the population appeared to be relatively

Map 2.2 Black Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population New York City 1999



higher in the northern part of Manhattan, the southern part of the Bronx, and the northern part of Brooklyn.

More than one in every two Asians in the City lived in Queens (54.1 percent), a disproportionately larger share compared to other racial and ethnic groups living in the borough, while the remainder lived mostly in two other boroughs: Brooklyn (20.4 percent) or Manhattan (18.2 percent) (Table 2.4). In Queens, Asians were concentrated in the southwestern part of sub-borough area 7 (Flushing/Whitestone). Asians in Manhattan were concentrated in the lower part of sub-borough area 2 (Lower East Side/Chinatown) and the southeastern part of sub-borough area 1 (Greenwich Village/Financial District). In Brooklyn, Asians were clustered in some census tracts in the following sub-borough areas: 7 (Sunset Park), 10 (Bay Ridge), 11 (Bensonhurst), and 12 (Borough Park) (Map 2.5).

Map 2.3 Puerto Rican Hispanic Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population New York City 1999



The distribution of population by race and ethnicity within each borough provides additional insights into the unique racial and ethnic composition of the population in each borough. One-third of the population in the Bronx was black, and more than eight in ten people in the borough were either black (34.1 percent), Puerto Rican (25.4 percent), or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (22.8 percent) (Table 2.5). The number of whites in the borough was very small, fewer than one in six. However, close to four in ten people in Brooklyn were white (37.9 percent). Blacks also constituted a large proportion of the borough's population: 35.7 percent. Thus, whites and blacks together constituted almost three-quarters of the population in the borough. Another two in ten people in the borough were either non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (10.3 percent) or Puerto Rican (9.6 percent). The remainder was a relatively small group of Asians (6.1 percent).
Map 2.4 Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population New York City 1999



Almost one in every two people in Manhattan (47.0 percent) was white, while close to four in ten were either non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (20.5 percent) or black (16.5 percent) (Table 2.5). The remaining one in six was equally divided between Puerto Rican and Asian. Of the people in Queens, which is the most racially and ethnically diverse county in the City, close to four in ten were white (36.9 percent). The remaining six in ten were divided almost evenly into the following three major racial and ethnic groups: black (20.6 percent), non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (18.6 percent), and Asian (18.3 percent). The overwhelming majority of people in Staten Island were white (77.1 percent), while the remainder were relatively small groups of blacks (7.3 percent), non-Puerto Rican Hispanics (5.3 percent), Asians (5.3 percent), and Puerto Ricans (4.9 percent) (Figure 2.2).

Map 2.5 Asian and Pacific Islander Population Density as a Percentage of Total Population New York City 1999



		New Yor	k City 1999	)	8	
Race/Ethnicity	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
White	38.1%	15.0%	37.9%	47.0%	36.9%	77.1%
Black/African American	25.7%	34.1%	35.7%	16.5%	20.6%	7.3%
Puerto Rican	10.3%	25.4%	9.6%	7.8%	5.2%	4.9%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	16.4%	22.8%	10.3%	20.5%	18.6%	5.3%
Asian	9.1%	2.3%	6.1%	7.8%	18.3%	5.3%
Native American	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	*

# Table 2.5Distribution of Individuals by Race/Ethnicity within Borough<br/>New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

Notes: a

Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Too few individuals to report.





#### Age and Gender Distribution of the Population

A review of the population by age provides useful information pertinent to an additional understanding of population characteristics in terms of housing needs and demands. The average age of the population in the City was 35.6 years in 1999, virtually constant since 1987 (Table 2.6). The average age was highest for whites, 41.4 years, and lowest for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, 30.3 years, in 1999. The average ages for Asians, blacks, and Puerto Ricans were 33.9, 32.4, and 31.7 respectively.

There has been no meaningful change in the average age of whites since 1987. However, it is worth noting that the average age of blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Asians is getting higher on average. The average age of blacks rose from 31.1 years in 1993 to 32.4 years in 1999 (Table 2.6). At the same time, the average age of Puerto Ricans increased from 28.9 years in 1987 to 30.3 years in 1996 and 31.7 years in 1999. For Asians, the average age increased from 30.9 years in 1987 to 32.9 years in 1996 and 33.9 years in 1999.

The higher average age of whites among all racial and ethnic groups is further illustrated by age distribution by race and ethnicity. Almost one in five whites in the City was 65 or older, while only one in six whites was younger than 18 (Table 2.7). Comparable figures for all people in the City were approximately one in eight and one in four respectively. The pattern of age distribution for blacks, Puerto Ricans, and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics was almost opposite to that for whites: three in ten were younger than 18, while fewer than one in ten was 65 or older. As their lower average age suggests, six in ten non-Puerto Rican Hispanics were 34 years old or younger, while only five in ten of all people in the City fell into this age group. Of Asians, more than one-third were in the economically active age group between 35 and 54 years of age, the highest proportion of any racial and ethnic category in this age group.

The average ages of people in Manhattan (37.4 years) and Queens (37.0 years) were higher than the average ages of all people in the City and the other boroughs (Table 2.8). The average age of people in the Bronx, 32.9 years, was lower than the citywide average and the lowest of all the boroughs. The average age of people in Staten Island was 35.9 years, similar to the average age in the City overall; in Brooklyn, it was 34.4 years.

In 1999, 53.0 percent of the people in the City were female (Table 2.9). However, this gender distribution did not remain constant for different age groups. Young people less than 18 years old were almost evenly divided into male and female, but the older the people, the more females: for those between 18 and 64, more than half were female; of people 65 or older, more than six in ten were female.

Race/Ethnicity <sup>a</sup>	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999
All	35.8	35.2	35.1	35.0	35.6
White	41.4	41.5	41.4	41.0	41.4
Black/African American	31.9	31.1	31.1	31.4	32.4
Puerto Rican	28.9	28.8	29.7	30.3	31.7
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	29.5	29.9	30.0	30.2	30.3
Asian	30.9	33.4	33.0	32.9	33.9
Other	32.1	30.5	30.4	32.4	38.0
Non-Report	40.6	36.9			

# Table 2.6Mean Age of Individuals by Race/EthnicityNew York City, Selected Years 1987 - 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

In 1987 and 1991 "Other" included American Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and all others identified as "Other race."
 For 1993, 1996 and 1999 "Other" includes only American Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos; individuals the respondent identified as "Other race" and those for whom race was not reported were allocated among the race categories.

				Age Group			Mean Age in
Race/Ethnicity	All	<18	18-34	35-54	55-64	65+	Years
All	100.0%	24.4%	26.2%	28.9%	8.4%	12.1%	35.6
White	100.0%	16.6%	24.0%	30.4%	9.9%	19.0%	41.4
Black/African American	100.0%	30.8%	24.5%	27.7%	8.4%	8.6%	32.4
Puerto Rican	100.0%	31.3%	26.3%	26.9%	7.6%	8.0%	31.7
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	29.1%	31.9%	26.3%	6.6%	6.1%	30.3
Asian	100.0%	22.8%	29.0%	33.5%	6.6%	8.1%	33.9
Native American	100.0%	17.9%	33.1%	24.9%	9.8%	14.2%	38.0

#### Table 2.7 Distribution of Individuals by Age Group within Race/Ethnicity Categories New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Borough	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999
All	35.8	35.2	35.1	35.0	35.6%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	33.9	32.6	32.9	32.5	32.9%
Brooklyn	34.2	34.1	33.9	34.1	34.4%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	38.7	37.3	37.2	36.8	37.4%
Queens	37.5	36.6	36.5	36.1	37.0%
Staten Island	32.8	34.3	34.7	35.4	35.9%

# Table 2.8Mean Age of Individuals by BoroughNew York City, Selected Years 1987 - 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

# Table 2.9Distribution of Individuals by Gender and by Age Group<br/>New York City 1999

		Gen	ıder	
Age Group	Number	Both	Male	Female
All Groups	7,245,251	100.0%	47.0%	53.0%
Less Than 18 Years	1,766,723	100.0%	50.6%	49.4%
18-64 Years	4,602,054	100.0%	47.4%	52.6%
65 Years and Older	876,474	100.0%	37.9%	62.1%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

### Educational Attainment of the Population

An individual's level of educational attainment has significant relevance to housing issues, since it is one of the determinants of an individual's ability to earn an adequate amount of income to afford housing. Educational attainment can be very usefully combined with other population characteristics-such as income and labor characteristics (like labor force participation rates, employment rates, and employment by industrial and occupational categories)--to gauge the differentiated demand for or the affordability of housing. Unlike income information alone, which can help us estimate how much money individuals had during a particular year before the HVS was conducted, information on educational attainment can provide us with insights into, first, the employability and, second, the potential earning capability individuals have or have not yet utilized and could utilize in the future. As the City's economy has substantially transformed from manufacturing to an advanced technology-, information-, and other knowledge-oriented economy, it has been widely recognized that, without a high level of educational attainment, it is extremely difficult for individuals to find jobs paying earnings high enough for those individuals to afford to rent or buy decent housing in the City, where the scarcity of affordable housing has been an increasingly serious problem in the City's very inflationary housing market. In this context, the level of educational attainment among different population groups for persons 18 years old or older living in renter, owner, and all households will be presented and discussed separately in this subsection and will be further discussed in Chapter 3 in the context of incomes and affordability.

According to the 1999 HVS, people in New York City were significantly better educated in 1999 than they were three years previously. In 1999, 77.4 percent of individuals 18 years old or older in all households, renter and owner combined, had finished at least high school, an increase of 2.0 percentage points over 1996 (Table 2.10). Particularly, when educational attainment is measured by the percentage of individuals with a higher education degree, New Yorkers became substantially better educated during those three years: the percentage of those who had graduated at least from college increased by 3.5 percentage points to 29.2 percent. With this significant improvement in level of educational attainment, the income of New Yorkers would certainly be expected to improve accordingly.

All racial and ethnic groups improved in their educational attainment, when judged from data on college graduation, during the three years between 1996 and 1999. In terms of high school graduates, again improvements were made for all racial and ethnic groups, except Asians, whose educational achievement appeared to remain the same in this regard. Whites achieved the highest proportion of educational milestones among the racial and ethnic groups by both measurements, high school graduates and college graduates. In 1999, almost nine in ten whites had graduated at least from high school, while more than four in ten had received a college degree (Table 2.10). Whites' educational achievement during the preceding three and six years was also substantial. The percent of white individuals with at least a high school diploma improved from 83.2 percent in 1993 to 85.1 percent in 1996 and 88.3 percent in 1999. Their achievement in higher education was even more remarkable. The percent of whites who were college graduates was 44.0 percent in 1999, a jump of 6.4 percentage points and 8.6 percentage points respectively, from 37.6 percent in 1996 and 35.4 percent in 1993. Three-quarters of Asians at least graduated from high school, while more than one-third graduated from college. However, their improvement over the preceding three and six years was not steady. The percent of Asians who at least graduated from high school remained the same between 1993 and 1999, while the percent of college graduates declined from 35.0 percent in 1993 to 33.2 percent in 1996 and then improved to 36.6 percent in 1999.

Almost eight in ten blacks had at least graduated from high school, and more than one in six had graduated from college in 1999 (Table 2.10). Like whites, blacks also improved their educational attainment markedly during the three years from 1996 to 1999. The percentage of blacks who had at least graduated from high school increased by 3.5 percentage points to 78.3 percent in the three years. However, only six in ten each of Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics had at least finished high school, while one in ten Puerto Ricans and one in seven non-Puerto Rican Hispanics had received college degrees in 1999 (Table 2.10). However, these groups also made encouraging improvements over

	Educational Attainment							
Race/Ethnicity	Year	All	Less than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	At Least College Graduate		
All	1999	100.0%	22.6%	28.5%	19.7%	29.2%		
	1996		24.7%	29.7%	20.0%	25.7%		
	1993		25.6%	31.0%	19.2%	24.3%		
White	1999	100.0%	11.7%	27.7%	16.6%	44.0%		
	1996		14.9%	29.0%	18.5%	37.6%		
	1993		16.8%	29.7%	18.0%	35.4%		
Black/African	1999	100.0%	21.7%	33.0%	27.8%	17.5%		
American	1996		25.2%	32.8%	25.1%	16.8%		
	1993		25.9%	36.6%	23.9%	13.6%		
Puerto Rican	1999	100.0%	41.3%	27.7%	21.1%	10.0%		
	1996		42.7%	30.0%	19.0%	8.3%		
	1993		45.6%	27.7%	18.9%	7.8%		
Non-Puerto	1999	100.0%	41.8%	26.5%	17.8%	13.8%		
Rican Hispanic	1996		43.3%	28.1%	17.5%	11.1%		
	1993		43.4%	29.9%	16.2%	10.5%		
Asian	1999	100.0%	23.4%	24.9%	15.1%	36.6%		
	1996		23.0%	25.9%	17.8%	33.2%		
	1993		23.7%	26.0%	15.3%	35.0%		
Native American	1999	100.0%	14.8%	38.7%	22.7%	23.8%		
	1996		28.4%	33.8%	21.4%	16.4%		
	1993		30.7%	29.6%	17.6%*	22.1%		

#### Table 2.10 Distribution of Educational Attainment Among Individuals Aged 18 or Over in All Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996, and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

the period. The percentage of Puerto Ricans who had at least completed high school was 54.4 percent in 1993, growing to 57.3 percent in 1996 and 58.7 percent in 1999. The percentage of college graduates also increased, from 7.8 percent to 8.3 percent and 10.0 percent in each of the three years. The percent of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics who had at least graduated from high school increased from 56.7 percent in 1996 to 58.2 percent in 1999. At the same time, their percent of college graduates improved from 10.5 percent in 1993 to 13.8 percent in 1999.

The pattern of educational attainment by race and ethnicity among renters resembled the pattern for all households, since the preponderant number of households in the City are renters. For white renters, 88.3 percent had at least graduated from high school, while 47.5 percent had finished college (Table 2.11). Percents of Asian renters who had at least graduated from high school and those who had graduated from college were 75.0 and 36.8 respectively. The proportion of black renters who had graduated from high school was 74.2 percent, no meaningful difference from the comparable Asian percent; however, blacks' percentage of college graduates was only 14.2 percent. The percents of Puerto Rican and non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renters who had at least graduated from high school were 54.8 and 55.2 respectively, while the percents of college graduates were 8.0 and 12.5 respectively (Figure 2.3).

In general, owners were considerably better educated than renters. The proportion of individuals in owner households who had at least finished high school was 85.5 percent in 1999, while it was 73.1 percent for individuals in renter households (Tables 2.11 and 2.12). Comparing the educational attainment of each racial and ethnic group among those in owner households to those in renter households shows the following noteworthy patterns. First, whites were the best educated among all racial and ethnic groups, regardless of whether they were in renter households or owner households. Furthermore, whites in renter households were just as well or better educated than those in owner households. In 1999, almost nine in ten whites in renter and owner households each had finished at least high school. Moreover, almost one in two in renter households and four in ten in owner households had at least graduated from college (Tables 2.11 and 2.12 and Figures 2.3 and 2.4).

Second, for blacks, Puerto Ricans, and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, those in owner households were approximately twice as well educated as those in renter households, in terms of both high school and college graduates (Tables 2.11 and 2.12). Asians in owner households had a slightly higher level of

	Educational Attainment						
Race/Ethnicity	All	Less than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	At Least College Graduate		
All	100.0%	26.9%	27.6%	18.8%	26.8%		
White	100.0%	11.7%	25.2%	15.6%	47.5%		
Black/African American	100.0%	25.8%	33.4%	26.6%	14.2%		
Puerto Rican	100.0%	45.2%	27.0%	19.7%	8.0%		
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	44.8%	26.5%	16.2%	12.5%		
Asian	100.0%	25.0%	23.3%	14.9%	36.8%		
Native American	100.0%	17.9%	42.4%	23.5%	16.3%		

#### Table 2.11 Distribution of Educational Attainment Among Individuals Aged 18 or Over in Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

educational attainment than those in renter households, when attainment is measured by high school graduation; but each had about the same proportion of college graduates.

In terms of a high school graduation level of educational attainment, people in Staten Island were better educated than those in the other boroughs, followed by those in Manhattan and Queens. In Staten Island, 85.4 percent of people had finished at least high school; the comparable percentages in Manhattan and Queens were 82.1 and 80.6 respectively; for Brooklyn and the Bronx, the corresponding percentages were 74.7 percent and 66.6 percent respectively (Table 2.13). However, in terms of the proportion of people who had a college degree, people in Manhattan were the best educated. One in two people in Manhattan had at least graduated from college, while three in ten people in Staten Island and one in four people in Queens had. The comparable proportions for Brooklyn and the Bronx were 22.7 percent and 14.7 percent respectively (Figure 2.5) (Map 2.6).



Figure 2.3 Level of Educational Attainment by Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Aged 18 or Over in Renter Households New York City 1999

### Table 2.12 Distribution of Educational Attainment Among Individuals Aged 18 or Over in Owner Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

	Educational Attainment						
Race/Ethnicity	All	Less than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	At Least College Graduate		
All	100.0%	14.5%	30.4%	21.5%	33.7%		
White	100.0%	11.8%	30.6%	17.7%	39.8%		
Black/African American	100.0%	13.7%	32.1%	30.2%	24.0%		
Puerto Rican	100.0%	23.8%	30.4%	27.3%	18.5%		
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	22.9%	26.6%	28.0%	22.5%		
Asian	100.0%	20.9%	27.4%	15.3%	36.4%		
Native American	100.0%	**	30.3%	21.0%*	41.1%		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

## Table 2.13 Distribution of Educational Attainment Among Individuals Aged 18 or Over by Borough New York City 1999

	Educational Attainment						
Borough	All	Less than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	At Least College Graduate		
All	100.0%	22.6%	28.5%	19.7%	29.2%		
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	33.4%	31.8%	20.1%	14.7%		
Brooklyn	100.0%	25.3%	31.2%	20.8%	22.7%		
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	17.9%	16.1%	15.5%	50.5%		
Queens	100.0%	19.4%	33.0%	21.6%	26.0%		
Staten Island	100.0%	14.6%	35.9%	21.0%	28.5%		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

Figure 2.4 Level of Educational Attainment by Race/Ethnicity of Individuals Aged 18 or Over in Owner Households New York City 1999





Figure 2.5 Level of Educational Attainment of Individuals Aged 18 or Over by Borough New York City 1999

Map 2.6 Percentage of Population Age 18 and Over with Less than 12 Years of Education New York City 1999



# Households

The 1999 HVS reports that the number of households in New York City was 2,868,000 in 1999. This represents an increase of 88,000 households, or 3.2 percent, over the 2,780,000 households in 1996 (Table 2.14). On the other hand, according to the Census 2000, the number was 3,022,000. The overall number of households from the Census 2000 is more updated and complete than the number from the HVS, as discussed earlier. However, in presenting and discussing the number and characteristics of households in detail, in the context of a comprehensive housing market analysis, the HVS is better than the Census 2000, since the HVS is a much more comprehensive source of detailed data on characteristics of population, households and housing units.

			All Hous	seholds		
	19	996	199	9	Difference	1996 - 1999
Borough	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	2,780,349	100.0%	2,868,415	100.0%	88,066	+3.2%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	411,775	14.8%	419,040	14.6%	7,265	+1.8%
Brooklyn	813,544	29.3%	821,293	28.6%	7,749	+1.0%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	703,943	25.3%	727,437	25.4%	23,494	+3.3%
Queens	713,978	25.7%	755,737	26.3%	41,759	+5.8%
Staten Island	137,109	4.9%	144,907	5.1%	7,798	+5.7%
			Rent	ers		
	19	996	1999		Difference 1996 – 1999	
Borough	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	1,946,165	100.0%	1,953,289	100.0%	7,124	+0.4%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	327,922	16.8%	327,444	16.8%	**	**
Brooklyn	591,694	30.4%	587,780	30.1%	-3,914	-0.7%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	561,100	28.9%	561,534	28.7%	**	**
Queens	412,789	21.2%	423,405	21.7%	10,616	+2.6%
Staten Island	52,660	2.7%	53,126	2.7%	**	**
			Own	ers		
	1996		199	9	Difference	1996 - 1999
Borough	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	834,183	100.0%	915,126	100.0%	80,943	+9.7%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	83,853	10.1%	91,596	10.0%	7,743	+9.2%
Brooklyn	221,850	26.6%	233,513	25.5%	11,663	+5.3%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	142,843	17.1%	165,904	18.1%	23,061	+16.1%
Queens	301,189	36.1%	332,332	36.3%	31,143	+10.3%
Staten Island	84,449	10.1%	91,781	10.0%	7,332	+8.7%

# Table 2.14 Number of Households by Borough and Tenure New York City 1996 and 1999

Notes: Marble Hill in the Bronx.

a Marble Hill in the Diola.\*\* Too few households to report.

#### Households by Location

The distribution of households by borough in 1999 was relatively consistent with that of the population by borough. There were 821,000 households in Brooklyn, 28.6 percent and the largest share of all households in New York City, followed by Queens, where 756,000 households, or 26.3 percent of the City's households, resided (Table 2.15). In Manhattan, there were 727,000 households, or 25.4 percent of the City's households, while 419,000, or 14.6 percent of the City's households, resided in the Bronx. There were only 145,000 households, or 5.1 percent and the smallest proportion of the City's households, residend.

	New York	City 1999	
		Tenure	
Borough	All	Owners	Renters
All	2,868,415	915,126	1,953,289
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	419,040	91,596	327,444
Brooklyn	821,293	233,513	587,780
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	727,437	165,904	561,534
Queens	755,737	332,332	423,405
Staten Island	144,907	91,781	53,126
Within Tenure			
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	14.6%	10.0%	16.8%
Brooklyn	28.6%	25.5%	30.1%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	25.4%	18.1%	28.7%
Queens	26.3%	36.3%	21.7%
Staten Island	5.1%	10.0%	2.7%
Within Borough			
All	100.0%	31.9%	68.1%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	21.9%	78.1%
Brooklyn	100.0%	28.4%	71.6%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	22.8%	77.2%
Queens	100.0%	44.0%	56.0%
Staten Island	100.0%	63.3%	36.7%

Table 2.15
Number and Distribution of Households by Borough and Tenure
New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

The number of households increased in every borough over the three years between 1996 and 1999, even in Queens and the Bronx, where the population declined. (Some of the inconsistency shown in population and household changes between 1996 and 1999 is likely the result of the new weighting method the Census Bureau used for the 1999 HVS, which is different from the one used for the 1996 and previous HVSs.<sup>11</sup> In fact, according to the Census 2000, the numbers of households in the Bronx and Queens were 463,000 and 783,000 respectively in 2000, substantially larger than the numbers the 1999 HVS reports.<sup>12</sup> In other words, in reality, the population in the two boroughs probably did not decline.) However, the size of the increase in households varied from borough to borough. Increases in Queens and Manhattan were considerable, with the additional number of households in Queens (42,000 or 5.8 percent) and Manhattan (23,000 or 3.3 percent) together totaling 65,000, or almost three-quarters of the increase of 88,000 in the City as a whole (Table 2.14).

#### Households by Tenure

More than nine in ten of the increase in the number of households in the City between 1996 and 1999 were owner households (Table 2.14). During the nine-year period from 1987 to 1996, the number of owner households in the City increased slightly by 17,000, or by 2.0 percent. But, during the most recent three years from 1996 to 1999, the number of owner households amounted to 915,000, increasing by 81,000 households, or 9.7 percent, almost five times the rate of increase during the preceding nine-year period (Table 2.16).

On the other hand, during the same nine-year period between 1987 and 1996, the number of renter households increased by 62,000, or by 3.3 percent (Table 2.16). In the following three years, however, it grew just slightly to 1,953,000. As a result of the considerable increase in the number of owner households and the marginal increase in the number of renter households between 1996 and 1999, renter households' proportion of all households decreased by 1.9 percentage points, from 70.0 percent in 1996 to 68.1 percent in 1999.

As was the case for all households, two-thirds of the increase in owner households during the three years occurred in Manhattan and Queens (Table 2.14). Specifically, in Manhattan, the number of owner households increased by 23,000, or by 16.1 percent; more than eight in ten of these additional owner households were in private cooperatives.<sup>13</sup> In Queens, the number increased by 31,000 households, or by 10.3 percent; more than eight in ten of this increase were in either conventional units (59.8 percent) or private cooperatives (25.4 percent).<sup>14</sup> In Brooklyn, the number of owner households increased by 12,000, or by 5.3 percent.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> For information on the new weighting method, see Appendix D.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, the Census 2000.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

The distribution of renter households by borough mirrored the distribution of all households by borough, because of the disproportionate dominance of renter households in the City. However, the distribution of owner households was different. The largest proportion of owner households in the City, 36.3 percent, resided in Queens, followed by 25.5 percent in Brooklyn (Table 2.15). Another 18.1 percent lived in Manhattan. The remaining 20.0 percent of owner households in the City were equally divided between the Bronx and Staten Island.

Household distribution within each borough by tenure shows the homeownership rate in each borough--that is, owner households' relative proportion of all households. In the City, the homeownership rate was 31.9 percent in 1999--that is, 31.9 percent of all households in the City were owner households (Table 2.15). Contrarily to this very low citywide homeownership rate, the homeownership rate in Staten Island was 63.3 percent, more than double the citywide rate, while the rate in Queens was 44.0 percent, substantially higher than the rate in the City as a whole. The homeownership rates in the other three boroughs were significantly lower than the citywide rate. The rate in Brooklyn was 28.4 percent; while it was 22.8 percent in Manhattan and 21.9 percent in the Bronx, markedly lower than the citywide rate of 31.9 percent.

While the City's homeownership rate is still low compared to the national rate and rates in other cities, it should be noted that the increase from 30.0 percent in 1996 to 31.9 percent in 1999 resulted from conversions and new construction and was helped notably by the City's effective efforts to expand homeownership opportunities in the City (Table 2.16).

#### Households by Rent Regulation Status

In 1999, seven in ten renter households in New York City lived in units whose rent was controlled or regulated by some form of federal, state, or city law and/or regulation (Table 2.17). Of all 1,953,000 renter households, 54.9 percent lived in rent-stabilized units (52.2 percent) or rent-controlled units (2.7 percent), while 15.7 percent lived in either public housing units (8.7 percent), *in rem* units

Table 2.16Number and Percent of Households by TenureNew York City, Selected Years 1987-1999						
			Year			
Tenure	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999	
All	2,701,686	2,780,711	2,775,225	2,780,349	2,868,415	
Owner	817,476	829,135	804,870	834,183	915,126	
Renter	1,884,210	1,951,576	1,970,355	1,946,165	1,953,289	
Percent Renter	69.7%	70.2%	71.0%	70.0%	68.1%	
Percent Owner	30.3%	29.8%	29.0%	30.0%	31.9%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

(0.8 percent), Mitchell-Lama units (3.4 percent), or "other-regulated" units (2.8 percent), such as HUD rent-regulated units, loft units, and New York State Article 4 units.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, 29.3 percent lived in unregulated rental units, whose owners can freely charge whatever rent they want, considering market conditions, without any government intervention in their determination of what rent is charged.

In Manhattan, close to nine in ten renter households lived in units whose rents were controlled and/or regulated by federal, state, and/or City laws or regulations (Table 2.18). In the borough, twothirds of renter households lived in rent-stabilized units (63.1 percent) or rent-controlled units (4.3 percent). Another more than one in six lived in public housing units (9.5 percent), Mitchell-Lama units (4.0 percent), "other-regulated" units (3.6 percent), or *in rem* units (1.5 percent). As a result, an extremely small portion of renter households in the borough (14.0 percent) lived in rent-unregulated, free-market units. As in Manhattan, an overwhelming majority of renter households in the Bronx, eight in ten, lived in various types of rent-controlled or rent-regulated units. In the borough, almost six in ten renter households lived in rent-stabilized units (57.1 percent) or rent-controlled units (1.3 percent). More than two in ten renter households lived in public housing units (11.0 percent), Mitchell-Lama units (5.9 percent), "other-regulated" units (3.9 percent), or *in rem* units (1.1 percent). The remaining very small proportion of rental units in the borough, only two in ten households (19.7 percent), lived in unregulated rental units (Figure 2.6).

Almost two-thirds of renter households in Brooklyn lived in units whose rents were controlled or regulated by government agencies. In the borough, one in two renter households lived in rent-stabilized units (46.0 percent) or rent-controlled units (2.5 percent) (Table 2.18). Another one in six lived in public housing units (9.8 percent), Mitchell-Lama units (2.9 percent), "other-regulated units" (2.8 percent), or *in rem* units (0.5 percent). On the other hand, more than one in three renter households lived in unregulated rental units (35.5 percent).

In Queens, a little fewer than six in ten renter households lived in rental units whose rents were controlled or regulated by public interventions. As in Brooklyn, almost one in two renter households lived in either rent-stabilized units (46.8 percent) or rent-controlled units (2.2 percent) (Table 2.18). The borough's relatively small proportion of renter households lived in public housing units (4.1 percent), Mitchell-Lama units (2.0 percent), or "other-regulated" units (1.2 percent). But a relatively large

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> "Controlled" units have their rents regulated under the provisions of the Local Emergency Rent Control Law of 1962. "Stabilized" units have their rents regulated under the provisions of the Rent Stabilization Law of 1969 and the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974. "Mitchell-Lama rental" units are in buildings constructed under the provisions of Article 2 of the PHFL. Rents of these units are directly regulated; adjustments are based on changes in operating costs, debt structure, and profitability in the particular project and must be approved by the appropriate state or city agency. "Other-regulated" units are regulated outside the rent control and rent stabilization systems and are primarily units in buildings which have received subsidies through federal, state, or local low-income housing programs, such as HUD's Section 8 New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation and 221(d)3 Programs, and the Article 4 Program, the rents of which are regulated under the provisions of these programs. This category also includes some unsubsidized, but rent-regulated, loft units. "Unregulated" units have either never been subject to rent regulation or were at one time rent-regulated but subsequently have become unregulated. "Public housing" units are owned and operated by the New York City Housing Authority. "In rem" units are in buildings which are owned by the City of New York as a result of an in rem proceeding against the previous owner for failure to pay real estate taxes or other City charges. More extensive definitions of these six regulatory categories, together with descriptions of the procedures used to categorize sample units, are provided in Appendix C, "Definitions of Rent Regulation Status."

Regulatory Status	Number	Percent
All	1,953,289	100.0%
Controlled	52,562	2.7%
Stabilized	1,020,588	52.2%
Pre-1947	749,010	38.3%
Post-1947	271,578	13.9%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	67,146	3.4%
In Rem	15,253	0.8%
Public Housing	169,339	8.7%
Other Regulated	55,539	2.8%
Unregulated	572,862	29.3%

Table 2.17 Number and Distribution of Renter Households by Regulatory Status New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Table 2.18
Distribution of Renter Households by Regulatory Status within Boroughs
New York City 1999

<b>Regulatory Status</b>	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
Number	1,953,289	327,444	587,780	561,534	423,405	53,126
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Controlled	2.7%	1.3%	2.5%	4.3%	2.2%	*
Stabilized	52.2%	57.1%	46.0%	63.1%	46.8%	19.8%
Pre-1947	38.3%	47.7%	37.0%	52.0%	19.1%	5.0%
Post-1947	13.9%	9.4%	9.0%	11.2%	27.7%	14.8%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	3.4%	5.9%	2.9%	4.0%	2.0%	*
In Rem	0.8%	1.1%	0.5%	1.5%	*	*
Public Housing	8.7%	11.0%	9.8%	9.5%	4.1%	10.1%
Other Regulated	2.8%	3.9%	2.8%	3.6%	1.2%	*
Unregulated	29.3%	19.7%	35.5%	14.0%	43.8%	67.5%
In Rental Buildings	26.0%	17.9%	34.1%	9.7%	38.0%	63.2%
In Coops/Condos	3.4%	1.8%	1.5%	4.3%	5.8%	4.3%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Too few households to report.



Figure 2.6 Households by Rental Regulation Status within Borough New York City 1999

proportion of renter households compared to the proportion of renters in the City as a whole and in the other populous boroughs, 43.8 percent of renter households in the borough, lived in unregulated rental units.

In Staten Island, unlike in the other boroughs, more renter households lived in unregulated rental units than in all types of rent-controlled or rent-regulated units as a whole. Two-thirds of renter households in the borough lived in unregulated rental units, while the remaining third lived mostly in rent-stabilized units (19.8 percent) or public housing units (10.1 percent) (Table 2.18).

### Households by Type of Ownership

In 1999, 915,000 households lived in owner units in New York City, of which 62.8 percent were in conventional owner units, while the remainder were in private cooperative units (25.7 percent), condominiums (5.5 percent), or Mitchell-Lama units (6.0 percent) (Table 2.19).

From borough to borough, the distribution of owner households by form of ownership was inconsistent from the pattern in the City as a whole. In the Bronx, six in ten owner households lived in conventional units, while more than two in ten lived in Mitchell-Lama units (Table 2.20). The remaining one in six lived in private cooperative or condominium units. A large proportion of owner households

### Table 2.19 Number and Distribution of Owner Households by Form of Ownership New York City 1999

Form of Ownership	Number	Percent
All	915,126	100.0%
Conventional	574,353	62.8%
Cooperative	235,257	25.7%
Condominium	50,671	5.5%
Mitchell-Lama Coop	54,845	6.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Table 2.20
Distribution of Owner Households by Form of Ownership by Borough
New York City 1999

Form of Ownership	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
Number	915,126	91,596	233,513	165,904	332,332	91,781
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Conventional	62.8%	61.1%	77.4%	4.4%	73.2%	94.8%
Cooperative	25.7%	14.8%	15.3%	72.2%	19.9%	**
Condominium	5.5%	1.7%*	1.8%	15.7%	4.3%	5.0%
Mitchell-Lama Coop	6.0%	22.4%	5.5%	7.7%	2.7%	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:aMarble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

in Brooklyn, more than three-quarters, lived in conventional units, while one in six lived in private cooperative or condominium units. The remaining very small proportion, one in twenty, lived in Mitchell-Lama cooperative units. Unlike the patterns in the City as a whole and in the other boroughs, almost nine in ten homeowners in Manhattan lived in private cooperative (72.2 percent) or condominium (15.7 percent) units, while fewer than one in ten lived in Mitchell-Lama cooperative units (7.7 percent) and only 4.4 percent lived in conventional units. The distribution of owner households by form of ownership in Queens was similar to that in Brooklyn. Almost three-quarters resided in conventional units, while most of the remainder lived in private cooperative (19.9 percent) or condominium (4.3 percent) units. In Staten Island, almost all owner households, 94.8 percent, lived in conventional units, while the remainder lived in condominium units (Figure 2.7).



Figure 2.7 Households by Form of Ownership within Borough New York City 1999

### Households by Race and Ethnicity

During the three years between 1996 and 1999, the number of households in rental and owner units together in the City increased by 88,000 units, or by 3.2 percent (Table 2.21). In this three-year period, white households grew by 17,000, or by 1.3 percent, while black households remained virtually unchanged and Puerto Rican households declined slightly by 6,000, or by 2.2 percent. However, as vividly reflected by their population growth, non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households increased tremendously by 18.1 percent, or by 55,000. This represents almost two-thirds of all households added during the period. The number of Asian households also increased substantially by 11.6 percent, or by 23,000, one out of every four added households in the City.

Of all households in the City in 1999, three in ten were owners (31.9 percent) (Table 2.22). The homeownership rate for each racial and ethnic group was inconsistent with the City's overall homeownership rate. Specifically, more than four in ten white households (42.0 percent) and more than one-third of Asian households (35.2 percent) were owners. However, the proportions of owners for other racial and ethnic household groups--particularly for Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics--were markedly lower than the proportion for the City as a whole: a mere 12.7 percent for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, 14.6 percent for Puerto Ricans, and 28.5 percent for blacks.

New York City 1996 and 1999							
	1996		199	)9	Change 1996-1999		
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
All	2,780,349	100.0%	2,868,415	100.0%	88,066	+3.2%	
White	1,308,987	47.1%	1,326,166	46.2%	17,179	+1.3%	
Black/African American	669,089	24.1%	668,264	23.3%	**	**	
Puerto Rican	286,535	10.3%	280,269	9.8%	-6,266	-2.2%	
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	306,730	11.0%	362,220	12.6%	55,490	+18.1%	
Asian	195,931	7.0%	218,671	7.6%	22,740	+11.6%	
Native American	13,075	0.5%	12,824	0.4%	**	**	

### Table 2.21 Distribution of Households by Race/Ethnicity of Householder New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

\*\* Too few households to report.

#### Table 2.22

### Distribution of Households by Tenure within Race/Ethnic Group of Householder New York City 1999

Race/Ethnicity	Total	Renter	Owner
All	100.0%	68.1%	31.9%
White	100.0%	58.0%	42.0%
Black/African American	100.0%	71.5%	28.5%
Puerto Rican	100.0%	85.4%	14.6%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	87.3%	12.7%
Asian	100.0%	64.8%	35.2%
Native American	100.0%	72.0%	28.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

The racial and ethnic stratification of all households, owner and renter households together, was noticeably different from the distribution of owner and renter households separately. Compared to all households, the vast majority of owner householders, six in ten, were white (Table 2.23). Of the remainder, one half was black (20.8 percent) and the other was either Asian (8.4 percent), non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (5.0 percent), or Puerto Rican (4.5 percent). On the other hand, four in ten renter householders were white, while one in four was black. The remaining households were either Puerto Rican (12.3 percent), non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (16.2 percent), or Asian (7.3 percent).

Race/Ethnicity	Total	Owner	Renter					
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%					
White	46.2%	60.9%	39.4%					
Black/African American	23.3%	20.8%	24.5%					
Puerto Rican	9.8%	4.5%	12.3%					
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	12.6%	5.0%	16.2%					
Asian	7.6%	8.4%	7.3%					
Native American	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%					

 
 Table 2.23

 Distribution of Households by Race/Ethnicity of Householder within Tenure Group New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Table 2.24 Distribution of Households by Rent Regulation Status within Race/Ethnicity of Householder New York City 1999

Regulatory Status	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non-PR Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Controlled	2.7%	4.6%	1.5%	1.8%	1.5%	**	**
Stabilized	52.2%	56.7%	41.4%	47.0%	62.5%	50.7%	53.6%
Pre-1947	38.3%	38.1%	29.7%	41.4%	50.8%	35.3%	47.7%
Post-1947	13.9%	18.6%	11.7%	5.6%	11.6%	15.3%	**
Mitchell Lama Rental	3.4%	2.3%	6.1%	3.6%	1.9%	3.4%	**
In Rem	0.8%	**	1.7%	1.4%	0.8%	**	**
Public Housing	8.7%	1.6%	17.8%	19.6%	6.5%	2.6%	**
Other Regulated	2.8%	1.7%	4.9%	4.4%	2.1%	1.4%*	**
Unregulated	29.3%	33.0%	26.6%	22.2%	24.7%	41.3%	21.9%
In Rental Buildings	26.0%	28.3%	25.1%	20.7%	22.3%	33.8%	20.0%*
In Coops/Condos	3.4%	4.7%	1.5%	1.5%	2.4%	7.6%	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

### Race and Ethnicity of Households by Rent Regulation Status

In the City, 54.9 percent of renter households lived in rent-stabilized units (52.2 percent) or rentcontrolled units (2.7 percent), while 29.3 percent lived in unregulated rental units, in 1999 (Table 2.24).

Notes:

At the same time, 8.7 percent of renter households lived in public housing, while 7.0 percent lived in either Mitchell-Lama rentals (3.4 percent), "other-regulated" units (2.8 percent), or *in rem* units (0.8 percent). Compared to this pattern for all renter households, more white renters lived in rent-stabilized and rent-controlled units or in unregulated rental units. Of white renters, 61.3 percent lived in rent-stabilized units (56.7 percent) or rent-controlled units (4.6 percent), while 33.0 percent lived in unregulated rental units. The remaining relatively very few white renter households, one in twenty, lived in other types of rent-regulated units, such as Mitchell-Lama rental units, "other-regulated" units, public housing units, and *in rem* units (Figure 2.8).





Of black renter households, just a little more than four in ten, lower than the proportion of all renter households and lower than the proportion of any other racial and ethnic group, lived in rent-stabilized units (41.4 percent) or rent-controlled units (1.5 percent) (Table 2.24). On the other hand, 6.1 percent of black renter households, higher than the proportion of all renter households and higher than the proportion of any other racial and ethnic group, lived in Mitchell-Lama rentals, while two in ten lived in either public housing units (17.8 percent) or *in rem* units (1.7 percent). On the other hand, a little more than a quarter of black renter households lived in unregulated rental units (26.6 percent).

About half of Puerto Rican renter households lived in either rent-stabilized units (47.0 percent) or rent-controlled units (1.8 percent) (Table 2.24). At the same time, one in five lived in public housing units (19.6 percent). This was higher than the proportion of all renter households as well as any other racial and ethnic group. Another almost one in ten lived in "other-regulated" units (4.4 percent), Mitchell-Lama rental units (3.6 percent), or *in rem* units (1.4 percent). On the other hand, just a little more than one in five, lower than the proportion of all renters or any other racial and ethnic group, lived in unregulated rental units.

Almost two-thirds of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic rental households lived in rent-stabilized units (62.5 percent) or rent-controlled units (1.5 percent), while a quarter lived in unregulated rental units (24.7 percent) (Table 2.24). Most of the remainder lived in public housing units (6.5 percent), "other-regulated" units (2.1 percent), or Mitchell-Lama rental units (1.9 percent).

Half of Asian renter households lived in rent-stabilized units (50.7 percent), while four in ten, an unparalleled higher proportion than for any other racial and ethnic group, lived in unregulated rental units (41.3 percent) (Table 2.24). The remainder lived mostly in Mitchell-Lama rental units (3.4 percent) or public housing units (2.6 percent).

The distribution of households by the race and ethnicity of the householder within each rentregulation status reveals how housing units in each regulation status serve different racial and ethnic groups. Compared to the distribution of renter householders as a whole by race and ethnicity, a disproportionately large proportion, two-thirds, of households in rent-controlled units were white (Table 2.25). The remaining households in this category were mostly black (13.5 percent), Puerto Rican (8.3 percent), or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (9.3 percent) (Table 2.25). More than four in ten households in rent-stabilized units were white, while another four in ten were evenly distributed between two groups: black (19.4 percent) or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (19.4 percent). The remaining two in ten were Puerto Rican (11.0 percent) or Asian (7.0 percent).

A very large proportion of Mitchell-Lama rental units served black households. More than four in ten households in Mitchell-Lama rental units were black (43.6 percent), while only about a quarter of all households were black in 1999. The proportions of Mitchell-Lama rental units that served other major racial and ethnic groups were about the same as or less than those group's proportions of all households (Table 2.25). Half of the households in *in rem* units were black. The remainder were mostly Puerto Rican (22.4 percent) or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (17.5 percent). Also, half of the households in public housing units were black, while four in ten were Puerto Rican (27.6 percent) or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (12.1 percent). The remainder were either white (7.3 percent) or Asian (2.2 percent). More than four in ten households in "other-regulated" units were black (42.2 percent), and another three in ten were Puerto Rican (18.8 percent) or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (12.0 percent). The remainder were mostly white.

More than four in ten households in unregulated rental units were white, while more than two in ten were black (Table 2.25). The remainder were Puerto Rican (9.3 percent), non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (13.6 percent), or Asian (10.2 percent). However, more than seven in ten households in unregulated rental units in private cooperatives and condominiums were white (55.4 percent) or Asian (16.4 percent).

	Thew Tork Only 1999								
Regulatory Status	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non-PR Hispanic	Asian	Native American		
All	100.0%	39.4%	24.5%	12.3%	16.2%	7.3%	0.5%		
Controlled	100.0%	66.8%	13.5%	8.3%	9.3%	**	**		
Stabilized	100.0%	42.7%	19.4%	11.0%	19.4%	7.0%	0.5%		
Pre-1947	100.0%	39.1%	18.9%	13.2%	21.5%	6.7%	0.6%		
Post-1947	100.0%	52.8%	20.6%	4.9%	13.6%	8.0%	**		
Mitchell-Lama Rental	100.0%	26.6%	43.6%	12.9%	8.9%	7.1%	**		
In Rem	100.0%	**	52.5%	22.4%	17.5%	**	**		
Public Housing	100.0%	7.3%	50.2%	27.6%	12.1%	2.2%	**		
Other Regulated	100.0%	23.0%	42.2%	18.8%	12.0%	3.5%*	**		
Unregulated	100.0%	44.3%	22.2%	9.3%	13.6%	10.2%	0.4%		
In Rental Buildings	100.0%	42.9%	23.6%	9.8%	13.9%	9.4%	0.4%*		
In Coops/Condos	100.0%	55.4%	11.1%	5.5%	11.4%	16.4%	**		

### Table 2.25 Distribution of Households by Race/Ethnicity of Householder within Rent Regulation Status Categories New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\*Too few households to report.

### Race and Ethnicity of Households by Type of Ownership

More than six in ten owner households in the City occupied conventional units, while another quarter lived in private cooperative units. The remaining relatively few owner households were distributed into two other types of ownership: condominiums (5.5 percent) and Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (6.0 percent) (Table 2.26). The distribution of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic owner households by type of owner units mirrored that of all owner households. For other racial and ethnic groups, however, the pattern varied from group to group. Nine in ten white owner households occupied either conventional units (58.0 percent) or private cooperative units (32.9 percent). On the other hand, three-quarters of black owner households lived in conventional units (73.7 percent), the highest proportion of any racial and ethnic group. The remainder lived in either private cooperatives (9.8 percent) or Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (14.9 percent). The distribution of Puerto Rican owner households was approximately similar to that of black owner households. On the other hand, two-thirds of Asian owner households occupied conventional units (67.9 percent), and most of the remainder lived in either private cooperative units (17.9 percent) or condominium units (12.0 percent), where Asian owners had a higher proportion than any other racial and ethnic group (Figure 2.9).

Race/Ethnicity	All	Conventional	Cooperative	Condominium	Mitchell-Lama Coop
All	100.0%	62.8%	25.7%	5.5%	6.0%
White	100.0%	58.0%	32.9%	6.1%	3.0%
Black/African American	100.0%	73.7%	9.8%	1.6%	14.9%
Puerto Rican	100.0%	69.6%	12.3%	3.1%*	14.9%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	61.3%	29.9%	5.9%	2.9%*
Asian	100.0%	67.9%	17.9%	12.0%	2.2%*
Native American	100.0%	53.4%*	**	**	**

# Table 2.26 Distribution of Owner Households by Type of Ownership within Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.





#### Household Size

Household size is a very important characteristic in assessing the need and demand for housing units of different sizes, as well as crowding and doubling-up situations in the City. The mean household size for all households in the City--that is, the average number of persons per household--was 2.53 in 1999, virtually constant with 1996, when it was 2.60 (Table 2.27). The sizes of renter and owner households were 2.48 and 2.63 respectively in 1999. These figures also do not appear to have changed meaningfully from 1996, when they were 2.54 and 2.75 respectively (Table 2.27).

Тепиге	1003	1006	1000
All	2.57	2.60	2.53
Renter	2.48	2.54	2.48
Owner	2.77	2.75	2.63

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Mean household size was computed by dividing the total number of individuals in a group by the total number of households in the same group.

Distribution of the Number of Persons per Household by Tenure New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999

All Households	1993	1996	1999
Number of Persons	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	33.4%	33.2%	33.2%
2	28.2%	27.7%	27.9%
3	16.4%	16.8%	16.2%
4 or more	22.0%	22.3%	22.7%
Renter Households	1993	1996	1999
Number of Persons	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	36.6%	35.8%	35.9%
2	27.2%	26.6%	26.7%
3	15.9%	16.9%	16.2%
4 or more	20.3%	20.6%	21.2%
Owner Households	1993	1996	1999
Number of Persons	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	25.6%	27.0%	27.4%
2	30.7%	30.3%	30.7%
3	17.5%	16.3%	16.2%
4 or more	26.2%	26.4%	25.7%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

As the mean household size remained practically constant between 1996 and 1999, the distribution of the number of persons per household remained effectively the same, without noticeable changes for all households, renter households, or owner households. A large proportion of households in the City, one-third, were still single-person households in 1999 (Table 2.28). Reviewing household size by borough and tenure reveals that, in Manhattan, singles were highly concentrated: one in every two households (48.4 percent) in the borough was a single-person household in 1999 (Table 2.29). It is significant to note that this pattern of a high concentration of singles in Manhattan remained true regardless of tenure.

All Households	All	<b>Bronx</b> <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
Number of Persons	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	33 7%	30.5%	20 7%	18 /1%	25.8%	22 7%
2	27 Q%	26.6%	27.6%	-73.+78 27.9%	23.8%	30.0%
3	16.2%	18.3%	17.5%	11.8%	17.6%	17.8%
4 or more	22.7%	24.5%	25.1%	12.0%	27.9%	29.4%
<b>Renter Households</b>						
Number of Persons	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	35.9%	30.7%	31.9%	48.8%	28.4%	35.4%
2	26.7%	25.3%	26.8%	26.5%	27.3%	30.9%
3	16.2%	19.6%	17.5%	11.9%	17.5%	15.7%
4 or more	21.2%	24.4%	23.8%	12.9%	26.8%	18.1%
Owner Households						
Number of Persons	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1	27.4%	29.6%	24.2%	47.2%	22.5%	15.4%
2	30.7%	31.5%	29.8%	32.5%	30.4%	29.5%
3	16.2%	13.8%	17.5%	11.4%	17.6%	19.1%
4 or more	25.7%	25.1%	28.5%	9.0%	29.4%	36.0%

#### Table 2.29 Distribution of the Number of Persons in Household by Tenure by Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

However, it also should be noted that more than two in ten households, even renter households, in the City were large households with four or more persons. Particularly in Queens and Staten Island, close to three in ten of all households were large households (Table 2.29). Of owner households in the two boroughs, the corresponding figures were 29.4 percent and 36.0 percent respectively.

The average household size in Staten Island, where close to six out of ten housing units were conventional owner units (see Chapter 4), was the largest, at 2.75 persons, while it was smallest at 2.12 in Manhattan, where about three-quarters of the housing units were rental units, many of which were studios or one-bedroom units, in multiple dwellings (Table 2.30). Household size was second highest in the Bronx, 2.72 persons, followed by Brooklyn, 2.69 persons, and Queens, 2.58 persons.

This pattern of household size for all households by borough is inconsistent with that of renter households or owner households. Of renter households, those in the Bronx, where one out of every two rental units was a two- or three-bedroom unit, were the largest, 2.72, while renter households in Manhattan, where many units are studios or one-bedroom units (see Chapter 4), were the smallest, 2.19 (Table 2.30). Renter household size in Brooklyn was 2.61, the second highest; in Queens, it was 2.50. Of owner households, household size was largest in Staten Island, at 2.99, followed by Brooklyn, at 2.88. Again, as for all households and for renter households, owner household size was smallest in Manhattan, at 1.90, even smaller than for all households and for renter households in the borough. Owner household sizes in the Bronx and Queens were 2.75 and 2.69 respectively.

New York City 1999				
Borough	All	Renter	Owner	
All	2.53	2.48	2.63	
Bronx <sup>b</sup>	2.72	2.72	2.75	
Brooklyn	2.69	2.61	2.88	
Manhattan <sup>b</sup>	2.12	2.19	1.90	
Queens	2.58	2.50	2.69	
Staten Island	2.75	2.34	2.99	

<b>Table 2.30</b>
Mean Household Size <sup>a</sup> by Tenure by Borough
New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Mean household size was computed by dividing the total number of individuals in a group by the total number of households in the same group

b Marble Hill in the Bronx.

The household size of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics was 3.22, the largest, followed by 2.97 for Asians, 2.79 for blacks, and 2.68 for Puerto Ricans. The household size of whites was smallest at 2.10 (Table 2.31). Because of their relatively large household size, non-Puerto Rican Hispanics' and Asians' proportion of all households was 12.6 percent and 7.6 percent respectively, lower than their respective proportions of the population, which were 16.1 percent and 9.0 percent. On the other hand, because their household size was small compared to that of other racial and ethnic groups, whites' proportion of all households was 46.2 percent, larger than their proportion of the overall population, which was 38.5 percent (Figures 2.10 and 2.11).

The size of households living in *in rem* units was 3.00, markedly larger than the 2.48 mean household size of all renter households in the City, and the largest of households living in units in any rent regulatory status in 1999 (Table 2.32). The *in rem* household size was almost equal to that of conventional owner units, which was 3.02 (Table 2.33). The sizes of households in public housing units (2.79) and unregulated rental units (2.65) were also higher than the citywide mean household size. On the other hand, the size of households living in rent-controlled units was only 1.66, the smallest of households in any rent-regulatory status. This is simply because most residents in rent-controlled units

#### Table 2.31 Number and Percentage of Individuals and Households and Mean Household Size by Race/Ethnicity of the Householder New York City 1999

	Individuals		Households		Mean Household
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Size <sup>a</sup>
All	7,245,251	100.0%	2,868,415	100.0%	2.53
White	2,786,502	38.5%	1,326,166	46.2%	2.10
Black/African American	1,862,650	25.7%	668,264	23.3%	2.79
Puerto Rican	750,821	10.4%	280,269	9.8%	2.68
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	1,166,665	16.1%	362,220	12.6%	3.22
Asian	650,081	9.0%	218,671	7.6%	2.97
Native American	28,530	0.4%	12,824	0.4%	2.22

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Mean household size was computed by dividing the total number of individuals in a group by the total number of households in the same group. For this table race/ethnicity of all individuals in a household was assumed to be that of the householder.





were seniors, many of whom were single. The size of households in Mitchell-Lama rentals, which is another rental category where many seniors lived, was 2.27, also much smaller than the citywide mean household size. The size of households living in rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947 was also small, only 2.14. This is mainly because many such units in relatively new buildings are either onebedroom units or studios.

The size of all owner households in the City was 2.63, higher than that of renter households, which was 2.48 (Table 2.33). However, the size of owner households in private cooperative units was only 1.86, not much larger than the size of households in rent-controlled units, 1.66, which was the smallest household size in units in any rental category. The sizes of owner households in Mitchell-Lama cooperatives and condominiums were also small, 2.21 and 2.23 respectively, smaller than the size of households in any rental category other than rent-controlled units.



Figure 2.11 Average Household Size by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

### Table 2.32 Number of Renter Households, Individuals and Mean Household Size by Regulatory Status New York City 1999

Dogulatory Status	Households	Individuals	Mean Household Size <sup>a</sup>
Regulatory Status	Housenoius	Individuals	Size
All Renters	1,953,289	4,839,008	2.48
Controlled	52,562	87,041	1.66
Stabilized	1,020,588	2,430,110	2.38
Pre-1947	749,010	1,849,447	2.47
Post-1947	271,578	580,663	2.14
Mitchell Lama Rental	67,146	152,552	2.27
Public Housing	169,339	472,694	2.79
In Rem	15,253	45,830	3.00
Other Regulated	55,539	130,708	2.35
Unregulated	572,862	1,520,074	2.65

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Mean household size was computed by dividing the total number of individuals in a group by the total number of households in the same group.

## Table 2.33 Number of Owner Households, Individuals and Mean Household Size for Form of Ownership New York City 1999

			Mean Household
Form of Ownership	Households	Individuals	Size <sup>a</sup>
All	915,126	2,406,242	2.63
Conventional	574,353	1,735,421	3.02
Cooperative	235,257	436,934	1.86
Condominium	50,671	112,838	2.23
Mitchell Lama Coop	54,845	121,050	2.21

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Mean household size was computed by dividing the total number of individuals in a group by the total number of households in the same group.

### Household Composition: Household Types

As an effort to understand policy and housing market implications of the current household composition and the historical changes in it, the last several HVS reports since 1987 have presented and analyzed HVS data on household composition by dividing all households in the City into the following six mutually exclusive categories designed to reveal the unique household composition of each and their resulting housing situations and requirements:

Single elderly household: household consisting of one adult 62 years old or older. Elderly household: household consisting of two or more adults, and the householder is 62 years old or older. Single adult household: household consisting of one person aged 18-61. Single adult with child(ren) household: household consisting of one adult 18-61 years old and one or more minor children. Adult household: household consisting of two or more adults, no minor children, and the householder is aged 18-61. Adult with child(ren) household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least and a the household: household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least adult with child(ren) household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least adult with child(ren) household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least adult with child(ren) household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least adult with child(ren) household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least household: household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least household: household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least household: household: household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least household: household: household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least household: household: household: household consisting of two or more adults and at least household: household:

one minor child; the householder is aged 18-61. (The few householders or spouses who reported being less than 18 years old are considered to be adults.)

Over the twelve-year period between 1987 and 1999, the following three household types' proportion of all households in the City have changed considerably. Elderly households' proportion of all households declined by 2.2 percentage points to 9.8 percent (Table 2.34). Adult households' proportion declined as well by 1.7 percentage points to 23.3 percent. On the other hand, adult-households-with-children's proportion increased considerably by 3.7 percentage points to 25.8 percent.

Of renter households, each household type's proportion of all renter households did not change significantly between 1996 and 1999, except for adult households with minor children. The proportional share of this household type increased markedly by 3.7 percentage points, from 19.5 percent in 1987 to 23.2 percent in 1996 (Table 2.34), and continued to increase by another 1.4 percentage points, to 24.6 percent, in the following three years.

Among owner households, two household types' proportional share of all owner households declined during the twelve-year period between 1987 and 1999. Elderly owner households declined by 3.2 percentage points to 16.7 percent, while adult owner households declined by 3.7 percentage points to 24.5 percent (Table 2.34). On the other hand, the proportional share of three single owner household types each grew noticeably during the same twelve-year period. The proportion of single elderly owner households grew by 2.8 percentage points to 13.5 percent, while the proportion of single adult owner households increased by 2.5 percentage points to 14.0 percent, and that of single-with-minor children owner households grew by 1.4 percentage points to 3.0 percent.

A review of the change in the number of households in each household type by tenure provides additional insights into the changes in household composition (Table 2.35). The number of households in the City increased by at least 88,000, or by 3.2 percent, between 1996 and 1999, according to the 1999 HVS. During the same three-year period, the number of adult households with minor children increased significantly by 60,000, or by 8.8 percent. The increase in this household type alone accounts for 68.2
Household Type <sup>a</sup>	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999	Change 1987-99		
All Households								
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Single Elderly	12.8%	12.7%	12.6%	12.5%	12.6%	-0.2%		
Single Adult	20.8%	19.7%	20.8%	20.7%	20.6%	-0.2%		
Single with Minor Child(ren)	7.2%	7.8%	8.3%	8.5%	7.9%	+0.7%		
Elderly Household	12.0%	11.5%	10.9%	9.9%	9.8%	-2.2%		
Adult Household	25.0%	23.8%	23.5%	24.0%	23.3%	-1.7%		
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	22.1%	24.4%	23.8%	24.4%	25.8%	+3.7%		
		R	enters					
Household Type	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Single Elderly	13.8%	13.0%	12.8%	12.2%	12.2%	-1.6%		
Single Adult	24.9%	22.5%	23.8%	23.6%	23.7%	-1.2%		
Single with Minor Child(ren)	9.7%	10.4%	10.9%	11.1%	10.2%	+0.5%		
Elderly Household	8.6%	7.7%	7.3%	6.5%	6.5%	-2.1%		
Adult Household	23.6%	23.3%	22.8%	23.3%	22.8%	-0.9%		
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	19.5%	23.0%	22.4%	23.2%	24.6%	+5.1%		
		Ov	vners					
Household Type	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999			
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Single Elderly	10.7%	12.0%	11.9%	13.2%	13.5%	+2.8%		
Single Adult	11.5%	12.9%	13.7%	13.8%	14.0%	+2.5%		
Single with Minor Child(ren)	1.6%	1.8%	2.0%	2.3%	3.0%	+1.4%		
Elderly Household	19.9%	20.5%	19.7%	17.9%	16.7%	-3.2%		
Adult Household	28.2%	25.1%	25.3%	25.5%	24.5%	-3.7%		
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	28.1%	27.7%	27.4%	27.3%	28.3%	+0.2%		

#### Table 2.34 Distribution of Households by Household Type by Tenure New York City, Selected Years 1987 – 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Household types are defined in the text and in Table 2.36.

#### Table 2.35 Number of Households, Change in Number of Households and Mean Household Size by Household Type by Tenure New York City 1996 and 1999

	1	996	1	999		
Household Type <sup>a</sup> All Households	Mean Household Size	Number of Households	Mean Household Size	Number of Households	Change 1996-99	% Change
All	2.60	2,780,349	2.53	2,868,415	88,066	+3.2%
Single Elderly	1.00	347,855	1.00	361,340	13,485	+3.9%
Single Adult	1.00	574,704	1.00	590,864	16,160	+2.8%
Single with Minor Child(ren)	3.12	235,760	2.93	227,922	-7,838	-3.3%
Elderly Household	2.57	275,930	2.48	279,971	4,041	+1.5%
Adult Household	2.73	666,714	2.60	668,836	2,122*	+0.3%
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	4.48	679,385	4.31	739,482	60,097	+8.8%
Renters		1996		1999		
All	2.54	1,946,165	2.48	1,953,289	7,124	+0.4%
Single Elderly	1.00	237,426	1.00	238,139	**	**
Single Adult	1.00	459,669	1.00	463,055	3,386	+0.7%
Single with Minor Child(ren)	3.16	216,378	2.97	200,171	-16,207	-7.5%
Elderly Household	2.59	126,791	2.56	126,795	**	0.0%
Adult Household	2.69	453,960	2.59	444,358	-9,602	-2.1%
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	4.44	451,942	4.30	480,770	28,828	+6.4%
Owners		1996		1999		
All	2.75	834,183	2.63	915,126	80,943	+9.7%
Single Elderly	1.00	110,429	1.00	123,200	12,771	+11.6%
Single Adult	1.00	115,035	1.00	127,809	12,774	+11.1%
Single with Minor Child(ren)	2.70	19,382	2.61	27,751	8,369	+43.2%
Elderly Household	2.55	149,140	2.42	153,176	4,036	+2.7%
Adult Household	2.81	212,754	2.64	224,478	11,724	+5.5%
Adult Household with Minor	4.56	227,443	4.33	258,712	31,269	+13.7%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Household types are defined in the text and in Table 2.36.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Child(ren)

percent of the increase of 88,000 in all households in the City as a whole. Since their mean household size was 4.31 persons, this means there was increased need and demand for larger housing units in the City during the period. (In the following chapters, this household type's household characteristics, such as income, and the availability and costs of larger housing units will be discussed.) The number of single elderly and single adult households also increased, but by a relatively smaller 13,000, or by 3.9 percent (15.3 percent of the total increase), and by 16,000, or by 2.8 percent (18.3 percent of the total increase), respectively. The number of single-adult-with-minor-children households decreased by 8,000, or by 3.4 percent.

The number of renter households as a whole did not change appreciably between 1996 and 1999. However, of renter households, the number of adult renter households with minor children increased by 29,000, or by 6.4 percent, during the three-year period (Table 2.35). But nine-tenths of this increase was offset by decreases in the number of single-adult-with-minor-children households (16,000 or 7.6 percent) and the number of adult households (9,000 or 2.1 percent).

As a result of growth in each and every owner household type between 1996 and 1999, the number of all owner households in the City increased by 81,000, or by 9.7 percent (Table 2.35). Almost four-tenths of this increase resulted from an increase of 31,000 in the number of one particular household group alone, adult owner households with minor children. Appreciable increases also occurred in single elderly owner households (13,000), single adult owner households (13,000), adult owner households (12,000), and single owner households with minor children (8,000).

Looking at household types by race and ethnicity can further enhance our understanding of the household composition and housing implications of these types. The pattern of household composition for each racial and ethnic group was uniquely diverse, except that the patterns of single-elderly households and elderly households were very similar. More than six in ten single-elderly households were white (62.2 percent), substantially larger than their proportion of all households and any other household type, except for elderly households (Table 2.36). Another two in ten (18.9 percent) were black. The proportions of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic and Asian single-elderly households were 7.0 percent and 3.2 percent respectively, much smaller than their proportions of all households. The remainder were mostly Puerto Rican. Eight in ten single-adult households were either white (55.6 percent) or black (22.8 percent), while the remainder were somewhat equally divided among the other major racial and ethnic groups.

On the other hand, more than eight in ten single-adult-with-minor-children households were either black (43.0 percent), Puerto Rican (21.0 percent), or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (20.0 percent), while the remainder were mostly white (14.3 percent) (Table 2.36). The pattern for adult households mirrored approximately that of all households: seven in ten were either white (48.5 percent) or black (19.7 percent), with the remainder being more or less equally divided among Puerto Rican, non-Puerto Rican Hispanic, and Asian. Adult households with minor children were racially and ethnically very diversified: eight in ten were either white (32.8 percent), black (24.8 percent), or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (19.0 percent); the other two in ten were Asian (12.0 percent) or Puerto Rican (11.0 percent) (see also Figure 2.12).

The distribution of household types within each rent regulation status shows which household types each regulation status serves. In 1999, two-thirds of rent-controlled units in the City were occupied

by the two elderly household types--single elderly (49.3 percent) and elderly (18.5 percent)--while the remainder were occupied mostly by single adult (15.1 percent) or adult (10.6 percent) households (Table 2.37). Three-quarters of rent-stabilized units were occupied by single adult households (27.5 percent), adult households (23.0 percent), or adult-with-minor-children households (22.8 percent). The remainder served single adult households with minor children (9.9 percent) and elderly or single elderly households (16.9 percent) (Figure 2.13). Rental units in the four remaining rent regulation statuses--Mitchell-Lama rental units, *in rem* units, public housing units, and "other-regulated" units--each served all household types (Table 2.37). Eight in ten of unregulated rental units were mostly occupied by three household types: adult households with children (30.7 percent), adult households (28.1 percent), or single adult households (21.5 percent) (Figure 2.13).

Each form of ownership serves a different combination of household types (Table 2.38). Six in ten conventional owner units were occupied by two adult household types--adult households with minor children (35.2 percent) and adult households (25.0 percent)--while three in ten were occupied by the two elderly household types: elderly households (19.4 percent) and single elderly households (11.4 percent).

	Race/Ethnicity						
Household Type <sup>a</sup>	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non-PR Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	100.0%	46.2%	23.3%	9.8%	12.6%	7.6%	0.4%
Single Elderly	100.0%	62.2%	18.9%	8.2%	7.0%	3.2%	0.5%*
Single Adult	100.0%	55.6%	22.8%	7.5%	7.6%	5.6%	0.8%
Single with Minor Child(ren)	100.0%	14.3%	43.0%	21.0%	20.0%	1.7%	**
Elderly Household	100.0%	61.7%	18.5%	6.7%	7.5%	5.2%	0.5%*
Adult Household	100.0%	48.5%	19.7%	8.7%	12.7%	10.0%	0.3%
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	100.0%	32.8%	24.8%	11.0%	19.0%	12.0%	0.3%

Table 2.36Distribution of Households by Household Type and by Race/Ethnicity<br/>New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

Household types are classified as follows: Single Elderly - one adult, age 62 or older; Single Adult - one adult, less than age 62; Single with Minor Child(ren) - one adult less than age 62, and one or more dependents less than age 18;
 Elderly Household - two or more adults and the householder is age 62 or over; Adult Household - two or more adults, no minors, and householder is less than age 62; Adult Household with Minor Child(ren) - two or more adults and at least one minor; householder is less than age 62. A householder or spouse less than age 18 is considered an adult.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.



Figure 2.12 Household Type by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

Table 2.37Distribution of Renter Households by Regulatory Status by Household Type<br/>New York City 1999

	Household Type <sup>a</sup>						
Regulatory Status	All	Single Elderly	Single Adult	Single with Child(ren)	Elderly	Adults	Adults with Child(ren)
All	100.0%	12.2%	23.7%	10.2%	6.5%	22.7%	24.6%
Controlled	100.0%	49.3%	15.1%	**	18.5%	10.6%	5.1%
Stabilized	100.0%	11.0%	27.5%	9.9%	5.9%	23.0%	22.8%
Pre-1947	100.0%	9.2%	28.6%	11.3%	5.0%	22.4%	23.6%
Post-1947	100.0%	16.0%	24.4%	5.7%	8.2%	24.8%	20.8%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	100.0%	19.9%	22.7%	12.8%	6.9%	20.0%	17.6%
In Rem	100.0%	11.7%*	19.6%	16.2%	7.7%*	18.4%	26.4%
Public Housing	100.0%	17.4%	16.0%	20.1%	9.1%	11.8%	25.5%
Other Regulated	100.0%	31.7%	11.6%	17.6%	9.3%	11.6%	18.2%
Unregulated	100.0%	6.6%	21.5%	7.7%	5.4%	28.1%	30.7%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Household types are defined in the text and in Table 2.36.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Figure 2.13 Renter Households by Household Type within Rent Regulation Status New York City 1999



Table 2.38Distribution of Owner Households by Household Type by Form of Ownership<br/>New York City 1999

	Form of Ownership				
Household Type <sup>a</sup>	All	Conventional	Cooperative	Condominium	Mitchell-Lama Cooperative
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Single Elderly	13.5%	11.4%	17.3%	8.1%	23.6%
Single Adult	14.0%	6.3%	29.3%	23.3%	19.2%
Single with Minor Child(ren)	3.0%	2.7%	2.5%	5.4%	6.4%
Elderly Household	16.7%	19.4%	11.9%	11.9%	13.7%
Adult Household	24.5%	25.0%	24.1%	28.0%	18.6%
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	28.3%	35.2%	14.8%	23.2%	18.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Household types are defined in the text and in Table 2.36.

Note: a

Of private cooperatives, four in ten were occupied by two adult household types: adult households (24.1 percent) and adult households with minor children (14.8 percent) (Table 2.38). Another three in ten were occupied by single elderly households (17.3 percent) and elderly households (11.9 percent). Most of the remaining units were occupied by single adult households. More than five in ten of all condominium units were occupied by two adult household types: adult households (28.0 percent) or adult households with minor children (23.2 percent). Another three in ten such units were occupied by two elderly household types: elderly households (11.9 percent) and single elderly households (8.1 percent). The remainder were mostly occupied by single adult households.

Of all Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, four in ten were occupied by the two elderly household types: single elderly households (23.6 percent) and elderly households (13.7 percent) (Table 2.38). Another quarter was occupied by the two household types with children: adult households with minor children (18.5 percent) and single-with-minor-children households (6.4 percent). The remainder served the two adult-only household types, single adult households and adult households, equally.

#### Foreign-Born Households (Determined by Birth Place of the Householder)

Traditionally, immigrants tend to cluster in large central cities. In the last several decades, they have highly concentrated in cities in the Northeast and West Coast areas. The number of immigrants in New York City has increased very visibly. As a result, their housing situations have been of great concern to policy makers and planners in the City. For this reason, it is useful to present and analyze data on the number and characteristics of immigrant households in the context of housing requirements.

Until 1999, the HVS provided only data on the birth region of the householder, not on immigrant households. In the absence of data on immigrant households, data on the birthplace of the householder was used as surrogate data on immigrants, although it was recognized that foreign-born householders are not necessarily all immigrants. Some may be foreign students, diplomats, or foreigners involved in business activities. Also, householders born outside the United States, whether immigrants or not, are not only those who came to this country in recent years. The HVS data on foreign-born households cover all householders born in Puerto Rico or outside the United States, including even those who were born or immigrated before World War II. In the 1996 and previous HVS reports, data on foreign-born householders were presented and discussed with a clear explanation of the limitations of the data.

For the first time, the 1999 HVS provides data on immigrant householders, as well as data on households by the birth region of the householder. Therefore, in the next section of this chapter, characteristics of immigrant householders will be discussed.

As in 1996, 39.9 percent of householders in New York City in 1999 were born outside the USA. Another 5.8 percent were born in Puerto Rico. Thus, covering households born in Puerto Rico or outside the United States, 45.7 percent of the City's householders in 1999 were born outside this country, a significant increase since 1991, when the proportion was 40.7 percent (Table 2.39). In other words, according to the 1999 HVS, close to one in every two householders in the City in 1999 was born outside the USA (Map 2.7).

## Table 2.39Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder and by Tenure<br/>New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999

	All Households					
Birth Region	1991	1993	1996	1999		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
U.S.A.	59.3%	57.5%	54.8%	54.3%		
Puerto Rico	7.0%	6.8%	6.9%	5.8%		
Caribbean	10.6%	11.0%	12.5%	12.5%		
Latin America	5.5%	6.2%	6.0%	7.3%		
Europe	9.8%	10.1%	10.3%	10.0%		
Asia	5.4%	5.8%	6.5%	7.1%		
Africa	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	1.1%		
Other	1.8%	1.7%	2.0%	1.9%		

	Renters					
Birth Region	1991	1993	1996	1999		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
U.S.A.	56.3%	54.4%	51.4%	50.6%		
Puerto Rico	8.7%	8.4%	8.6%	7.2%		
Caribbean	12.1%	12.5%	14.1%	14.2%		
Latin America	6.4%	7.3%	7.0%	8.4%		
Europe	8.5%	9.1%	9.7%	9.3%		
Asia	5.3%	5.7%	6.4%	7.0%		
Africa	0.7%	0.9%	1.2%	1.4%		
Other	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.9%		

		Owners				
Birth Region	1991	1993	1996	1999		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
U.S.A.	66.2%	65.4%	63.0%	62.0%		
Puerto Rico	2.8%	2.9%	2.7%	2.8%		
Caribbean	7.1%	7.3%	8.5%	8.9%		
Latin America	3.2%	3.6%	3.8%	5.0%		
Europe	12.9%	12.6%	11.9%	11.3%		
Asia	5.7%	6.0%	6.8%	7.4%		
Africa	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.7%		
Other	1.9%	1.8%	2.6%	1.8%		

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Map 2.7 Percentage of Householders Born in Puerto Rico or Outside the United States New York City 1999



One in four of all householders in the City in 1999 were born in the Caribbean (12.5 percent), Latin America (7.3 percent), or Puerto Rico (5.8 percent) (Table 2.39). At the same time, one in ten was born in countries in Europe, while one in thirteen was born in countries in Asia.

For householders born in the United States (excluding Puerto Rico), the homeownership rate was 36.7 percent, while, for householders born outside the country, it was only 26.7 percent, well below the rate of 31.9 percent for all households in the City in 1999 (Table 2.40). Particularly, with homeownership rates of 15.6 percent, 22.9 percent, 22.1 percent, and 18.8 percent respectively, householders born in Puerto Rico and in countries in the Caribbean, Latin America, and Africa tended to be mostly renters.

Within Tenure						
	Tenure					
Birth Region	Both	Renter	Owner			
Number <sup>a</sup>	2,868,415	1,953,289	915,126			
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
U.S.A.	54.3%	50.6%	62.0%			
Non-USA	45.7%	49.4%	38.0%			
Puerto Rico	5.8%	7.2%	2.8%			
Caribbean	12.5%	14.2%	8.9%			
Latin America	7.3%	8.4%	5.0%			
Europe	10.0%	9.3%	11.3%			
Asia	7.1%	7.0%	7.4%			
Africa	1.1%	1.4%	0.7%			
Other	1.9%	1.9%	1.8%			

#### Table 2.40 Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder by Tenure New York City 1999

#### Within Birth Region

			Tenure	
Birth Region	Number	Both	Renter	Owner
All <sup>a</sup>	2,868,415	100.0%	68.1%	31.9%
U.S.A.	1,304,306	100.0%	63.3%	36.7%
Non-USA	1,098,780	100.0%	73.3%	26.7%
Puerto Rico	139,737	100.0%	84.4%	15.6%
Caribbean	300,217	100.0%	77.1%	22.9%
Latin America	175,974	100.0%	77.9%	22.1%
Europe	239,417	100.0%	63.7%	36.3%
Asia	171,139	100.0%	66.5%	33.5%
Africa	27,182	100.0%	81.2%	18.8%
Other	45,113	100.0%	68.5%	31.5%
Not Reported	465,329	100.0%	69.2%	30.8%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: a Total includes those not reporting birth region.

÷

The locational distribution by borough of householders born in the United States was similar to that of all householders. However, the locational distribution of householders born outside the United States was considerably different and varied by each birth region. Specifically, seven in ten householders born in Puerto Rico lived in either the Bronx (38.5 percent) or Brooklyn (31.6 percent). The remainder lived mostly in Manhattan (18.1 percent) or Queens (10.3 percent) (Table 2.41). Close to four in ten householders born in Caribbean countries resided in Brooklyn (36.5 percent), while most of the remaining lived in the Bronx (21.6 percent), Queens (21.1 percent), or Manhattan (20.6 percent). One in every two householders born in Latin American countries lived in Queens. The remainder lived mostly in Brooklyn (23.1 percent), the Bronx (11.7 percent), or Manhattan (11.1 percent) (Map 2.7).

Table 2.41
Distribution of Households by Borough by Birth Region of Householder
New York City 1999

	Borough					
Birth Region	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	14.6%	28.6%	25.4%	26.3%	5.1%
U.S.A	100.0%	14.8%	27.5%	27.1%	23.1%	7.4%
Puerto Rico	100.0%	38.5%	31.6%	18.1%	10.3%	1.5%
Caribbean	100.0%	21.6%	36.5%	20.6%	21.1%	**
Latin America	100.0%	11.7%	23.1%	11.1%	52.3%	1.7%
Europe	100.0%	4.9%	39.3%	16.6%	35.1%	4.1%
Asia	100.0%	3.0%	21.9%	21.4%	51.2%	2.5%
Africa	100.0%	23.8%	23.1%	13.6%	35.6%	3.9%*
Other	100.0%	13.0%	36.5%	29.7%	13.3%	7.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Almost three-quarters of householders born in countries in Europe lived in either Brooklyn (39.3 percent) or Queens (35.1 percent); another one in six lived in Manhattan (Table 2.41). The remainder were more or less evenly distributed between the Bronx and Staten Island. As was the case for householders born in Latin American countries, one in every two householders born in countries in Asia resided in Queens. Of the remainder, four in ten lived in either Brooklyn (21.9 percent) or Manhattan (21.4 percent). More than eight in ten householders born in Africa lived in Queens (35.6 percent), the Bronx (23.8 percent), or Brooklyn (23.1 percent). The remainder lived mostly in Manhattan (13.6 percent).

Examining the distribution of foreign-born householders within each borough reveals additional information about the locational concentrations of these householders. In Queens, 54.2 percent of householders were born in countries outside the USA or in Puerto Rico (Table 2.42). In the borough, four in ten householders were born in countries in Latin America (14.0 percent), Asia (13.3 percent) or Europe (12.8 percent). On the other hand, in Staten Island, only 19.9 percent of householders were born outside the USA; and more than half of these were from countries in Europe (8.0 percent) or Asia (3.6 percent) (Figure 2.14).



Figure 2.14 Households by Birth Region of Householder within Borough New York City 1999

In Manhattan, 36.1 percent of householders were foreign-born, a considerably smaller proportion compared to all the City's householders born outside the USA; almost seven in ten of foreign-born householders were from countries in the Caribbean (11.1 percent), Europe (7.2 percent), or Asia (6.6 percent) (Table 2.42). About half of the householders in Brooklyn were foreign-born, with a third being born in either the Caribbean (15.5 percent) or Europe (13.3 percent). In the Bronx, 46.6 percent of householders were foreign-born, with a third being born in either the Caribbean (17.9 percent) or Puerto Rico (14.9 percent).

#### Table 2.42 Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder by Borough New York City 1999

	Borough						
Birth Region	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island	
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
U.S.A	54.3%	53.4%	50.7%	63.9%	45.8%	80.1%	
Puerto Rico	5.8%	14.9%	6.2%	4.6%	2.2%	1.7%	
Caribbean	12.5%	17.9%	15.5%	11.1%	9.6%	**	
Latin America	7.3%	5.7%	5.8%	3.5%	14.0%	2.5%	
Europe	10.0%	3.3%	13.3%	7.2%	12.8%	8.0%	
Asia	7.1%	1.4%	5.3%	6.6%	13.3%	3.6%	
Africa	1.1%	1.8%	0.9%	0.7%	1.5%	0.9%*	
Other	1.9%	1.6%	2.3%	2.4%	0.9%	2.8%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

#### Table 2.43 Distribution of Renter Households by Rent Regulation Status by Birth Region of Householder New York City 1999

	Birth Region								
Regulatory Status	All	U.S.A.	Puerto Rico	Caribbean	Latin America	Europe	Asia	Africa	Other
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Controlled	2.7%	3.6%	2.9%	1.3%	**	4.2%	1.0%*	**	**
Stabilized	52.2%	46.8%	44.4%	60.7%	54.9%	62.2%	50.9%	61.3%	51.3%
Pre-1947	38.3%	34.3%	40.1%	51.4%	38.3%	40.4%	35.6%	38.0%	37.1%
Post-1947	13.9%	12.6%	4.3%	9.3%	16.6%	21.8%	15.4%	23.3%	14.2%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	3.4%	3.7%	3.0%	2.7%	1.4%*	2.2%	2.2%	6.4%*	**
In Rem	0.8%	0.9%	1.7%*	1.0%	**	**	**	**	**
Public Housing	8.7%	11.4%	25.5%	6.6%	3.5%	1.7%	2.4%	**	3.3%*
Other Regulated	2.8%	3.3%	5.7%	2.5%	1.2%*	2.4%	1.7%*	**	**
Unregulated	29.3%	30.2%	16.9%	25.3%	37.9%	27.3%	41.8%	27.8%	37.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

The distribution of renter householders born in the United States (excluding Puerto Rico) by regulatory status was very similar to that of all householders in the City. However, the distribution of foreign-born householders was different from that of all householders and that of USA-born householders, except for householders born in countries in Latin America. For example, more than eight in ten householders born in Puerto Rico resided in units whose rents were controlled or regulated by government agencies. Specifically, a little fewer than half lived in rent-stabilized units (44.4 percent) or in rent-controlled units (2.9 percent), while a third lived in public housing units (25.5 percent), "other-regulated" units (5.7 percent), or Mitchell-Lama rental units (3.0 percent) (Table 2.43). Only one in six lived in unregulated rental units.

Three-quarters of the householders born in the Caribbean resided in units whose rent was controlled or regulated, while the remaining quarter lived in unregulated rental units (Table 2.43). Specifically, more than six in ten lived in rent-stabilized units (60.7 percent) or rent-controlled units (1.3 percent), while one in eight lived in public housing units (6.6 percent), Mitchell-Lama rental units (2.7 percent), "other-regulated" units (2.5 percent) or *in rem* units.

The distribution by rent-regulatory status of householders born in countries in Latin America was somewhat similar to that of all householders and of householders born in the USA, except that the proportion living in public housing was much smaller and the proportion living in unregulated rental units was much larger, with close to four in ten householders having been born in such countries (Table 2.43). The distribution of householders born in countries in Europe was approximately similar to that of householders born in the Caribbean, except that the proportion of householders born in Europe in rent-stabilized and rent-controlled units together was somewhat higher, while their proportion in public housing units was considerably smaller.

A little more than four in ten householders born in countries in Asia lived in unregulated rental units (41.8 percent), a higher proportion than that of all householders or of householders born in the United States, while a little fewer than six in ten householders born in Asia lived in some type of rent-regulated units (Table 2.43). The distribution of householders born in countries in Africa was similar to that of householders born in countries in Europe.

In the City, half of all rental units and less than half of units in all types of rent-regulatory categories, except for rent-stabilized units, were occupied by foreign-born householders in 1999 (Table 2.44). Of rent-stabilized units, 53.8 percent were occupied by foreign-born householders.

A little more than six in ten of all owner householders in the City lived in conventional units, while the rest lived in private cooperatives (25.7 percent), condominiums (5.5 percent), or Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (6.0 percent) (Table 2.45). This distribution was similar to that of householders born in the USA in the City. However, the distribution of foreign-born owner householders in each geographical region was different from the pattern, and each varied. In general, all foreign-born owner groups tended to live more in conventional units than did owners born in the USA. More than eight in ten owner householders born in Caribbean countries lived in conventional units, while another one in ten lived in private cooperatives; the remainder lived mostly in Mitchell-Lama cooperatives. Close to eight in ten owner householders born in Latin American countries lived in conventional units, while

	New York City 1999								
_	Birth Region								
Regulatory Status	All	U.S.A.	Puerto Rico	Caribbean	Latin America	Europe	Asia	Africa	Other
All	100.0%	50.6%	7.2%	14.2%	8.4%	9.3%	7.0%	1.4%	1.9%
Controlled	100.0%	65.5%	7.5%	6.6%	**	14.1%	2.4%*	**	**
Stabilized	100.0%	46.2%	6.3%	16.8%	9.0%	11.3%	6.9%	1.6%	1.9%
Pre-1947	100.0%	45.4%	7.6%	19.1%	8.4%	9.9%	6.5%	1.3%	1.8%
Post-1947	100.0%	48.7%	2.4%	10.1%	10.7%	15.5%	8.2%	2.4%	2.1%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	100.0%	61.1%	7.1%	12.3%	3.8%*	6.8%	5.1%	2.8*	**
In Rem	100.0%	58.3%	14.9%*	17.6%	**	**	**	**	**
Public Housing	100.0%	62.3%	19.9%	10.1%	3.2%	1.7%	1.8%	**	0.7%*
Other Regulated	100.0%	57.1%	14.0%	12.1%	3.3%*	7.5%	4.0%*	**	**
Unregulated	100.0%	51.2%	4.1%	12.0%	10.7%	8.6%	9.8%	1.3%	2.4%

#### Table 2.44 Distribution of Renter Households by Birth Region of Householder by Rent Regulation Status New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

#### Table 2.45 Distribution of Owner Households by Form of Ownership by Birth Region New York City 1999

	Form of Ownership					
Birth Region	All	Conventional	Cooperative	Condominium	Mitchell-Lama Cooperative	
All	100.0%	62.8%	25.7%	5.5%	6.0%	
U.S.A.	100.0%	60.4%	27.2%	4.5%	7.9%	
Puerto Rico	100.0%	73.0%	8.8*%	**	13.6%	
Caribbean	100.0%	83.0%	9.5%	2.3%*	5.2%	
Latin America	100.0%	77.5%	15.6%	5.6%	**	
Europe	100.0%	69.0%	20.3%	5.6%	5.1%	
Asia	100.0%	67.8%	19.3%	11.3%	**	
Africa	100.0%	75.3%	**	**	**	
Other	100.0%	69.0%	20.7%	10.3%*	**	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

another two in ten lived in either private cooperatives (15.6 percent) or condominiums (5.6 percent). A little more than seven in ten Puerto-Rican-born owner householders lived in conventional units; another two in ten lived in either Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (13.6 percent) or private cooperative units (8.8 percent).

Seven in ten European-born owner householders lived in conventional units, while another two in ten lived in private cooperative (20.3 percent) units; the remainder lived in condominiums (5.6 percent) or Mitchell-Lama cooperative units (5.1 percent) (Table 2.45). Two-thirds of Asian-born owner householders lived in conventional units, while the remaining third lived in private cooperative (19.3 percent) or condominium (11.3 percent) units. Three-quarters of African-born owner householders lived in conventional units, while the remainder lived in three other types of owner units: private cooperative or condominium units or Mitchell-Lama units.

#### **Immigrant Households**

At HPD's request, the 1999 HVS included a set of questions to estimate the number and characteristics of immigrant households: first, householders (heads of households) were asked to identify the region or country where they were born; then, those born outside the United States were asked if they had moved to this country as immigrants. Based on the answers to these two questions, the 1999 HVS reports that there were 791,000 immigrant households in the City in 1999 (Table 2.46). However, out of all 2,868,000 households in the City, 465,000 (or 16.2 percent) did not answer the birthplace questions. Of the 2,403,000 householders who responded to the question, 959,000 said they were born outside the United States. Of these, another 68,000 (or 7.1 percent) did not answer the immigration questions was very high, and the figure of 791,000 could be an underestimate. For this reason, the HVS data on immigrant households will be presented and discussed in this report only to approximate the general demographic, housing, and neighborhood situations of immigrant households, rather than to estimate reliably the number of immigrant households in the City.

In 1999, seven in ten immigrant households in the City resided in Queens (37.0 percent) or Brooklyn (33.3 percent) (Table 2.47). The remaining three in ten lived mostly in Manhattan (14.8 percent) or the Bronx (12.5 percent).

The homeownership rate for immigrant households in 1999 was 29.2 percent, lower than the rate for all households in the City, which was 31.9 percent. That is to say, of the 791,000 immigrant households, 231,000, or 29.2 percent, were owner households (Table 2.47). In Manhattan and the Bronx, where only two in ten housing units were owner units (Table 2.15), the homeownership rates for immigrant households were extremely low, 14.8 percent and 18.2 percent respectively. In Brooklyn, the rate was 26.1 percent, while it was 39.4 percent in Queens, where four in ten housing units were owner units. In Staten Island, where almost all housing units were owner units, the rate was 63.1 percent.

Seven in ten immigrant renter households in the City resided in rental units whose rents were controlled or regulated by government agencies, as did all householders and all foreign-born householders in 1999. However, the pattern is different from borough to borough. In the Bronx, there

#### Table 2.46 Number and Rate of Households Responding to Questions Regarding Birthplace of Householder and Immigration by Tenure New York City 1999

	<b>Response to Birthplace of Householder</b>					
	Total	<b>Owner Households</b>	<b>Renter Households</b>			
All Households	2,868,415	915,126	1,953,289			
Responded	2,403,086	771,853	1,631,233			
No Response	465,329	143,273	322,056			
All Households	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Responded	83.8	84.3	83.5			
No Response	16.2	15.7	16.5			
All Households	100.0%	31.9	68.1			
Responded	100.0%	32.1	67.9			
No Response	100.0%	30.8	69.2			
	Res	ponse to Immigration Questi	on			
	Total	<b>Owner Households</b>	<b>Renter Households</b>			
Householders Born						
A 1	050 042	271 355	687,688			
Abroad	939,042	271,000	,			
Responded to	959,042	271,555	,			
Responded to Immigration Question	891,100	251,771	639,330			
Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant	891,100 790,952	251,771 231,257	639,330 559,695			
Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant	891,100 790,952 100,148	251,771 231,257 20,514	639,330 559,695 79,635			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response Born Abroad	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941 100.0%	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357 100.0%			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response Born Abroad Responded	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941 100.0% 92.9	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584 100.0% 92.8	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357 100.0% 93.0			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response Born Abroad Responded No Response	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941 100.0% 92.9 7.1	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584 100.0% 92.8 7.2	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357 100.0% 93.0 7.0			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response Born Abroad Responded No Response	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941 100.0% 92.9 7.1	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584 100.0% 92.8 7.2	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357 100.0% 93.0 7.0 71.7			
Abroad Responded to Immigration Question Immigrant Not immigrant No Response Born Abroad Responded No Response Born Abroad Responded	891,100 790,952 100,148 67,941 100.0% 92.9 7.1 100.0% 100.0%	251,771 231,257 20,514 19,584 100.0% 92.8 7.2 28.3 28.3 28.3	639,330 559,695 79,635 48,357 100.0% 93.0 7.0 71.7 71.7			

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note: <sup>a</sup> Not including 139,737 householders born in Puerto Rico.

were more immigrant households in rent-stabilized units (67.7 percent) and fewer in unregulated rental units (18.2 percent) (Table 2.48). The pattern in Brooklyn was somewhat similar to the pattern in the City as a whole. In Manhattan, three-quarters of immigrant renter households lived in rent-stabilized units (68.2 percent) or rent-controlled units (6.2 percent), while only one in ten lived in unregulated rental units (9.7 percent). In Queens, close to half (44.6 percent) of immigrant renters lived in unregulated rental units, while the remainder lived mostly in rent-stabilized units (50.6 percent). Two-thirds of immigrant renters in Staten Island lived in unregulated rental units.

Percent Distribution of Immigrant Households within New York City by Borough and within Borough by Tenure New York City 1999				
	_		By Tenure	
Borough	Distribution Within NYC	All	Renters	Owners
All	100.0%	100.0%	70.8%	29.2%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	12.5%	100.0%	81.8%	18.2%
Brooklyn	33.3%	100.0%	73.9%	26.1%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	14.8%	100.0%	85.2%	14.8%
Queens	37.0%	100.0%	60.6%	39.4%
Staten Island	2.4%	100.0%	36.9%	63.1%

Table 2.47

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note: a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

In 1999, three-quarters of immigrant owner households lived in conventional units, while the remainder lived in private cooperatives (15.4 percent), condominiums (5.3 percent), or Mitchell-Lama units (3.7 percent) (Table 2.49). The patterns in Queens and the Bronx were approximately similar to that in the City as a whole, except that, in the Bronx, the proportion of immigrant householders in Mitchell-Lama cooperatives was much higher (12.0 percent), while the proportion in condominiums was negligible. But the pattern in Brooklyn was different. In that borough, the proportion of immigrant owner households in conventional units was considerably higher, 83.0 percent. As a result, the proportion in other types of owner units was smaller compared to the respective proportions in the City as a whole: in cooperatives, 9.7 percent; in Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, 4.4 percent; and in condominiums, 2.9 percent. In Manhattan, six in ten immigrant owner households lived in private cooperatives, while another two in ten lived in condominiums. The remainder lived in either Mitchell-Lama units (12.3 percent) or conventional units. Almost all immigrant owner households in Staten Island lived in conventional units, since most of the owner units in the borough are conventional units.

#### Table 2.48 Percent Distribution of Immigrant Renter Households by Rent Regulation Status within New York City and within Boroughs New York City 1999

Regulatory Status	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Controlled	1.9%	**	1.1%	6.2%	0.9%*	**
Stabilized	58.1%	67.7%	57.1%	68.2%	50.6%	24.6%*
Pre-1947	42.1%	59.2%	46.0%	61.3%	20.7%	**
Post-1947	16.0%	8.5%	11.1%	6.9%	29.9%	16.2%*
Mitchell-Lama Rental	2.5%	3.5%	2.0%	3.3%	2.1%	**
In Rem	0.4%	**	**	1.4%*	**	**
Public Housing	3.7%	6.1%	3.0%	7.2%	1.3%	**
Other Regulated	2.0%	3.5%	1.9%	4.0%	0.5%*	**
Unregulated	31.4%	18.2%	34.6%	9.7%	44.6%	66.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

# Table 2.49Percent Distribution of Immigrant Owner Households by Type of Ownership<br/>within New York City and within Borough<br/>New York City 1999

Type of Ownership	All	<b>Bron</b> x <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Conventional	75.6%	74.3%	83.0%	8.6%*	79.7%	92.4%
Cooperative	15.4%	11.7%	9.7%	60.6%	14.2%	**
Condominium	5.3%	**	2.9%	18.3%	5.1%	**
Mitchell-Lama Coop	3.7%	12.0%	4.4%	12.3%	1.0%*	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Six in ten immigrant householders were non-Puerto Rican Hispanics (30.3 percent) or whites (30.5 percent). Another two in ten were blacks (21.1 percent), and the remainder were mostly Asians (17.3 percent) (Table 2.50). The racial and ethnic patterns of immigrant householders among renters were similar to those of all immigrant householders, except that the proportion of white immigrant renter householders was smaller and the proportion of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic immigrant renter householders was larger than the corresponding proportions of all immigrant householders. However, the pattern for immigrant owner householders was considerably different: four in ten were white, while the remaining six in ten were divided in the following order: black (25.4 percent), Asian (22.3 percent), or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (12.2 percent).

Percent Distribution of Immigrant Households by Race/Ethnicity of Householder by Tenure New York City 1999				
Race/Ethnicity	All	Renters	Owners	
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
White	30.5%	26.8%	39.6%	
Black/African American	21.1%	19.3%	25.4%	
Puerto Rican	0.4%	0.5%	*	
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	30.3%	37.7%	12.2%	
Asian	17.3%	15.2%	22.3%	
Native American	0.4%	0.4%	*	

## Table 2.50

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: \* Too few households to report.

A review of immigrant households by tenure within each racial and ethnic group provides additional insights into the tenure patterns of immigrant households. Proportionately, white, Asian, and black immigrant households each owned more housing units than did Puerto Rican or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic immigrant households. Their homeownership rates were 37.9 percent, 37.7 percent, and 35.3 percent respectively; these rates were substantially higher than the rate of all immigrant households, which was 29.2 percent (Table 2.51). They were more than triple the rate of non-Puerto Rican immigrant households, which was a mere 11.8 percent.

The household size, the number of persons per household, for immigrant households was larger than that for all households in the City. In 1999, the average size of immigrant households was 3.06 persons, compared to 2.53 persons for all households (Table 2.52). The distribution of household size further illustrates the large size of immigrant households. Of immigrant households, 55.8 percent were three-or-more-person households, while 38.9 percent of all households were households of this size. Of immigrant households, 36.0 percent were four-or-more-person households, while only 22.7 percent of all households were of this size.

Table 2.51
Percent Distribution of Immigrant Households by Tenure by Race/Ethnicity
New York City 1999

Race/Ethnicity	All	Renters	Owners
All	100.0%	70.8%	29.2%
White	100.0%	62.1%	37.9%
Black/African American	100.0%	64.7%	35.3%
Puerto Rican	100.0%	88.3%	*
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	100.0%	88.2%	11.8%
Asian	100.0%	62.3%	37.7%
Native American	100.%	75.8%	*

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: \* Too few households to report.

#### Table 2.52 Percent Distribution of All Households and Immigrant Households by Number of Persons in the Household and Mean Household Size New York City 1999

Number of Persons in Household	All Households	Immigrant Households
All	100.0%	100.0%
1	33.2%	19.9%
2	27.9%	24.3%
3	16.2%	19.8%
4 or more	22.7%	36.0%
Mean Household Size	2.53	3.06

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Table 2.53

#### Distribution of All Households and Immigrant Households by Educational Attainment New York City 1999

			Immigrant Household	ls
Educational Attainment	All Households	Both	Moved within Last 5 Years	Moved Over 5 Years Ago
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less Than 12 Years	21.4	29.1	25.6	31.7
High School Graduate	27.3	28.1	26.6	29.3
13-15 Years	18.5	16.5	17.4	15.9
At Least College	32.8	26.2	30.5	23.2

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

In general, immigrant householders were less educated than all householders. Of all immigrant householders in the City, 70.9 percent had completed at least high school, while 78.6 percent of all householders had (Table 2.53). At the same time, 26.2 percent of immigrant householders had graduated at least from college, compared to 32.8 percent of all householders. Of immigrant householders, those who had recently moved to the City between 1994 and 1999 were substantially better educated than those who had moved to the City over five years ago. Specifically, 74.4 percent of recently-moved immigrant householders who had moved to the City before 1994. Also, judging by the proportion of those who were at least college graduates, recent immigrant householders were better educated than older immigrant householders.

#### **Recently Moved Households**

The racial and ethnic distribution of households that moved into their current residence in New York City in 1994 or earlier was very similar to that of all households. But the distribution of households that moved into their current residence from outside the USA, from other parts of the USA (excluding the City), and from within the City between 1994 and 1999 was different from that of all households and that of households that moved into their current residence in or before 1994, regardless of origin of move. More than four in ten households that recently moved from outside the USA--that is, that moved between 1994 and 1999--into their current residence were either Asian (27.2 percent) or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (18.2 percent). Asians' proportion of recent movers from outside the USA was almost four times Asians' proportion of all households (Table 2.54). Another more than four in ten were whites, while the remainder were mostly blacks (8.5 percent). This proportion of all households.

More than seven in ten households that recently moved into their current residence in the City from places within the United States but from outside the City were whites, while two in ten were Asians (9.5 percent) or blacks (9.3 percent) (Table 2.54). Six in ten recent movers from within the City were whites (33.5 percent) or blacks (27.4 percent), while three in ten were non-Puerto Rican Hispanics (16.4 percent) or Puerto Ricans (13.0 percent) (Figure 2.15).

Three in four of all households in the City that recently moved into their current residence moved from another residence in the City (Table 2.54). Nine in ten recently-moved black or Puerto Rican households moved from within the City, while eight in ten recently-moved non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households moved from within the City. On the other hand, six in ten white or Asian recently-moved households moved from within the City.

Using at least high school graduation and college graduation as measures of educational attainment, householders who recently moved into the City from other places in the United States were the best educated among recently-moved households, followed by recently-moved householders from outside the United States and recently-moved households from within the City (Table 2.55). Almost all recent movers from other parts of the United States had finished at least high school and seven in ten had graduated from college (Figure 2.16).

#### Table 2.54 Distribution by Race/Ethnicity of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago New York City 1999

		Moved into Current Residence Within Last 5 Years			Moved into Current Residence	
Race/Ethnicity	All <sup>a</sup>	From Outside USA <sup>b</sup>	From USA Excluding NYC	Within NYC	Over 5 Years Ago	
Number	2,868,415	105,984	126,120	687,577	1,701,631	
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
White	46.2%	43.6%	71.2%	33.5%	48.9%	
Black/African American	23.3%	8.5%	9.3%	27.4%	23.8%	
Puerto Rican	9.8%	2.0%	3.7%	13.0%	9.6%	
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	12.6%	18.2%	5.8%	16.4%	11.8%	
Asian	7.6%	27.2%	9.5%	9.1%	5.5%	
Native American	0.4%	*	*	0.5%	0.4%	

		Moved into Current Residence Within Last 5 Years				
Race/Ethnicity	All Households	Number <sup>a</sup>	All	From Outside USA <sup>b</sup>	From USA Excluding NYC	Within New York City
All	2,868,415	1,166,784	100.0%	11.5%	13.7%	74.8%
White	1,326,166	494,270	100.0%	12.6%	24.5%	62.9%
Black/African American	668,264	262,472	100.0%	4.3%	5.6%	90.1%
Puerto Rican	280,269	117,582	100.0%	2.2%	4.9%	92.9%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	362,220	160,749	100.0%	13.9%	5.2%	80.9%
Asian	218,671	125,052	100.0%	27.9%	11.6%	60.4%
Native American	12,824	6,659	100.0%	*	*	78.1%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Total includes those not reporting origin of move.

b Including Puerto Rico.
\* Too few households to t

\* Too few households to report.

Figure 2.15 Race/Ethnicity of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago New York City 1999



#### Table 2.55

Distribution by Educational Attainment of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago New York City 1999

		Moved into Current Residence Within Last 5 Years			Moved into Current
Educational Attainment	All	From Outside USA <sup>a</sup>	From USA Excluding NYC	Within NYC	Residence Over 5 Years Ago
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than 12 Years	21.4%	17.7%	5.7%	21.8%	23.4%
High School Graduate	27.3%	21.9%	9.3%	25.0%	30.1%
13-15 Years	18.5%	13.1%	14.3%	22.0%	18.1%
At Least College Graduate	32.8%	47.3%	70.6%	31.3%	28.4%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Including Puerto Rico.

Figure 2.16 Educational Attainment of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Within the Previous 5 Years by Origin of Move and of Householders Who Moved into Current Residence Over 5 Years Ago New York City 1999



#### Doubled-Up Households (Sub-Family and Secondary Individual Households)

The 1999 HVS reports that, between 1996 and 1999, the housing supply increased visibly, housing neighborhood conditions improved markedly, and even the rent-income ratio declined. However, during the same period, renter households' already serious crowding situation in the City worsened. Thus, the analysis of the doubled-up household situation here is designed to improve our understanding of this current housing problem in terms of the magnitude and complexities of hidden households and their housing requirements.

The discussion of the doubled-up situation uses the following categories and definitions of types of households and families:

*Primary family household* -- All members of the household are related to the household head; no members form sub-families, and no secondary individuals are present.

Primary individual household -- A single-person household (one person living alone).

Sub-family household -- The household contains at least one sub-family living with a "host" primary

family or primary individual. A sub-family can be either a parent and child(ren) or a couple with or without children. These doubled-up sub-families may be either related or unrelated to the householder, although the majority are related to the householder. Examples of sub-families are a single mother, age 17, and her baby, who live with the single mother's 42-year-old mother; or a married couple living with the husband's parents; or a parent and child rooming with an unrelated primary family.

Secondary individual household -- The household contains unrelated individual(s) living with a "host" primary family or primary individual. Secondary individuals are unrelated roommates, boarders, or roomers. (Although unmarried partners technically are also unrelated individuals, for the purpose of the 1999 HVS family and household analyses, they were not coded as secondary individuals but were treated as a type of domestic partner, similar to a spouse.) If a household contains both a sub-family and a secondary individual, it is categorized as a sub-family type of household.

The 1999 HVS reports that 3.6 percent of all households, or 103,000 households, contained a sub-family in New York City in 1999 (Table 2.56). In addition, according to the survey, there were 118,000 households, or 4.1 percent of all households, containing a secondary individual. This means that together, in 1999, there were 221,000 doubled-up households in the City, an increase of 18,000, or 9.1 percent, over the 203,000 doubled-up households in 1996. Three in four doubled-up households containing sub-families or secondary individuals were renter households.

In 1999, 68,000 renter households, or 3.5 percent of all renter households in the City, contained at least one sub-family. Of these doubled-up renter households, 30,000, or 43.8 percent, were crowded (more than 1.01 persons per room) and 9,000, or 14.0 percent, were seriously crowded (more than 1.51 persons per room), compared to the crowding rate of 11.0 percent and the serious crowding rate of 3.9 percent for all renter households in 1999, which are discussed in Chapter 7 of this report. At the same time, 99,000 renter households contained secondary individuals--that is, 5.1 percent of all renter households in the City in 1999. Of these doubled-up renter households, 13,000, or 13.3 percent, were crowded and 6,000, or 6.5 percent, were seriously crowded.

In 1999, there were 137,000 sub-families and 218,000 secondary individuals in the City (Table 2.57). Altogether, there were 355,000 hidden households in the City; many of them may have needed their own housing units. Of all sub-families, 93,000, or 68.1 percent, were in renter households. The median income of these sub-families in renter households was \$10,000 in 1998. Almost three-quarters of these renter sub-families had incomes below \$20,000. A preponderant proportion of all renter sub-families had incomes below \$20,000. A preponderant proportion of these crowded renter sub-families had incomes below \$20,000. At the same time, 16,000 renter sub-families, or 17.1 percent of all renter sub-families, were seriously crowded. Two-thirds of these seriously crowded renter sub-families had incomes below \$20,000.

Of the 218,000 secondary individuals in the City in 1999, 86.4 percent were in renter households. The median income of these secondary individuals in renter households was \$20,000 in 1998. Of these, 33,000, or 17.8 percent of all secondary individuals in renter households, were crowded. Three-quarters of these crowded renter secondary individuals, or 25,000, had median incomes below \$20,000.

#### Table 2.56 Selected Characteristics of Households Containing a Doubled-up Sub-family or Secondary Individual by Tenure of the Householder New York City 1996 and 1999

	Tenure of the Householder			
	All	Renter	Owner	
1996				
Total households	2,780,349	1,946,165	834,183	
Households containing at least one sub-family <sup>a</sup> (percent)	96,944 (3.5%)	63,191 (3.2%)	33,752 (4.0%)	
Median income (in 1998 dollars)	<sup>\$</sup> 39,600	<sup>\$</sup> 29,232	<sup>\$</sup> 63,735	
Crowded <sup>b</sup>	33,705	26,769	6,936	
Seriously crowded <sup>b</sup>	11,713	10,365	**	
Additional households containing a secondary individual (percent)	105,983 (3.8%)	88,619 (4.6%)	17,363 (2.1%)	
Median Income (1998 dollars)	<sup>\$</sup> 50,624	<sup>\$</sup> 46,664	<sup>\$</sup> 73,850	
Crowded <sup>b</sup>	13,229	12,295	**	
Seriously crowded <sup>b</sup>	5,878	5,535	**	
Total "doubled-up" households	202,926	151,811	51,116	
1999				
Total households	2,868,415	1,953,289	915,126	
Households containing at least one sub-family <sup>a</sup> (percent)	103,423 (3.6%)	67,601 (3.5%)	35,822 (3.9%)	
Median income	<sup>\$</sup> 41,240	<sup>\$</sup> 29,300	<sup>\$</sup> 76,000	
Crowded <sup>b</sup>	37,081	29,637	7,444	
Seriously crowded <sup>b</sup>	11,853	9,469	2,384*	
Additional households containing a secondary individual (percent)	117,967 (4.1%)	99,229 (5.1%)	18,739 (2.0%)	
Median Income	<sup>\$</sup> 53,250	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	<sup>\$</sup> 70,100	
Crowded <sup>b</sup>	14,550	13,218	**	
Seriously crowded <sup>b</sup>	7,192	6,459	**	
Total "doubled-up" households	221,391	166,830	54,561	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

There can be more than one sub-family and/or secondary individual in a doubled-up household. Crowded = 1.01 or more persons per room. Seriously crowded = 1.51 or more persons per room. Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. Too few households to report. а

b \*

\*\*

#### Table 2.57 Selected Characteristics of Sub-families and Secondary Individuals by Tenure of the Householder New York City 1996 and 1999

	Tenure of the Householder			
Selected Characteristics	All	Renter	Owner	
1996				
Total sub-families	136,718	89,934 (65.8%)	46,784 (34.2%)	
Median Income (1998 dollars)	<sup>\$</sup> 12,843	<sup>\$</sup> 8,990	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	
Incomes below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	88,248	65,612 (74.3%)	22,636 (25.7%)	
Crowded <sup>a</sup>	49,794	39,371 (79.1%)	10,423 (20.9%)	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	34,541	28,872 (83.6%)	5,669 (16.4%)	
Seriously crowded <sup>a</sup>	17,631	15,667 (88.9%)	(11.1%)*	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	12,373	10,957 (88.6%)	(11.4%)*	
Total secondary individuals	202,182	170,035 (84.1%)	32,146 (15.9%)	
Median Income (1998 dollars)	<sup>\$</sup> 16,054	<sup>\$</sup> 16,054	<sup>\$</sup> 12,843	
Incomes below \$20,000	117,285	99,391 (84.7%)	17,894 (15.3%)	
Crowded	34,727	31,430 (90.5%)	3,297 (9.5%)	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	28,042	25,017 (89.2%)	3,024 (10.8%)	
Seriously crowded	17,051	15,998 (93.8%)	(6.2%)*	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	13,995	12,942 (92.5%)	(7.5%)*	
1999				
Total sub-families	137,220	93,480 (68.1%)	43,740 (31.9%)	
Median Income	<sup>\$</sup> 12,500	<sup>\$</sup> 10,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	
Incomes below \$20,000	86,739	68,506 (79.0%)	18,233 (21.0%)	
Crowded <sup>a</sup>	54,101	44,422 (82.1%)	9,679 (17.9%)	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	36,806	32,279 (87.7%)	4,528 (12.3%)	
Seriously crowded <sup>a</sup>	19,404	16,021 (82.6%)	3,383 (17.4%)	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	12,135	10,861 (89.5%)	(10.5%)*	
Total secondary individuals	217,825	188,149 (86.4%)	29,676 (13.6%)	
Median Income	<sup>\$</sup> 19,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 16,000	
Incomes below \$20,000	110,632	93,969 (84.9%)	16,662 (15.1%)	
Crowded	36,572	33,430 (91.4%)	3,142 (8.6%)	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	27,277	24,985 (91.6%)	2,292*(8.4%)	
Seriously Crowded	20,634	18,679 (90.5%)	(9.5%)*	
Income below <sup>\$</sup> 20,000	13,641	12,374 (90.7%)	(9.3%)*	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Crowded = 1.01 or more persons per room. Seriously crowded = 1.51 or more persons per room.

\* Since the number of individuals or sub-families is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

#### Table 2.58 Selected Characteristics of Sub-families with Incomes Less than \$20,000 in Crowded Renter Households <sup>a</sup> New York City 1996 and 1999

Characteristics	1996	1999
Number	28,872	32,279
Median Income (1998 dollars)	<sup>\$</sup> 5,338	<sup>\$</sup> 6,976
Median income by source None Earnings Public assistance	<sup>\$</sup> 0 <sup>\$</sup> 13,914 <sup>\$</sup> 4,983	<sup>\$</sup> 0 <sup>\$</sup> 10,000 <sup>\$</sup> 6,000
Primary income source No income Earnings Public assistance	7,638 (26.5%) 13,331 (46.2%) 6,285 (21.8%)	7,806 (24.2%) 18,717 (58.0%) 4,538 (14.1%)
Worked last week (family head)	9,660 (34.5%)	17,703 (55.6%)
Not in labor force (family head) <sup>b</sup>	13,045 (49.1%)	13,384 (42.1%)
Main reason not in labor force Family/Child care School	33.4% 24.7%	31.4% 24.1%
Median gross rent-income ratio of household	32.8	28.5
Median share of household income By primary income source None Earnings	21% 0% 41%	23% 0% 33%
Public assistance	18%	23%
Receive less than 20% of household income	14,152 (49.0%)	14,273 (44.2%)
Receive 40% or more of household income	9,193 (31.8%)	7,625 (23.6%)
Family composition Single parent Female single parent Couple (with or without children)	17,468 (60.5%) 16,783 (58.1%) 11,404 (39.5%)	17,511 (54.2%) 16,010 (49.6%) 14,768 (45.8%)
Mean number of children under 18	1.3	1.2
Median age of sub-family head Female single parent	30 years 27 years	27 years 25 years
Education of sub-family head Less than high school High school diploma or more	43.7% 56.3%	53.9% 46.1%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Percents based on sub-families with incomes less than \$20,000 in crowded renter households after excluding individuals with missing data. Crowded = 1.01 or more persons per room.

b Not in labor force means did not work last week, not temporarily absent or on layoff, and not looking for work.

There were 32,000 sub-families with incomes below \$20,000 that were, at the same time, in crowded renter households in the City (Table 2.58). In 1996, the number of such sub-families was 29,000. The median income of these sub-families was only \$6,976 in 1998. Only close to six in ten received their incomes from earnings (58.0 percent), while the remainder either had no income (24.2 percent) or received public assistance (14.1 percent). Of all these poor sub-families in crowded households, 42.1 percent were not in the labor force, and the two major reasons given were, first, responsibility for family/childcare (31.4 percent) and, second, school (24.1 percent).

	Number o	or Percent <sup>a</sup>
Characteristics	1996	1999
Number	25,017	24,985
Males (median age)	20,305 (28)	19,379 (27)
Females (median age)	4,713 (25)	5,607 (30)
Median income (1998 dollars) Males Females	<sup>\$</sup> 8,562 <sup>\$</sup> 11,131 <sup>\$</sup> 1,017	<sup>\$</sup> 9,090 <sup>\$</sup> 10,000 <sup>\$</sup> 8,000
Receiving less than 20% of household income	16,524 (66.1%)	16,407 (65.7%)
Median share of household's income	17%	15%
Primary income source None Earnings	28.9% 66.8%	24.1% 75.0%
Not in labor force	18.1% 72.5%	19.7% 75.7%
Education Less than high school High school diploma or more	37.2% 62.8%	47.0% 53.0%
Median gross rent/income ratio of household	19.5	16.5
Mean size of household	5.1 persons	5.7 persons

Table 2.59
Selected Characteristics of Secondary Individuals with Incomes Less than \$20,000
in Crowded Renter Households
New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a Percents based on secondary individuals with incomes less than \$20,000 in crowded renter households after excluding individuals with missing data. Crowded = 1.01 or more persons per room.

b Not in labor force means did not work last week, not temporarily absent or on layoff, and not looking for work.

Notes:

	Number or Percent <sup>a</sup>	
Characteristics	1996	1999
Number	7,720	7,669
Median income (1998 dollars)	<sup>\$</sup> 2,034	<sup>\$</sup> 5000
Median income by source None Earnings Public Assistance	0 \$8,755 \$2,997*	0 \$6,500 **
Primary income source: No income Earnings Public assistance	40.1% 43.3% 16.5%*	32.5% 58.6% **
Worked last week (family head) Not in labor force <sup>b</sup> (family head)	27.7% 56.3%	58.2% 41.6%
Receive less than 20% of household income Receive 40% or more of household income	53.4% 41.1%	40.0% 43.1%
Median share of household income	12%	33%
Family composition: Single parent Female single parent Couple	4,850 (62.8%) 4,837 (62.7%) 2,870* (37.2%)	3,494 (45.6%) 3,211 (41.9%) 4,175 (54.4%)
Median age of female, single parent sub-family head	25 years	24 years
Education of sub-family head Less than high school High school diploma or more	59.7% 40.3%	60.8% 39.2%
Median gross rent/income ratio of household	82.5	77.6
Median total household income	<sup>\$</sup> 10,275	<sup>\$</sup> 10,100

#### Table 2.60 Selected Characteristics of Sub-Families with Incomes Less than \$20,000 in Crowded Renter Households with Very High Rent Burdens New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Percents based on sub-families with incomes less than \$20,000 in crowded renter households with very high rent burden after excluding individuals with missing data. Crowded = 1.01 or more persons per room; very high rent burden is 50% or more of income.

b Not in labor force means did not work last week, not temporarily absent or on layoff, and not looking for work.

\* Since the number of sub-families is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few sub-families to report.

The median share of household income by these poor sub-families was a mere 23.0 percent. Of all 32,000 poor sub-families in crowded renter households, 18,000, or 54.2 percent, were single-parent families, 16,000 of which were headed by a single female parent. The median age of such single female parents was 25 years; 53.9 percent of the heads of such poor sub-families did not finish high school.

In 1999, there were 25,000 secondary individuals with incomes of less than \$20,000 living in crowded renter households in the City (Table 2.59). Of these, more than three-quarters were males, whose median age was 27 years. The median income of these poor secondary individuals in crowded renter households was only \$9,090; their median share of household income was just 15.0 percent. For three-quarters of these secondary individuals, the primary source of income was earnings. Near to one in two did not finish high school. The mean size of the crowded households containing such poor secondary individuals was very large, 5.7 persons.

There were 8,000 sub-families with incomes less than \$20,000 in crowded renter households with rent-income ratios of 50.0 percent or more in 1999 (Table 2.60). The median income of these sub-families was \$5,000, while the median income of the households with such high rent burdens containing these poor sub-families was \$10,100. These sub-families' median share of their total household income was 33 percent. Of the heads of such poor sub-families, 41.6 percent were not in the labor force, and six in ten did not finish high school. More than four in ten of such poor sub-families were headed by a single female parent, whose median age was 24.

The findings of the above discussion lead to the conclusion that most very poor sub-families and secondary individuals in crowded renter households with high rent burdens were hidden households that needed separate housing units. However, they had profoundly insufficient incomes to be able to afford their own units and, as a result, lived doubled-up in crowded households.

### **3** Household Incomes in New York City

#### Introduction

In this chapter, all major issues covered in the HVS that are relevant to determining the capabilities of households to pay housing costs are discussed. The first part of the chapter presents and analyzes household incomes. The most critical single descriptor for a household's current cost-paying capability is the amount of income available to the household. Thus, household income is separated from other household characteristics and is covered by itself in the first part of this chapter. The amount of household income that can be allocated to housing costs generally determines the specific segment of the housing inventory--in terms of tenure and type, condition, and neighborhoods--where housing units with a unique bundle of housing services can be chosen by households. In other words, most households with higher incomes live in relatively larger and/or higher-quality housing units in more desirable neighborhoods with better and/or preferable private and public neighborhood services than most lower-income households do. However, other household characteristics, as discussed in the previous chapter, serve as modifiers to household income as the main housing demand indicator. In addition, public policies--such as rent control and regulation, and public housing--intervene in how demand for housing is structured and functions and in the intersection of demand and supply. Also, discrimination in a city's housing market, such as residential racial segregation or discrimination, can negate household income as a leading variable defining the housing units households can actually occupy. Thus, this chapter discusses changes in and patterns of household income, not only by tenure, location, and other housing unit characteristics, but also by rent regulation status, race and ethnicity, and other household characteristics.

For almost all surveys, many respondents tend not to provide data on income or other financial information. The number of respondents who do not provide such data and information is very large for the HVS, as is the case for other surveys done by the Census Bureau, and the number has been growing over recent survey years. For this reason, for the 1996 HVS, the Census Bureau used, for the first time, an imputation method to assign values to income and some other questions not answered by respondents. The Census Bureau then went back and imputed missing data for the 1993 HVS but did not impute data for missing items for HVSs prior to 1993. In the imputation method the Census Bureau used, values derived from persons or housing units that did respond and that had characteristics similar to the non-respondents were assigned for non-responses.<sup>1</sup> For the 1999 HVS, the Census Bureau again used this imputation method. Therefore, to ensure comparability, data on household income will be discussed in this report in two ways: (1) for trends for the period between 1992 and 1998, all income, reported and imputed, will be covered; but (2) for long-term trends from 1986 to 1998, only **reported** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For further information on the imputation procedures the Census Bureau developed and used for the 1993, 1996, and 1999 HVSs, see Chapter 1 and Appendix D of this report.

income will be covered. Whenever reported income data only are used, they will be specifically noted as "reported" in presentations and discussions.<sup>2</sup>

The second part of the chapter discusses households with incomes below various income levels that are policy-important in assessing changes in the magnitude of housing demands and needs. Included are households with different levels of income covered in HUD's Consolidated Plan, which HUD requires local governments receiving Community Development Block Grants and other HUD grants to prepare and submit to show the magnitude of and justifications for housing assistance needs. This part of the chapter also covers changes in the number of households with incomes below the federal poverty level and changes in the number of households receiving cash public assistance.

The final part of the chapter analyzes employment characteristics of households--such as labor force participation, unemployment, and occupational and industrial patterns--which largely determine household incomes. Household income is a key determinant of effective housing demand. However, household income, which is the total amount members of a household receive currently in income from all sources, does not provide any information on the relative importance of each source of income or the causes of income differentiation among individuals and households. Moreover, household income alone does not help us gauge the possibility of income improvement that might be made by further utilizing the unused earning potential of household members, particularly in terms of their educational and employment characteristics, such as level of educational attainment, earnings, occupation, and/or industry. Data on education and employment can be usefully combined with income data to provide additional and deeper insights into, among other things, the overall capability, particularly the potential capability, of households to improve further their incomes and, thus, possibly their housing situations.

Household income data from the Census 2000 are different from the 1999 HVS data, not just because the Census 2000 income data are for the year 1999 and the 1999 HVS data are for the year 1998. As discussed in Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households," the following other survey coverage, method-, and process-related reasons apply as well. First, for the Census 2000 all households, whether or not they reside in regular residential housing units, were surveyed; but, for the HVSs, only households in regular housing units are interviewed. Households in units that are in "special places" are not included in the HVS sample. Second, for the Census 2000, the Census Bureau used a mail survey, while, for the 1999 HVS, the Census Bureau hired and trained interviewers and then sent them out to collect data on each of the sample units. Third, the City provided the Census Bureau with more than 370,000 household addresses that were added during the 1990 decade or missed in the 1990 census. These addresses were included in the Census 2000 but could not have been covered in the sample used for the 1999 and earlier HVSs. Finally, the Census Bureau made extra efforts to count everyone and to reduce the undercount in 2000. On the other hand, the sample for the 1999 HVS was selected from the 1990 census, where the undercount was higher; moreover, the weighting methodology for the 1999 HVS used estimates based on the 1990 census.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Income data are for the year before the survey year. To ensure complete comparability between 1999, 1996, 1993, and previous survey years, the income data from the HVSs presented to show historical trends are estimated by applying a method that is almost the same as the method the Census Bureau used for the 1991 and, originally, the 1993 HVSs. Since income data were tabulated for the 1996 and 1999 HVSs slightly differently from the way they were originally organized for the 1993 and previous HVSs, data on reported incomes for 1992 and selected previous years presented in the report *Housing New York City, 1993* are a little different from the data from the 1996 and 1999 HVSs. However, the differences are small.

#### Household Incomes

#### Changes in Household Income by Tenure

According to the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, incomes of residents in New York City increased considerably during the three years between 1995 and 1998. For all households, renters and owners together, median household income in current dollars increased by 11.5 percent, from \$29,600 to \$33,000, or by an annual compound rate of 3.7 percent (Table 3.1). Income growth outpaced inflation. For all items for all urban consumers, the consumer price index for New York-Northeast New Jersey-Long Island increased by 7.0 percent during the three-year period. The resulting household real income --income after adjusting for inflation--increased by 4.2 percent over the three-year period, or by an annual compound rate of 1.4 percent. This was the first back-to-back growth in real income for New Yorkers in many years. Analysis of **reported** median household income for the last five surveys, from 1986 through 1998, confirms this solidly sustained income improvement for City residents over the last six years. The real **reported** median household income declined by 2.7 percent between 1986 and 1990, and dropped further by 13.9 percent between 1990 and 1992 (Table 3.2). Then, this descending trend reversed in the succeeding three years. Real household income improved by 6.2 percent between 1992 and 1995 and continued to climb by 9.1 percent, or by an annual compound rate of 2.9 percent, in the following three years through 1998.

			Average Annual Compound Rate of Change
Tenure	1995	1998	1995-98
	Consta	nt (1998) Dollars	
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 31,680	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	+1.4%
Owner	<sup>\$</sup> 51,975	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	+0.7%
Renter	<sup>\$</sup> 25,571	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	+0.6%
	Cu	rrent Dollars	
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 29,600	\$33,000	+3.7%
Owner	<sup>\$</sup> 48,562	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	+3.0%
Renter	\$23,892	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	+2.9%

Table 3.1
Median Household Income in Constant and Current Dollars by Tenure
New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a In the Income chapter, current 1995 dollars are multiplied by the following fraction to produce constant 1998 dollars: Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for New York-Northern N.J.-Long Island, All Items, average monthly value in 1998, divided by the average monthly value in 1995 (173.6/162.2).

b Unless otherwise noted, 1995 and 1998 income data include imputed values where they were not reported.

					Average Annual Compound Rate of Change	
1986	1990	1992	1995	1998	1986-95	1995-98
Constant (1998) Dollars						
<sup>\$</sup> 30,917	\$30,082	<sup>\$</sup> 25,910	<sup>\$</sup> 27,506	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	-1.3%	+2.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 46,376	<sup>\$</sup> 48,954	<sup>\$</sup> 45,738	<sup>\$</sup> 48,163	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	+0.4%	+1.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 24,734	<sup>\$</sup> 25,069	<sup>\$</sup> 21,404	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	-1.6%	+2.4%
Current Dollars						
<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,700	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	+2.8%	+5.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 39,056	<sup>\$</sup> 40,600	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	+4.6%	+3.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 16,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 19,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	+2.5%	+4.8%
	1986 <sup>\$</sup> 30,917 <sup>\$</sup> 46,376 <sup>\$</sup> 24,734 <sup>\$</sup> 20,000 <sup>\$</sup> 30,000 <sup>\$</sup> 16,000	1986         1990           \$30,917         \$30,082           \$46,376         \$48,954           \$24,734         \$25,069           \$20,000         \$24,000           \$30,000         \$39,056           \$16,000         \$20,000	1986         1990         1992           Constant           \$30,917         \$30,082         \$25,910           \$46,376         \$48,954         \$45,738           \$24,734         \$25,069         \$21,404           Curre           \$20,000         \$24,000         \$23,000           \$30,000         \$39,056         \$40,600           \$16,000         \$20,000         \$19,000	1986         1990         1992         1995           Constant (1998) Dollars <sup>\$30,917</sup> <sup>\$30,082 <sup>\$25,910</sup> <sup>\$27,506</sup> <sup>\$46,376</sup> <sup>\$48,954</sup> <sup>\$45,738</sup> <sup>\$48,163</sup> <sup>\$24,734</sup> <sup>\$25,069</sup> <sup>\$21,404 <sup>\$21,406           Current Dollars           <sup>\$20,000</sup> <sup>\$24,000</sup> <sup>\$23,000</sup> <sup>\$25,700</sup> <sup>\$30,000</sup> <sup>\$39,056</sup> <sup>\$40,600</sup> <sup>\$45,000</sup> <sup>\$16,000</sup> <sup>\$20,000</sup> <sup>\$19,000 <sup>\$20,000</sup> </sup></sup></sup></sup>	1986         1990         1992         1995         1998           Constant (1998) Dollars <sup>\$</sup> 30,917 <sup>\$</sup> 30,082 <sup>\$</sup> 25,910 <sup>\$</sup> 27,506 <sup>\$</sup> 30,000 <sup>\$</sup> 46,376 <sup>\$</sup> 48,954 <sup>\$</sup> 45,738 <sup>\$</sup> 48,163 <sup>\$</sup> 50,000 <sup>\$</sup> 24,734 <sup>\$</sup> 25,069 <sup>\$</sup> 21,404 <sup>\$</sup> 21,406 <sup>\$</sup> 23,000           Current Dollars <sup>\$</sup> 20,000 <sup>\$</sup> 24,000 <sup>\$</sup> 23,000 <sup>\$</sup> 25,700 <sup>\$</sup> 30,000 <sup>\$</sup> 30,000 <sup>\$</sup> 39,056 <sup>\$</sup> 40,600 <sup>\$</sup> 45,000 <sup>\$</sup> 50,000 <sup>\$</sup> 16,000 <sup>\$</sup> 20,000 <sup>\$</sup> 19,000 <sup>\$</sup> 20,000 <sup>\$</sup> 23,000	Average Compound Char           1986         1990         1992         1995         1998         1986-95           Constant (1998) Dollars         Constant (1998) Dollars         1986-95 <sup>§</sup> 30,917 <sup>§</sup> 30,082 <sup>§</sup> 25,910 <sup>§</sup> 27,506 <sup>§</sup> 30,000         -1.3% <sup>§</sup> 46,376 <sup>§</sup> 48,954 <sup>§</sup> 45,738 <sup>§</sup> 48,163 <sup>§</sup> 50,000         +0.4% <sup>§</sup> 24,734 <sup>§</sup> 25,069 <sup>§</sup> 21,404 <sup>§</sup> 21,406 <sup>§</sup> 23,000         -1.6%           Current Dollars <sup>§</sup> 20,000 <sup>§</sup> 24,000 <sup>§</sup> 23,000 <sup>§</sup> 25,700 <sup>§</sup> 30,000         +2.8% <sup>§</sup> 30,000 <sup>§</sup> 39,056 <sup>§</sup> 40,600 <sup>§</sup> 45,000 <sup>§</sup> 50,000         +4.6% <sup>§</sup> 16,000 <sup>§</sup> 20,000 <sup>§</sup> 19,000 <sup>§</sup> 20,000 <sup>§</sup> 23,000         +2.5%

 Table 3.2

 Median Reported Household Income in Constant and Current Dollars by Tenure

 New York City, Selected Years 1986-1998<sup>a</sup>

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

Based on **reported** data only in order to provide comparable data. In the 1991, and subsequent surveys household income data were based on the respondent's report of the annual income of each household member age 15 or over in seven income categories, while prior to 1991 only three categories were used. The extent to which the change in method of collecting income data affected comparisons of household income data collected before 1991 with data collected in 1991 and later is unknown.

When using 1993, 1996, and 1999 data, where missing income was completed by imputation, in order to obtain household incomes that are logically comparable to amounts reported in 1991 and before, all imputed values were cleared; then the same criteria as originally used in 1991 and before were applied to treat households with insufficient information as non-reports; then reported values only were aggregated. This computation of household income is closely analogous to the treatment originally used before imputed values were available.

b Very minor differences in 1992 reported current dollars from the 1993 report reflect the constraints of applying similar techniques to both 1996 and 1993 data to produce "reported" only data after the 1992 data were organized to support imputation of missing data.

The back-to-back growth in household income between 1992 and 1998 was a consequence of the steady and solid economic growth in the City, as in the national economy generally, during the period. According to the 1993 and 1999 HVSs, the labor-force participation rate increased by 2.6 percentage points to 61.9 percent in 1999. During the same six-year period, the number of employed persons increased by 317,000, or by 10.9 percent, as the unemployment rate declined by 3.7 percentage points to 6.7 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics's *Status of the Civilian Labor Force in New York City*. This labor-market growth was greatly helped by the City's determined and persistent efforts to make the City a better place in which to live, work, and invest. At the same time, the total number of crimes in the seven major felony categories plunged by 54.4 percent, from 207,794 in January-June 1993 to 94,667 in January-June 1999.<sup>3</sup> In addition, according to the 1999 HVS, people in New York City were

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The City of New York, Mayor's Office of Operations, Mayor's Management Report, Fiscal 2000, Volume 1--Agency Narratives. The seven major felony categories are murder, robbery, rape first-degree and attempts, felonious assault, burglary, grand larceny, and grand larceny motor vehicle.
significantly better educated in 1999 than they were three years previously. In 1999, 77.4 percent of individuals 18 years old or older in all households had finished at least high school, an increase of 2.0 percentage points over 1996. Particularly, the percentage of those who had graduated at least from college increased by 3.5 percentage points to 29.2 percent. With the remarkable improvement in quality of life, significant economic growth, and better educational attainment,<sup>4</sup> incomes of New Yorkers grew accordingly.

During the same period between 1995 and 1998, the growth in median household income for renters and owners also exceeded the inflation rate, albeit at a lower rate than that for all households combined. The median renter household income increased by \$2,100, or by 8.8 percent, during the period, reaching \$26,000 in 1998 (Table 3.1). After inflation, renter income increased by an annual compound rate of 0.6 percent. At the same time, median owner household income improved by \$4,400, or by 9.1 percent. In real terms, median owner household income increased by a compound rate of 0.7 percent annually.

Judging from median household income disaggregated by income quintile, using 1998 dollars, it is clear that incomes of households in the City improved for all income levels, except the middle. The growth of the two highest and two lowest income quintiles was greater than the growth for the City as a whole. The growth rate for the second-lowest group was 7.6 percent, the highest of all groups (Table 3.3). The growth rate for the highest group was 6.2 percent, while the rate for the lowest group was 5.9 percent, considerably higher than the rate of 4.2 percent for all households. The income growth rate for the middle twenty percent was only 3.2 percent, noticeably lower than the rate for all households and all other quintiles.

Household Income Quintile	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995-98
Highest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 94,185	<sup>\$</sup> 100,000	+6.2%
2nd Highest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 51,374	<sup>\$</sup> 54,110	+5.3%
Middle 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 31,199	<sup>\$</sup> 32,200	+3.2%
2nd Lowest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 16,054	<sup>\$</sup> 17,276	+7.6%
Lowest. 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 6,422	<sup>\$</sup> 6,800	+5.9%
All Households	<sup>\$</sup> 31,680	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	+4.2%

Table 3.3Median Household Income by Household Income Quintile in 1998 Dollars<br/>New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

<sup>4</sup> Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households," Housing New York City, 1999.

An examination of the disaggregation of households by the number of workers in the household in each quintile discloses that, in 1998, three-quarters of households in the lowest income quintile did not have any workers, while only a quarter of all households had no workers (Table 3.4). On the other hand, one in fifty households in the top quintile and fewer than one in twenty households in secondhighest quintile had no workers. However, almost a fifth of households in the top quintile had three or more workers, while almost no households with such a large number of workers were in the lowest group.

Table 3.4

	House by I	holds Distri Number of V New	buted into Ir Workers in th York City 19	come Quinti e Household 98	les	
Number of Workers	All	Lowest	Second Lowest	Middle	Second Highest	Highest
All	2,868,415	572,781	559,918	572,790	588,729	574,197
None	733,260	432,389	204,405	61,702	23,193	11,571
One	1,154,969	127,247	283,817	344,577	265,074	134,254
Two	786,930	12,016	63,390	139,864	253,284	318,375
Three or More	193,255	**	8,306	26,646	47,178	109,996
		Distribution	within Quintil	е		
Number of Workers	All	Lowest	Second Lowest	Middle	Second Highest	Highest
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None	25.6%	75.5%	36.5%	10.8%	3.9%	2.0%
One	40.3%	22.2%	50.7%	60.2%	45.0%	23.4%
Two	27.4%	2.1%	11.3%	24.4%	43.0%	55.4%
Three or More	6.7%	0.2*	1.5%	4.7%	8.0%	19.2%
	Dist	ribution withi	n Number of W	orkers		
Number of Workers	All	Lowest	Second Lowest	Middle	Second Highest	Highest
All	100.0%	20.0%	19.5%	20.0%	20.5%	20.0%
None	100.0%	59.0%	27.9%	8.4%	3.2%	1.6%
One	100.0%	11.0%	24.6%	29.8%	23.0%	11.6%
Two	100.0%	1.5%	8.1%	17.8%	32.2%	40.5%
Three or More	100.0%	0.6*	4.3%	13.8%	24.4%	56.9%

Source: U.S. Bur Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

The distribution of households with different numbers of workers in the household by different income levels confirms the findings of the above analysis that, in general, earnings were the principal source of household income; and the more workers in a household, the higher the household income. Of households with no workers, six in ten were in the lowest income quintile, while another almost three in ten were in the second lowest (Table 3.4). On the other hand, of households with three or more workers, close to six in ten were in the top income group, while another about a quarter were in the second-highest group.

Similar conclusions are revealed from a review of the data on the same relationship in 1995 (Table 3.5). In addition, an analysis of changes in the number of households with different numbers of

Table 3.5

	House by I	holds Distri Number of V	buted into Ir Workers in th	ncome Quinti le Household 05	les	
Number of Workers	All	Lowest	Second Lowest	Middle	Second Highest	Highest
All	2,780,349	555,011	544,580	568,453	553,716	558,588
None	797,616	461,921	234,205	66,825	24,329	10,335
One	1,113,766	85,946	261,162	359,293	255,641	151,724
Two	695,830	6,713	45,850	122,811	229,083	291,374
Three or More	173,136	*	3,364	19,524	44,663	105,155
		Distribution	within Quintil	e		
Number of Workers	All	Lowest	Second Lowest	Middle	Second Highest	Highest
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None	28.7%	83.2%	43.0%	11.8%	4.4%	1.9%
One	40.1%	15.5%	48.0%	63.2%	46.2%	27.2%
Two	25.0%	1.2%	8.4%	21.6%	41.4%	52.2%
Three or More	6.2%	*	0.6%	3.4%	8.1%	18.8%
	Dist	ribution withi	n Number of W	orkers		
Number of Workers	All	Lowest	Second Lowest	Middle	Second Highest	Highest
All	100.0%	20.0%	19.6%	20.4%	19.9%	20.1%
None	100.0%	57.9%	29.4%	8.4%	3.1%	1.3%
One	100.0%	7.7%	23.4%	32.3%	23.0%	13.6%
Two	100.0%	1.0%	6.6%	17.6%	32.9%	41.9%
Three or More	100.0%	*	1.9%	11.3%	25.8%	60.7%

Source Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

Too few households to report.

workers in each income quintile between 1995 and 1998 discloses that there was a significant increase in the numbers of workers, particularly for households in the lower income quintile groups. Between the two survey years, the number of households in the City with no workers was reduced by 8.1 percent, or by 64,000 (Tables 3.4 and 3.5). The reduction of households with no workers in the lowest income quintile alone was 30,000, accounting for close to half of the total decrease in no-worker households in all income groups during the three years. The decrease in no-worker households in the second-lowest income group was also 30,000, another close to half of the decrease in all such households. On the other hand, the number of households with one worker in the bottom income group increased by 48.1 percent, or by 41,000, while the number of households with two workers in the same income group increased by 79.0 percent, or by 5,000. At the same time, the number of households with one worker in the secondlowest income group increased by 8.7 percent, or by 23,000, while the number of households with two workers in the same income group increased by 38.3 percent, or by 18,000. The findings of this analysis help explain that the 7.6-percent income growth spurt for the second-lowest income group during the three years, markedly higher than the growth rate of 4.2 percent for all households and the highest of any income group, and the 5.9-percent growth rate for the lowest income group, also significantly higher than the rate for all households, resulted from a significant increase in the number of households with one or two workers and a decrease in the number of households with no workers in those income groups. Judging from these findings, it is certain that the income improvement New York City residents made during the 1995-1998 period resulted from the remarkable economic growth in the City in general and the labor market growth in particular, which will be further discussed later in this chapter.

#### **Distribution of Household Incomes**

Looking at household distribution by detailed income intervals discloses that, between 1995 and 1998, the proportion of low-income households decreased, while the proportion of high-income households increased. This holds true for both renter and owner household groups. The proportion of households with incomes of less than \$30,000 decreased by 3.0 percentage points, while the proportion of households with incomes of \$70,000 or more increased by the same 3.0 percentage points (Table 3.6).

In 1998, a third of all households had incomes less than \$20,000 a year; four in ten renter households and fewer than two in ten owner households had such low incomes. Households with incomes less than \$20,000 a year could only afford \$555 a month for rent, if paying no more than a third of household income for a housing unit is used as a reasonable measure of affordability. In 1999, only units in the following four categories, the rents of which were controlled or regulated with heavy public subsidies, had median contract rents of less than \$555: rent-controlled units, "other-regulated" units, public housing units, and *in rem* units. Of all households and renter households, 32.7 percent and 34.8 percent respectively were in the \$20,000-\$49,999 income level. Of owner households, the proportion was lower: 28.0 percent. As the income level moves up, the proportion of owner households continues to expand, while the proportion of renter households shrinks. Of all households, 24.2 percent were in the income level between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The comparable figures for renter and owner households in the income level of \$100,000 or more was 10.2 percent, while the comparable proportions for renters and owners were 5.9 percent and 19.3 percent respectively (see also Figure 3.1).

	Bo	th	Ren	iters	Ow	ners
Household Income	1995	1998	1995	1998	1995	1998
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<\$5,000	7.1%	7.0%	8.8%	9.0%	3.1%	2.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 5,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 9,999	12.5%	10.4%	15.8%	13.2%	4.9%	4.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 10,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 14,999	8.5%	8.5%	9.7%	9.9%	5.8%	5.4%
<sup>\$</sup> 15,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 19,999	6.7%	7.0%	7.4%	7.7%	5.0%	5.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 20,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 29,999	13.8%	12.7%	15.4%	14.4%	10.1%	9.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 30,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 39,999	11.5%	11.1%	12.1%	11.7%	9.9%	9.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 40,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 49,999	8.7%	8.9%	8.2%	8.7%	9.8%	9.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 50,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 69,999	13.1%	13.4%	11.3%	11.9%	17.3%	16.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 70,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 99,999	9.2%	10.8%	6.3%	7.5%	16.1%	18.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 100,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 124,999	3.8%	4.7%	2.2%	2.9%	7.4%	8.4%
<sup>\$</sup> 125,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 149,999	1.8%	1.9%	1.0%	1.0%	3.7%	4.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 150,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 174,999	0.8%	1.1%	0.4%	0.7%	1.7%	2.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 175,000 and over	2.4%	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	5.0%	4.9%

# Table 3.6Distribution of Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Tenure<br/>New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.



Figure 3.1 Renter and Owner Households by Income Group New York City 1998

### Distribution of Household Incomes by HUD Income Classification

In recent years, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has required that local governments receiving HUD's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other grants prepare and submit to HUD a Consolidated Plan. In the Consolidated Plan, the local government is required to present and describe data on income, affordability, and physical housing condition to justify the housing assistance needs of low- and moderate-income households. As the Consolidated Plan definition points out, HUD adjusts the income limits for the Section 8 program based on household size and local market conditions. Given these adjustments, the income level equivalent to the four-person median family income (MFI) for the New York, NY Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) was \$53,400 for a family of four. The income limits for a family of four applied for each level effective for January 1999 were as follows:

30% of MFI	\$16,000
50% of MFI	\$26,700
80% of MFI	\$42,700
95% of MFI	\$50,750

Applying these income limits, households in different income levels are defined as follows:

- Extremely-low-income households: households with incomes at or below \$16,000, which is 30 percent of the adjusted four-person median family income, equivalent to \$53,400 in the PMSA.
- Very-low-income households: households with incomes at or below \$26,700, which is 50 percent of the adjusted four-person median family income in the area.
- Other low-income households: households with incomes between 51 and 80 percent of the four-person median family income in the area (over \$26,700 to \$42,700).
- Moderate-income households: households with incomes between 81 and 95 percent of the four person median family income in the area (over \$42,700 to \$50,750).

HUD has required not only local government agencies but also private groups to use these definitions in their applications to HUD for CDBG, Home, and other grant funds. For this reason, there has been a great demand for the presentation and analysis of HVS data on income distribution classified using the HUD income definitions. Applying these definitions, then, 36.5 percent of all households in New York City in 1998, or 1,047,000 households, were very-low-income households with incomes at or below 50 percent of the adjusted median family income for the New York, NY PMSA (Table 3.7). Of these households, 82.8 percent, or 866,000, were renter households. Of all households in the City, close to a quarter, or 655,000, were extremely-low-income households with incomes at or below 30 percent of the adjusted median family income in the area. Combining very-low-income households with other low-income households -- that is, all those with incomes at or below 80 percent of the adjusted median family income-the total number of low-income households in the City was 1,514,000, or 52.8 percent of all households in 1998. Of all these low-income households, 79.8 percent, or 1,208,000, were renter households.

In addition, 207,000 households, or 7.2 percent of all households in the City, were moderateincome households, whose incomes were between 81 and 95 percent of the adjusted median family income for the area in 1998. Of these households, 69.1 percent, or 143,000, were renter households.

#### Changes in Median Household Income by Borough

The geographical stratification of median household incomes by borough shows that the substantial improvement made in household incomes citywide was not consistent from borough to borough; it discloses, instead, substantial variations in income change between 1995 and 1998. The growth rate of household incomes in Brooklyn during the three years was the highest of any borough,

## Table 3.7 Distribution of Household Income by HUD Consolidated Plan Income Categories by Tenure New York City 1998

	Bot	h	Ren	ter	Owi	ner
Household Income	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	2,868,415	100.0%	1,953,289	100.0%	915,126	100.0%
Very Low Income (0-50% of MFI)	1,047,009	36.5	866,454	44.4	180,556	19.8
Extremely Low Income (0-30% of MFI)	655,099	22.8	567,515	29.1	87,584	9.6
Other Very Low Income (31-50% of MFI)	391,910	13.7	298,939	15.3	92,972	10.2
Other Low Income (51-80% of MFI)	467,051	16.3	341,597	17.5	125,453	13.7
Moderate Income (81-95% MFI)	206,729	7.2	142,894	7.3	63,835	7.0
Middle and Other Income (96% of MFI and over)	1,147,626	40.0	602,344	30.8	545,281	59.6

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: The median family income (MFI) for the New York, NY Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) was \$53,400 for a family of four. As Consolidated Plan definitions point out, HUD adjusts the limits for the Section 8 program based on household size and local market conditions. The income limits for a family of four for each level, effective January 1999 were as follows: 30% of median family income (MFI) \$16,000

30% of median family income (MFI)	\$16,000
50% of MFI	\$26,700
80% of MFI	\$42,700
95% of MFI	\$50,750

For further information on HUD's estimation of the area Median Family Income and Section 8 Income Limits, see *HUD Income Limits Briefing Material*, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, December 1998.

while the growth rate in Queens was the lowest. The real median income of all households in Brooklyn grew by 12.1 percent to \$28,800 in 1998, while median renter household and median owner household incomes grew by 8.4 percent, to \$23,200, and by 14.5 percent, to \$49,000, respectively (Table 3.8). The growth rate in real median income for all households in the borough was about three times the

Borough and Tenure	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995-98
All Boroughs			
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 31,680	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	+4.2%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 25,571	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	+1.7%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 51,975	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	+2.0%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>			
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 22,000	+2.8%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 17,395	<sup>\$</sup> 17,472	+0.4%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 42,811	<sup>\$</sup> 42,521	-0.7%
Brooklyn			
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 25,687	<sup>\$</sup> 28,800	+12.1%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 23,200	+8.4%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 42,811	<sup>\$</sup> 49,000	+14.5%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>			
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 37,460	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	+6.8%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 34,140	+6.3%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 80,271	<sup>\$</sup> 74,600	-7.1%
Queens			
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 37,460	\$38,000	+1.4%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 30,664	\$30,000	-2.2%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 51,374	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	-2.7%
Staten Island			
Both	<sup>\$</sup> 45,808	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	+9.2%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 29,968	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	+6.8%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 58,866	<sup>\$</sup> 64,900	+10.3%

Table 3.8 Median Household Incomes in 1998 Dollars of Renters and Owners by Borough New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

Note:

Map 3.1 Median Household Incomes New York City 1999



citywide rate of 4.2 percent, while the growth rates in renter and owner household incomes were about five and seven times, respectively, the comparable rates citywide (Map 3.1).

Household income in Staten Island, \$50,000, was the highest in 1998, as it was in 1995 (Table 3.8). During the three years, median household income in the borough increased by 9.2 percent, more than twice the citywide growth rate. Renter and owner incomes increased by 6.8 percent, to \$32,000, and by 10.3 percent, to \$64,900, respectively. Real income growth rates for renters and owners in the borough were four and five times respectively the comparable citywide growth rates.

In Manhattan, real median incomes for all households and for renter households grew more than the income of all households citywide, but the real income of owner households in the borough, unlike that of all owner households in the City, declined. In the borough, real median household incomes for all households and for renter households increased by 6.8 percent, to \$40,000, and by 6.3 percent, to \$34,100, respectively, while median owner income declined by 7.1 percent, to \$74,600 in 1998 (Table 3.8).

Unlike the substantial growths in income in Brooklyn and Staten Island, income growth in the Bronx was very marginal. The median income for all households in the borough, which was only 66.7 percent of the income of all households in the City in 1998, increased by only 2.8 percent after inflation, to \$22,000, while real incomes for renter and owner households remained virtually the same.

In Queens, the real median income for all households increased to \$38,000 in 1998, with the growth rate for the three years being only 1.4 percent, one-third that of the citywide rate (Table 3.8). In the borough, real median renter and owner household incomes decreased respectively by 2.2 percent, to \$30,000, and by 2.7 percent, to \$50,000, in 1998. Except in Queens, where the median owner household income was a little more than one-and-a-half times the median renter household income, median owner household income in each of the other boroughs was more than double that of renter households. The median income for all households were each highest in Staten Island. However, the median incomes of renter households and owner households, renter households, and owner households in the Bronx were the lowest of any of the boroughs (Figure 3.2).





## Distribution of Household Income by Borough

The distribution of household income by borough displays significant variations from borough to borough. Compared to the citywide proportion of low-income households, a disproportionately large number of households in the Bronx were low-income households. Close to half of all households in the Bronx had incomes below \$20,000, compared to a third of all households in the City (Table 3.9). At the same time, only about a fifth of all households in the borough had incomes of \$50,000 or more, with only about 3 percent of these households having incomes of \$100,000 or more. Income distribution in Brooklyn resembled approximately the distribution citywide, except that there were more households with incomes of less than \$20,000 and fewer households with incomes of more than \$50,000 in the borough (see also Figure 3.3).

In Manhattan, there were more high-income households and fewer low-income households than in the City as a whole. Close to a fifth of all households in the borough had incomes of more than \$100,000, almost twice the citywide proportion (Table 3.9). Consequently, the proportion of households in the borough with incomes below \$50,000 was smaller than the comparable citywide proportions.

Household Income	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
< <sup>\$</sup> 5,000	7.0%	11.2%	7.5%	6.2%	5.4%	3.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 5,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 9,999	10.4%	16.4%	12.0%	9.3%	7.0%	6.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 10,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 14,999	8.5%	11.3%	9.4%	7.4%	7.5%	6.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 15,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 19,999	7.0%	7.6%	7.9%	6.3%	7.1%	3.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 20,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 29,999	12.7%	14.5%	14.1%	10.6%	12.8%	9.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 30,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 39,999	11.1%	11.8%	12.1%	8.8%	12.0%	10.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 40,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 49,999	8.9%	8.6%	8.8%	8.7%	9.4%	8.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 50,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 69,999	13.4%	9.6%	12.2%	12.7%	16.5%	18.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 70,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 99,999	10.8%	6.2%	9.1%	10.8%	14.0%	17.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 100,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 124,999	4.7%	1.7%	3.7%	6.8%	4.8%	7.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 125,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 149,999	1.9%	0.7%	1.5%	2.8%	1.9%	3.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 150,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 174,999	1.1%	*	0.7%	2.2%	1.0%	1.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 175,000 and over	2.5%	*	1.1%	7.3%	0.7%	2.3%

Table 3.9
Distribution of Household Income by Borough
New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Too few households to report.

Figure 3.3 Percent Distribution of Household Income Categories by Borough New York City 1998



In Queens, there were more moderate- and middle-income households and fewer high- and low-income households. Three in ten households in the borough had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999, while the proportions of households with incomes below \$20,000 and households with incomes over \$100,000 were smaller in comparison to citywide proportions. In Staten Island, there were more middle- and high-income households: only a fifth of households in the borough had incomes of less than \$20,000, while more than a third had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The proportion of households with incomes over \$100,000 was 15.4 percent in Staten Island, higher than the comparable proportion citywide but lower than in Manhattan.

# Median Household Incomes by Rent-Regulation Status

Findings of the analysis of median household income by rent-regulation status have been the most widely used. The overall real median household income for all renters in the City as a whole increased by only 1.7 percent during the three years between 1995 and 1998 (Table 3.10). However, the real median income of households in unregulated rental units increased substantially by \$3,200, or by 10.1 percent, to \$35,400. The incomes of households in the two sub-categories of unregulated rental units--that is, units in rental buildings and units in cooperative or condominium buildings--showed different increases: a 9.0-percent increase, to \$35,000, for those in rental buildings and a 6.6-percent

increase, to \$49,000, for those in cooperatives or condominiums. During the same three-year period, the real median income of households in rent-controlled units, which was only 65.4 percent of the overall median renter household income of \$26,000 in 1998, increased significantly by \$2,600, or by 18.3 percent, to \$17,000. At the same time, the real median income of households in *in rem* units, which was still extremely low and only 44.1 percent of the overall median renter household income, increased substantially by \$2,500, or by 27.7 percent, to \$11,500.

Contrarily to these significant income improvements for households in unregulated, rentcontrolled, and *in rem* units, the real incomes of households in other rent-regulated categories--such as Mitchell-Lama, "other-regulated," and public housing units--changed unappreciably between 1995 and 1998. The median income of households in Mitchell-Lama units was \$21,500, or 82.5 percent of the median renter household income of \$26,000 (Table 3.10). Median incomes of households in "otherregulated" and public housing units were very low, \$10,200 and \$9,700 respectively, a mere 39.2 and 37.3 percent of the median income of all renter households.

The real median income of households in rent-stabilized units as a whole and in those buildings built before 1947 remained virtually unchanged from 1995 to 1998. In 1998, the median income of households in rent-stabilized units was \$27,000, slightly higher than that of \$26,000 for all renter households (Table 3.10). Of households in rent-stabilized units, the median income of those in buildings built before 1947 was only \$25,600. On the other hand, the real median income of those in buildings

	INCW IOIR City	1775 and 1778	
Regulatory Status	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995-98
All Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 25,571	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	+1.7%
Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 14,372	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000	+18.3%
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 27,132	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	-0.5%
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 25,687	<sup>\$</sup> 25,600	-0.3%
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 32,644	<sup>\$</sup> 30,400	-6.9%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 21,454	+0.2%
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 9,847	<sup>\$</sup> 10,200	+3.6%
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	\$35,350	+10.1%
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	\$35,000	+9.0%
In Coops/Condos	<sup>\$</sup> 46,022	<sup>\$</sup> 49,080	+6.6%
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 9,633	<sup>\$</sup> 9,704	+0.7%
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 8,990	<sup>\$</sup> 11,478	+27.7%

Table 3.10
Median Renter Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Regulatory Status
New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

built in or after 1947 decreased by 6.9 percent to \$30,400, which was still substantially higher than the median income of both all rent-stabilized households and all renter households.

In general, the reasons for household income changes are two: first, incomes of the same households increased or decreased between 1995 and 1998; and, second, lower-income households moved out and higher income households moved in, or vice versa. Thus, a review of household income differences in two separate groups--housing units whose households in 1998 were the same as they were in 1995, and housing units whose households in 1998 were different from those occupying the units in 1995--adds to our understanding of how median household incomes of different rental categories in the City changed, which a review of the overall median incomes of all households alone obscures. In other words, longitudinal data covering the same housing units in the 1996 and 1999 HVSs can help us answer the following questions: are the higher median incomes of renter households in 1998 than in 1995 a result of actual rising incomes of occupants who stayed in the same unit from 1995 through 1998, or are they a reflection of the replacement of lower-income renter households by higher-income renter households upon turnover of the units?

With replacement households' 27.3-percent higher income than staying-in-place households and with 34.5 percent of all units being turned over, the real median household income of all renter households in the City increased by 1.7 percent (Tables 3.10, 3.11, and 3.12). The 1998 median income of replacement households in unregulated rental units was only 5.7 percent higher than that of households in such units that did not turn over, while 45.1 percent of such units turned over during the three-year period between 1995 and 1998. During the three years, the real median income of households in unregulated rental units increased by 10.1 percent.

The 1998 median income of replacement households in rent-stabilized units was 14.0 percent higher than the income of households in such units that did not turn over. Meanwhile, 34.9 percent of such units turned over, almost the same as the overall proportion of turned-over units in the three years between 1995 and 1998 (Tables 3.10, 3.11, and 3.12). During the same three years, the real median income of households in rent-stabilized units remained virtually constant. The 1998 median household income of replacement households in Mitchell-Lama rental was 40.0 percent higher than the income of households in such units that did not turn over, while 31.6 percent of such units turned over from 1996 to 1999. During the same period, the real median income of Mitchell-Lama renter households overall did not change appreciably.

Unlike the large increases in median incomes of replacement households in such turned-over units, particularly in Mitchell-Lama units, the median income of replacement households in *in rem* units was only 2.8 percent higher than that of households that stayed in place, while only 18.8 percent of such units turned over (Tables 3.11 and 3.12). Therefore, the outpacing 27.7-percent increase in *in rem* household real income should be mostly the result of the actual increase in the incomes of such households. The proportion of *in rem* households whose income was higher than \$10,000 increased by 8.4 percentage points, from 46.5 percent in 1996 to 54.9 percent in 1999. This was mostly the result of an increase in the number of workers in such households. During the same three-year period, the proportion of *in rem* households with one or more workers increased by 6.7 percentage points, and households with two or more workers increased by 4.8 percentage points.<sup>5</sup>

Table 3.11
Median 1998 Incomes by Rent Regulatory Status
and Unit Turnover between 1996 and 1999
Longitudinal Units New York City 1999

	Median 19		
Regulatory Status	egulatory Status No Turnover 96-99		Percent Difference
All	<sup>\$</sup> 22,825	<sup>\$</sup> 29,050	+27.3%
Public	<sup>\$</sup> 9,672	<sup>\$</sup> 9,360	-3.2%
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 11,478	<sup>\$</sup> 11,800*	+2.8%
Mitchell Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	+40.0%
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 11,612	<sup>\$</sup> 8,172	-29.6%
Rent Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 16,800		
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 25,800	<sup>\$</sup> 29,400	+14.0%
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 27,558	+10.2%
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 34,000	+13.3%
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	<sup>\$</sup> 37,000	+5.7%
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 34,780	<sup>\$</sup> 36,000	+3.5%
In Coops/Condos	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	+11.1%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Data for linked units remaining in same regulatory status between surveys only.

Note: \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

The income of replacement households in public housing units was slightly lower than that of households that stayed in place, and only 21.6 percent of such units were turned over. As a result, the real income of households in public housing units did not change appreciably. The median income of replacement households in "other-regulated" units--which includes units in programs such as Section 8 and Article 4 as well as loft units--was 29.6 percent lower than that of households that stayed in place; and only 27.5 percent of such units were turned over (Tables 3.11 and 3.12). As a result, the real median income of households in such units increased marginally by only 3.6 percent.

Table 3.12
Vacancy Rate by Rent Regulatory Status and Unit Turnover Between 1996 and 1999
Longitudinal Units, New York City 1999

Regulatory Status	Vacancy Rate	Turned Over 1996-1999
All	3.19%	34.5%
Public	1.92%	21.6%
In Rem	8.00%*	18.8%*
Mitchell Lama	4.04%	31.6%
Other Regulated	2.02%*	27.5%
Rent Controlled	-	
Stabilized	2.46%	34.9%
Pre-1947	2.61%	35.6%
Post-1947	2.06%	33.2%
Unregulated	4.98%	45.1%
In Rental Buildings	3.79%	44.9%
In Coops/Condos	13.25%	47.7%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Turnover data for linked units remaining in same regulatory status between surveys only.

Note: \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

The above analysis confirms that the turn-over of units is a unique source of household income change in each rental category, reflecting the income and related characteristics of replacement households and the changes in those characteristics for households that remained in their units during the three-year period.

The analysis of the difference between changes in real median incomes of households in units that did not turn over and changes in real incomes of households in units that did turn over between 1996 and 1999 for different rental categories provides additional insights into the dynamics of household income sources that are uniquely different for each rental category. Between 1995 and 1998, the real median income of households in rent-stabilized units that did not turn over changed little, while that of

Table 3.13
Percentage Change in Real Median Incomes between 1995 and 1998
by Rent Regulatory Status and Unit Turnover
Longitudinal Units New York City 1998

		No Turnover		Turnover			
	Median Income		Percent Change	Median Income		Percent Change	
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	1995	1998		1995 <sup>a</sup>	1998		
All	<sup>\$</sup> 22,476	<sup>\$</sup> 22,825	+1.6%	<sup>\$</sup> 27,827	<sup>\$</sup> 29,050	+4.4%	
Public	<sup>\$</sup> 9,311	<sup>\$</sup> 9,672	+3.9%	<sup>\$</sup> 11,110	<sup>\$</sup> 9,360	-15.8%	
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 9,418	<sup>\$</sup> 11,478	+21.9%	<sup>\$</sup> 8,930*	<sup>\$</sup> 11,800*	+32.1%	
Mitchell Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 19,265	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	+3.8%	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	+30.8%	
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 9,979	<sup>\$</sup> 11,612	+16.4%	\$8,562	\$8,172	-4.6%	
Rent Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 16,970	<sup>\$</sup> 16,800	-1.0%				
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 25,901	<sup>\$</sup> 25,800	-0.4%	<sup>\$</sup> 28,898	<sup>\$</sup> 29,400	+1.7%	
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 24,081	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	+3.8%	<sup>\$</sup> 26,757	<sup>\$</sup> 27,558	+3.0%	
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 31,135	\$30,000	-3.6%	<sup>\$</sup> 37,460	<sup>\$</sup> 34,000	-9.2%	
Unregulated	\$32,109	\$35,000	+9.0%	<sup>\$</sup> 35,319	<sup>\$</sup> 37,000	+4.8%	
In Coops/Condos	<sup>\$</sup> 47,610	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000	-5.5%	<sup>\$</sup> 58,437	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	-14.4%	
In Rental/Buildings	\$30,798	<sup>\$</sup> 34,780	+12.9%	\$33,132	<sup>\$</sup> 36,000	+8.7%	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Data for linked units remaining in same regulatory status between surveys only.

Notes: a Median incomes of previous occupant households in 1995, adjusted for inflation.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

replacement households in this rental category increased by 1.7 percent over the income of the previous households in 1995 (Table 3.13). On the other hand, the real median income of households that stayed in place in unregulated rental units increased by 9.0 percent, while that of replacement households increased by 4.8 percent over the previous households' 1995 income. However, the income changes for households that stayed in place and for replacement households during the three-year period for households in unregulated rental units in rental buildings and households in cooperative/condominium buildings were disparate. The real median income of households that stayed in such units in rental buildings increased by 12.9 percent, while that of replacement households in such units increased by 8.7 percent; but the real income of households that stayed in place in unregulated rental units in cooperative/condominium buildings decreased by 5.5 percent, while that of replacement households in such units in such units in such units decreased by 14.4 percent.

In Mitchell-Lama units, the real income of households that stayed in place increased by only 3.8 percent, but that of replacement households increased by 30.8 percent over the income of the previous occupants in 1995 (Table 3.13). The difference between the two household income changes can largely be explained by the following. First, among Mitchell-Lama households, replacement householders were relatively younger than householders who stayed in place. Only 21.2 percent of replacement householders were 62 years old or older, while 36.2 percent of householders who stayed in place were. Second, one-third of replacement householders had completed at least college, while a quarter of householders who stayed in place had. Third, three-quarters of replacement households had one or more workers in the household, compared to six in ten for households that stayed in place.<sup>6</sup> In other words, replacement householders were younger, better educated, and more of their households had one or more workers and, thus, higher incomes, compared to households that stayed in place.

In *in rem* units, the incomes of in-place and replacement households each increased, by 21.9 and 32.1 percent respectively. However, in public housing units, incomes of households that stayed in place increased by 3.9 percent, while incomes of replacement households declined by 15.8 percent. At the same time, in "other-regulated" units, the median income of in-place households increased by 16.4 percent, while that of replacement households declined by 4.6 percent.

### Distribution of Household Income by Rent-Regulation Status

Turning to an the analysis of household distribution by rent-regulation status, we see that the distribution of median income of households in rent-stabilized units closely mirrored the distribution of that of households in all rental units in the City, mainly because more than half of all rental units in the City were rent-stabilized in 1999 (Table 3.14). Almost four in ten households in rent-stabilized units had incomes below \$20,000 in 1998, while 36.3 percent had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999. Another fifth had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999, while the remaining 5.8 percent had incomes of \$100,000 or more.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

As the earlier discussion of the high median income of households in unregulated rental units suggests, of households in such units, more had higher incomes and fewer had lower incomes compared to households in other rental categories. Of households in unregulated rental units, fewer than three in ten had incomes below \$20,000, while about four in ten had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999 (Table 3.14). At the same time, a quarter had incomes between \$50,000 and \$99,999. The remaining almost one in ten had incomes of \$100,000 or more,

Of households in rent-controlled units, almost six in ten had incomes below \$20,000, while a quarter had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999 (Table 3.14). Putting it another way, most rent-controlled units housed low-income households. The distribution of income shows clearly that public housing, "other-regulated," and *in rem* units really served the poor, who needed them, the most. Of households in public housing units, half had incomes below \$10,000, while another little more than a fifth had incomes between \$10,000 and \$19,999. Most of the remainder had incomes between \$20,000 and \$49,999. The income distribution of "other-regulated" units and *in rem* units resembled that of public housing units, except that almost no *in rem* households had incomes of \$40,000 or more.

Table 3.14	
Distribution of Renter Household Income within Regulato	ry Status
New York City 1998	

				Stabilized		M-L			Other	Un-
	All	Public	Both	Pre-47	Post-47	Rental	Controlled	In Rem	Regulated	regulated
Number	1,953,289	169,339	1,020,588	749,010	271,578	67,146	52,562	15,253	55,539	572,862
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<\$5,000	9.0%	17.1%	8.6%	9.2%	7.0%	8.8%	9.1%	18.9%	15.7%	6.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 5,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 9,999	13.2%	33.8%	11.8%	12.5%	9.8%	13.6%	19.0%	26.2%	33.5%	6.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 10,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 14,999	9.9%	15.2%	9.4%	9.8%	8.3%	14.1%	17.6%	13.4%	15.3%	7.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 15,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 19,999	7.7%	6.6%	8.2%	8.1%	8.6%	10.3%	12.7%	8.0%*	6.3%	6.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 20,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 29,999	14.4%	13.1%	15.1%	15.6%	13.6%	16.1%	11.1%	13.2%	10.3%	14.1%
\$30,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 39,999	11.7%	7.1%	12.0%	11.7%	12.8%	10.7%	8.9%	7.6%*	8.0%	13.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 40,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 49,999	8.7%	2.9%	9.2%	9.5%	8.6%	7.5%	5.6%	**	2.6%*	10.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 50,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 69,999	11.9%	2.6%	12.0%	11.3%	13.9%	11.4%	7.3%	**	3.9%	15.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 70,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 99,999	7.5%	1.4%	7.8%	7.2%	9.5%	3.5%	3.6%*	**	2.9%*	10.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 100,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 124,999	2.9%	**	2.9%	2.4%	4.3%	2.6%*	2.6%*	**	**	4.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 125,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 149,999	1.0%	**	0.9%	0.9%	1.2%	**	2.1%*	**	**	1.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 150,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 174,999	0.7%	**	0.9%	0.7%	1.2%	**	**	**	**	0.8%
\$175,000 and over	1.3%	**	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	**	**	**	**	2.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Notes:

#### Median Household Income by Race and Ethnicity

During the three years from 1995 to 1998, the median real income of all households increased by 4.2 percent to \$33,000. However, the change in income varies from one racial and ethnic group to another. In the three years, the real median income for whites--who made great improvements in their educational attainment, particularly in terms of college graduates and more education, as discussed in Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households"--increased substantially by 10.1 percent to \$43,000 in 1998 (Table 3.15). Their income remained the highest among the major racial and ethnic groups, as in 1995. The real income of Puerto Rican households soared by 14.1 percent to \$20,800. This was a back-to-back outpacing increase by more than 10.0 percent for this group. Between 1992 and 1995, their real income surged by 12.5 percent.7 But despite this growth spurt, their median income was still the lowest of any racial and ethnic group, only 63.0 percent of the income of all households in 1998. The real income of black households also increased substantially, by 7.6 percent to \$28,000, considerably higher than the rate for all households in the City. On the other hand, the income growth rate for Asian households lagged behind that for all households, with a mere 2.4 percent increase to \$40,000. In 1995, their income was equal to that of whites and was the highest of any racial and ethnic group; but, with a slower growth rate in the following three years, their income in 1998 fell to second highest after whites. The median real income of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics decreased by 4.3 percent to \$24,000 (Figure 3.4).

Race/Ethnicity	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995- 98
All	<sup>\$</sup> 31,680	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	+4.2%
White	<sup>\$</sup> 39,065	<sup>\$</sup> 43,000	+10.1%
Black/African American	<sup>\$</sup> 26,021	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	+7.6%
Puerto Rican	<sup>\$</sup> 18,225	<sup>\$</sup> 20,800	+14.1%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	<sup>\$</sup> 25,070	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	-4.3%
Asian	<sup>\$</sup> 39,065	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	+2.4%
Native American	<sup>\$</sup> 24,617	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	+5.6%

Table 3.15 Median Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

<sup>7</sup> Moon Wha Lee, Housing New York City, 1996, page 128.

Figure 3.4 Distribution of Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1995 and 1998



The median real income of renter households also increased between 1995 and 1998, albeit by a mere 1.7 percent. However, the level of real increase for each racial and ethnic renter group was not uniformly consistent with that for all renter households. As for all households, the median real income of white renter households climbed tremendously by 12.1 percent to \$36,000 in 1998 (Table 3.16). At the same time, the real income of Puerto Rican renter households also increased substantially, by 8.7 percent to \$17,000. However, their income was still the lowest among the major racial and ethnic renter households, only 65.4 percent of the income of all renter households. The real income of black renter households also improved, by 2.0 percent to \$21,800. Contrarily to these income improvements for white, Puerto Rican, and black households, the real income of Asian renter households, \$32,000, did not change meaningfully from three years earlier, while that of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics dropped by 5.0 percent to \$21,800.

Race/Ethnicity	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995-98
All	<sup>\$</sup> 25,571	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	+1.7%
White	\$32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 36,000	+12.1%
Black/African American	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 21,840	+2.0%
Puerto Rican	<sup>\$</sup> 15,643	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000	+8.7%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	<sup>\$</sup> 22,990	<sup>\$</sup> 21,840	-5.0%
Asian	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	-0.3%
Native American	<sup>\$</sup> 20,335	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	-1.6%

Table 3.16Median Renter Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity<br/>New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

From 1995 to 1998, the real median income of owner households as a whole grew by 2.0 percent to \$53,000. As was the case for all households as well as renter households, the racial and ethnic groups of owners differed in their income changes (Table 3.17). As for all and renter households, the real median income of Puerto Rican owner households surged by 13.9 percent to \$54,800, outpacing the median income of \$53,000 for all owner households and almost reaching the median income level of white owner households, \$55,000, the highest of any major racial and ethnic group. The real median income of black owner households also climbed substantially, by 6.5 percent to \$49,000, while the real income of white owner households increased only by 2.8 percent. However, the real median income of Asian owner households plummeted by 5.1 percent to \$57,000, although their income was still the highest among the major racial and ethnic groups of owners in 1998. As for all and non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renter households, the real income of this racial/ethnic group's owner households dropped significantly by 4.5 percent to \$46,000.

#### Household Income by Household Size

The relationship between household size and household income level changes little over time. Judging from the distribution of median household income by household size for each racial and ethnic group, it can be stated that, in general, the larger the household, the higher the median household income. The general pattern of this relationship was maintained in 1998. The median income of all households rose continuously, up to households of five; but it was no higher for households of six or more persons than it was for households of five (Table 3.18). This general pattern was maintained for each racial and ethnic group, with minor inconsistencies among very large households of five or six or more persons, as observed for all households. A similar relationship emerged from the distributions for both renter and owner households (Tables 3.19 and 3.20). The primary reason for this relationship is that, in general, the larger the household size, the more workers in the household; the more workers in a household, the higher the household income. This relationship will be discussed further in the following sections.

Race/Ethnicity	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995-98
All	<sup>\$</sup> 51,975	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	+2.0%
White	<sup>\$</sup> 53,514	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000	+2.8%
Black/African American	<sup>\$</sup> 46,022	<sup>\$</sup> 49,000	+6.5%
Puerto Rican	<sup>\$</sup> 48,163	<sup>\$</sup> 54,840	+13.9%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	<sup>\$</sup> 48,163	<sup>\$</sup> 46,000	-4.5%
Asian	<sup>\$</sup> 60,043	<sup>\$</sup> 57,000	-5.1%
Native American	<sup>\$</sup> 53,835	<sup>\$</sup> 60,000	+11.5%

Table 3.17Median Owner Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Race/Ethnicity<br/>New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

# Table 3.18Median Household Income by Household Size and by Race/Ethnicity<br/>New York City 1998

	Race/Ethnicity						
Number of Persons	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	<sup>\$</sup> 43,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,800	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000
One	<sup>\$</sup> 21,000	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	<sup>\$</sup> 16,000	<sup>\$</sup> 10,000	<sup>\$</sup> 14,235	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 15,960
Two	<sup>\$</sup> 38,000	<sup>\$</sup> 50,800	\$30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 26,400	<sup>\$</sup> 42,060	<sup>\$</sup> 35,400
Three	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 65,600	<sup>\$</sup> 36,000	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,533	<sup>\$</sup> 51,600*
Four	<sup>\$</sup> 42,521	<sup>\$</sup> 70,000	<sup>\$</sup> 39,040	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 23,440	<sup>\$</sup> 48,000	**
Five	<sup>\$</sup> 44,000	<sup>\$</sup> 63,500	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000	<sup>\$</sup> 29,050	<sup>\$</sup> 32,640	<sup>\$</sup> 42,000	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000*
Six or More	<sup>\$</sup> 41,200	\$57,000	<sup>\$</sup> 44,616	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,480	<sup>\$</sup> 54,000	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report

# Table 3.19

# Median Renter Household Income by Household Size and by Race/Ethnicity

				Race/Ethnicit	ţ		
Number of Persons	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 36,000	<sup>\$</sup> 21,840	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000	<sup>\$</sup> 21,840	\$32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000
One	<sup>\$</sup> 18,300	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 14,880	<sup>\$</sup> 9,156	<sup>\$</sup> 12,864	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000
Two	<sup>\$</sup> 31,000	<sup>\$</sup> 49,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,964	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	<sup>\$</sup> 36,400	<sup>\$</sup> 16,671*
Three	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 53,800	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 22,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	**
Four	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 52,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	<sup>\$</sup> 22,000	<sup>\$</sup> 39,000	**
Five	<sup>\$</sup> 30,600	<sup>\$</sup> 42,000	\$30,654	<sup>\$</sup> 20,800	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	\$30,000*
Six or More	\$30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 23,200	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 39,000	**

New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

				2			
	Race/Ethnicity						
Number of Persons	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000	<sup>\$</sup> 49,000	<sup>\$</sup> 54,840	<sup>\$</sup> 46,000	<sup>\$</sup> 57,000	<sup>\$</sup> 60,000
One	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	<sup>\$</sup> 29,454	<sup>\$</sup> 23,454	<sup>\$</sup> 23,904	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 15,960*
Two	<sup>\$</sup> 50,800	<sup>\$</sup> 54,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000	<sup>\$</sup> 49,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000	<sup>\$</sup> 51,560	<sup>\$</sup> 66,000*
Three	<sup>\$</sup> 70,000	<sup>\$</sup> 80,000	<sup>\$</sup> 59,000	<sup>\$</sup> 63,000	<sup>\$</sup> 63,000	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000	**
Four	<sup>\$</sup> 72,000	<sup>\$</sup> 82,450	<sup>\$</sup> 64,000	<sup>\$</sup> 70,000	<sup>\$</sup> 42,521	<sup>\$</sup> 68,000	**
Five	<sup>\$</sup> 77,000	<sup>\$</sup> 80,000	<sup>\$</sup> 79,000	<sup>\$</sup> 62,000	<sup>\$</sup> 71,500	<sup>\$</sup> 61,000	**
Six or More	<sup>\$</sup> 80,000	<sup>\$</sup> 87,000	<sup>\$</sup> 81,000	<sup>\$</sup> 83,000	<sup>\$</sup> 64,404	<sup>\$</sup> 68,400	**

# Table 3.20 Median Owner Household Income by Household Size and by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

### Household Income by Number of Employed Persons

The earlier analysis of households distributed into income quintiles by the number of workers in the household suggests that households with a larger number of employed persons have higher incomes. However, this general relationship does not hold true across the board for each racial and ethnic group. The average number of employed persons for Asian households was 1.54, the highest of any racial and ethnic group, followed by 1.42 for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic, 1.18 for black, and 0.99 for Puerto Rican households (Table 3.21). But the median income of Asian households was \$40,000, the second-highest after that of white households, \$43,000; and the incomes of other racial and ethnic groups were not distributed in accordance with the rank-order of the average number of employed persons in their households. For example, although the average number of employed persons for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was much higher than that for black households, their income was lower. Thus, there must be additional determinants of household income, and this can be deduced from the following analysis.

In 1998, the median income of white households with three or more employed persons was \$102,000, the highest of any racial or ethnic group with the same number of employed persons, followed by \$79,200 for black, \$77,400 for Puerto Rican, \$75,000 for Asian, and \$49,400 for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households (Table 3.21). The different income levels for each racial and ethnic household

Notes:

# Table 3.21 Mean Number of Employed Persons in Household and Median Household Income by Number of Employed Persons in Household, by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998

	Number of Employed Persons in Household					
Race/Ethnicity	Mean	All	0	1	2	3+
All	1.18	\$33,000	<sup>\$</sup> 9,080	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 61,960	<sup>\$</sup> 76,240
White	1.09	<sup>\$</sup> 43,000	<sup>\$</sup> 12,204	<sup>\$</sup> 43,773	<sup>\$</sup> 80,000	<sup>\$</sup> 102,000
Black/African American	1.18	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 7,368	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	<sup>\$</sup> 79,200
Puerto Rican	0.99	<sup>\$</sup> 20,800	<sup>\$</sup> 7,044	<sup>\$</sup> 24,500	<sup>\$</sup> 51,000	<sup>\$</sup> 77,436
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	1.42	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	<sup>\$</sup> 7,027	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,090	<sup>\$</sup> 49,400
Asian	1.54	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 7,176	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 60,000	<sup>\$</sup> 75,000
Native American	1.08	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 6,712	<sup>\$</sup> 29,000	<sup>\$</sup> 51,600	*

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

Too few households to report.

group with the same number of employed persons mean that the reason why the household income of a particular racial or ethnic group--for example, white households--was higher than that of another--for example, Puerto Rican households--was that the average amount of earnings of each employed person in white households was higher than that of each employed person in Puerto Rican households. Specifically, judging from the level of income of households with three or more employed persons, the amount of earnings of each employed person in white households appears to be the highest, followed by that of each employed person in black, Puerto Rican, Asian, and non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households.

The findings of the analysis of the relationship between the level of renter household income and the number of employed persons in renter households are mirrored approximately in the findings for all households as well as for owner households, with the following exceptions that deserve to be noted. The median income of Puerto Rican renter households with three or more employed persons was considerably higher than that of black renter households with the same number of employed persons (Table 3.22). The distribution for owner households shows that, while the average number of employed persons in Puerto Rican households was about the same as that in black households, the median income of Puerto Rican owner households was considerably higher than that of black owner households (Table 3.23). Moreover, the median income of Puerto Rican owner households with three of more employed persons was higher than that of any other major racial and ethnic group with the same number of employed persons, except for white households.

# Table 3.22 Mean Number of Employed Persons in Renter Household and Median Renter Household Income by Number of Employed Persons in Household, by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998

	Number of Employed Persons in Renter Household					
Race/Ethnicity	Mean	All	0	1	2	3+
All	1.12	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 7,300	<sup>\$</sup> 27,850	<sup>\$</sup> 51,415	<sup>\$</sup> 58,306
White	1.06	<sup>\$</sup> 36,000	<sup>\$</sup> 9,800	<sup>\$</sup> 39,000	<sup>\$</sup> 68,000	<sup>\$</sup> 83,650
Black/African American	1.06	<sup>\$</sup> 21,840	<sup>\$</sup> 6,960	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,800	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000
Puerto Rican	0.90	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000	<sup>\$</sup> 7,008	<sup>\$</sup> 22,000	<sup>\$</sup> 44,276	<sup>\$</sup> 63,000
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	1.40	<sup>\$</sup> 21,840	<sup>\$</sup> 7,000	<sup>\$</sup> 19,000	<sup>\$</sup> 32,540	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000
Asian	1.43	\$32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 5,400	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	<sup>\$</sup> 62,400
Native American	0.96	\$20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 6,000	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	\$37,500*	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

# Table 3.23

# Mean Number of Employed Persons in Owner Household and Median Owner Household Income by Number of Employed Persons in Household, by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998

	Number of Employed Persons in Owner Household					
Race/Ethnicity	Mean	All	0	1	2	3+
All	1.30	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	<sup>\$</sup> 16,218	<sup>\$</sup> 47,000	<sup>\$</sup> 81,000	<sup>\$</sup> 99,280
White	1.14	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000	<sup>\$</sup> 16,932	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	<sup>\$</sup> 96,000	<sup>\$</sup> 117,000
Black/African American	1.50	<sup>\$</sup> 49,000	<sup>\$</sup> 16,200	<sup>\$</sup> 39,000	<sup>\$</sup> 65,000	<sup>\$</sup> 94,000
Puerto Rican	1.52	<sup>\$</sup> 54,840	<sup>\$</sup> 11,964	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 68,700	<sup>\$</sup> 99,280
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	1.56	<sup>\$</sup> 46,000	<sup>\$</sup> 14,000	<sup>\$</sup> 39,000	<sup>\$</sup> 63,000	<sup>\$</sup> 91,000
Asian	1.72	<sup>\$</sup> 57,000	<sup>\$</sup> 15,050	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 73,000	<sup>\$</sup> 90,400
Native American	1.37	<sup>\$</sup> 60,000	**	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000*	<sup>\$</sup> 95,000*	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Notes:

#### Individual Incomes by Race and Ethnicity, Educational Attainment, and Employment

The above analysis of the relationship between household income level and the number of employed persons suggests the potentially important relationship between household income level and individual earnings capability. In the following, educational attainment, as a critical determinant of individual earning capability, will be discussed to provide additional insight into an unde6rstanding of the differentiated income levels for various racial and ethnic groups.

In 1995, the median income of Asian households was equal to that of white households, the highest of any racial and ethnic groups (Table 3.15). Three years later in 1998, although Asian households' income was no longer equal to that of whites, which remained the highest, it was still very close to it. However, of individuals 18 years old or older who had full-time jobs in 1998--that is, individuals who worked 35 or more hours a week for 50 or more weeks in the preceding year--the median income of Asians was \$30,000, only 69.8 percent of the comparable white income of \$43,000 (Table 3.24). On the other hand, the mean number of employed persons in Asian households was 1.54, higher than that of any other major racial and ethnic group, including whites, whose mean number of employed persons was only 1.09. From this, it is reasonable to conclude that the high median income of Asian households.

The median income of Puerto Rican households was the lowest of any racial and ethnic group (Table 3.15). However, the median income of Puerto Rican individuals was not the lowest, and the level of difference between their income and the incomes of other racial and ethnic individuals--particularly blacks, whose average household size and average number of employed persons were not markedly larger than that of Puerto Ricans--decreased to a much smaller level (Table 3.24). Thus, it is logical to say that their smaller average number of employed persons--0.99, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group--contributed mostly to the lower income of Puerto Rican households.

Further analytic review of the median income of fully employed individuals sheds more light on the causes of income differentiation among each racial and ethnic group. Of individuals who had fulltime jobs, the median income of Puerto Ricans was \$27,697, only 64.4 percent that of whites (Table 3.24). However, the median income of Puerto Rican individuals who had completed at least college and had full-time jobs was \$35,000, or 74.5 percent that of whites with the same level of education and the same as that of blacks with a similar education. Furthermore, among individuals who had gone to graduate school and had full-time jobs, the median income of Puerto Rican individuals was higher than that of black individuals and 81.8 percent that of whites. The distribution of median incomes by the level of educational attainment and by race/ethnicity for renters mirrors the relationship displayed for all individuals (Table 3.25). The distribution for owners shows that, of owners who had full-time jobs, the median income of Puerto Ricans was the second highest after whites (Table 3.26). Furthermore, of individuals who had completed graduate school and had full-time jobs, the median income of Puerto Ricans was higher than that of either blacks or Asians, and was 84.6 percent that of whites. In short, the number of employed persons and the level of their educational attainment are key determinants of the level of household income.

# Table 3.24Median Individual Income of Persons Aged 18 Years or OverWho Worked 50 or More Weeks Last Year, 35 or More Hours per Weekby Race/Ethnicity and by Educational AttainmentNew York City 1998

	Educational Attainment					
	All	Less Than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	College Graduate	17 Years or More
All	\$32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 17,208	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	\$30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000
White	<sup>\$</sup> 43,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 34,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 47,000	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000
Black/African American	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 21,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 29,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	\$39,000
Puerto Rican	<sup>\$</sup> 27,697	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	\$30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	<sup>\$</sup> 19,240	<sup>\$</sup> 13,000	<sup>\$</sup> 18,000	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 36,080
Asian	\$30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 16,640	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 29,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000
Native American	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	*	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	\$33,015	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	*

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

Too few households to report.

# Median Individual Income of Persons Aged 18 Years or Over Who Worked 50 or More Weeks Last Year, 35 or More Hours per Week in Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity and by Educational Attainment New York City 1998

	<b>Educational Attainment</b>					
-Race/Ethnicity	All	Less Than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	College Graduate	17 Years or More
All	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 15,600	<sup>\$</sup> 22,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	\$37,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000
White	<sup>\$</sup> 39,500	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	\$35,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000
Black/African American	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 19,500	<sup>\$</sup> 21,000	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	\$32,000	\$33,000
Puerto Rican	<sup>\$</sup> 24,940	<sup>\$</sup> 19,000	<sup>\$</sup> 23,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 31,000	\$37,000
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	<sup>\$</sup> 18,000	<sup>\$</sup> 13,000	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000	<sup>\$</sup> 24,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000
Asian	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	<sup>\$</sup> 15,600	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 38,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000
Native American	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	**	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000*	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000*	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the number of persons is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few persons to report.

Notes:

#### Table 3.26

# Median Individual Income of Persons Aged 18 Years or Over Who Worked 50 or More Weeks Last Year, 35 or More Hours per Week in Owner Households by Race/Ethnicity and by Educational Attainment New York City 1998

		Educational Attainment				
– Race/Ethnicity	All	Less Than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	College Graduate	17 Years or More
All	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	<sup>\$</sup> 31,200	<sup>\$</sup> 38,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,280	<sup>\$</sup> 60,000
White	<sup>\$</sup> 50,000	<sup>\$</sup> 37,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 46,000	<sup>\$</sup> 53,000	<sup>\$</sup> 65,000
Black/African American	<sup>\$</sup> 32,500	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,500	<sup>\$</sup> 47,000
Puerto Rican	<sup>\$</sup> 37,000	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 55,000
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000	<sup>\$</sup> 22,000	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 48,000
Asian	<sup>\$</sup> 34,200	<sup>\$</sup> 20,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,000	<sup>\$</sup> 31,000	<sup>\$</sup> 40,000	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000
Native American	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	**	**	\$35,000*	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000*	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note:

\* Since the number of persons is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few persons to report.

#### Household Income by Household Types

The median income of adult households was \$55,500 in 1998, the highest of any household type, as in 1995 (Table 3.27). Their income increased by 8.0 percent overall, while their renter income increased by 5.8 percent to \$45,300, and their owner income inched up by 1.0 percent to \$75,000. The median income of adult households with minor children, the number of which grew tremendously by 60,000 during the three-year period,<sup>8</sup> increased by 3.7 percent to \$43,600 overall, while their owner income improved by 8.3 percent to \$73,000, and their renter income, which was \$32,200 in 1998, did not change appreciably. At the same time, the median income of single-adult-with-minor-children households, the number of which declined during the same three years,<sup>9</sup> soared by 18.7 percent to \$12,200, although this was still extremely low and only 37.0 percent of the median household income of all households in 1998. Both owner and renter income of single-adult-with-minor-children households in the same time, the \$10,000 respectively. The median income of single-elderly households also grew, by 6.0 percent to \$10,900, although this was still the lowest income of any household type and only about a third of the median income of all households in

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households."

1998. Of this household group, owner income increased by 5.0 percent to \$15,000, and renter income increased by 4.0 percent to \$9,300. On the other hand, the median income of single-adult households decreased by 3.3 percent to \$30,000. Contrarily to the decrease in median household income for this household type as a whole, renter and owner incomes each improved noticeably, by 4.6 percent to \$28,000 and by 7.1 percent to \$47,000 respectively. The median income of elderly households, which was \$27,900 in 1998, did not change appreciably during the three-year period. Of this household group, renter income decreased by 3.1 percent to \$21,000, while owner income increased by 2.9 percent to \$35,600.

Household Type <sup>a</sup> /Tenure	1995	1998	Percent Change 1995-98
Single Elderly	<sup>\$</sup> 10,275	<sup>\$</sup> 10,896	+6.0%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 8,939	<sup>\$</sup> 9,300	+4.0%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 14,327	<sup>\$</sup> 15,050	+5.0%
Single Adult	<sup>\$</sup> 31,038	<sup>\$</sup> 30,012	-3.3%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 26,778	<sup>\$</sup> 28,000	+4.6%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 43,882	<sup>\$</sup> 47,000	+7.1%
Single with Minor Child(ren)	<sup>\$</sup> 10,275	<sup>\$</sup> 12,200	+18.7%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 9,247	<sup>\$</sup> 10,000	+8.1%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 34,249	<sup>\$</sup> 39,671	+15.8%
Elderly Household	<sup>\$</sup> 28,191	<sup>\$</sup> 27,900	-1.0%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 21,680	<sup>\$</sup> 21,000	-3.1%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 34,592	<sup>\$</sup> 35,592	+2.9%
Adult Household	<sup>\$</sup> 51,374	<sup>\$</sup> 55,500	+8.0%
Renters	<sup>\$</sup> 42,811	<sup>\$</sup> 45,292	+5.8%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 74,235	<sup>\$</sup> 75,000	+1.0%
Adult with Minor Child(ren)	<sup>\$</sup> 42,032	<sup>\$</sup> 43,600	+3.7%
Renter	\$32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 32,200	+0.3%
Owners	<sup>\$</sup> 67,428	<sup>\$</sup> 73,000	+8.3%

# Table 3.27 Median Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Household Type and Tenure New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

Household Types are classified as follows: Single Elderly- one adult, age 62 or older; Single Adult- one adult, less than age 62; Single with Minor Child(ren)-one adult less than age 62, and one or more dependents less than age 18; Elderly Household- two or more adults and the householder is age 62 or over; Adult Household- two or more adults, no minors, and householder is less than age 62; Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)- two or more adults and at least one dependent minor; householder is less than age 62. A householder or spouse less than age 18 is considered an adult.

#### Sources of Household Income by Race and Ethnicity

The HVS household income data are collected by asking, for each household member aged 15 or over, his or her annual income from each of seven sources. The household's aggregate income is then calculated by adding the incomes of each household member from all income sources. Because the income data are gathered and organized in this way, it is possible to break down each household's income according to the sources from which it came. In the discussion that follows, household income has been decomposed into six major sources: earnings, investment, Social Security, Public Assistance, pension, and other.<sup>10</sup>

This section looks at the sources of household income data from two perspectives. In the first, each household's income from all six sources is analyzed to determine which is the primary source of income--that is, which contributes the most to the total household income. In this perspective, the unit of analysis is the household and, thus, questions such as the following can be answered: how many households are primarily dependent on earnings for their income? how many live primarily on Social Security payments? In the second perspective, the unit of analysis is not the household, but the aggregate income overall by sources of household income. This approach helps us determine, in terms of aggregate amount of income, which is the most important source of household income. This set of data allows us to answer the following and similar questions: which source of income is relatively more important in terms of the amount of money received from that source?

First, it is helpful to understand clearly the level of income of households with different primary sources of income. In 1998, the median income of households whose primary source of income was earnings was \$45,000, the highest level of households with any source of income (Table 3.28). Second highest, at \$32,000, were those households whose primary source of income was investments, followed, at \$26,900, by those households whose primary source was pensions. On the other hand, the median incomes of households whose primary source of income was Social Security or Public Assistance were \$12,000 and \$7,000 respectively, the lowest of all households with any primary source of income. The median income of households whose primary source of income was a source other than those specified above was \$13,000.

Of all households, seven in ten received their income primarily from earnings (71.8 percent), while one in six received it from Social Security (13.5 percent) or pensions (3.0 percent) (Table 3.29). A relatively small proportion of households (6.8 percent) cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income, while a very marginal portion (only 1.4 percent) said that investments contributed mostly to their total household income. The distribution of primary sources of income for white households was similar to that of all households, except that, of white households, more cited Social Security (17.5 percent) and fewer cited Public Assistance (2.8 percent) as their primary income source. Black households' distribution of primary income sources also mirrored the distribution of all households, with the following exceptions: compared to all households, fewer black households received their income primarily from Social Security (11.5 percent), while more received it primarily from Public Assistance (9.1 percent). On the other hand, compared to the distribution for all households, markedly fewer Puerto Rican

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> For detailed information on the sources of income, see Appendix E: 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Questionnaire and Appendix B: 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary.

Source of Income	1995	1998
All	<sup>\$</sup> 31,680	<sup>\$</sup> 33,000
None <sup>a</sup>	0	0
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 43,882	<sup>\$</sup> 45,000
Investment	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 32,000
Social Security	<sup>\$</sup> 11,431	<sup>\$</sup> 12,000
Public Assistance	<sup>\$</sup> 7,064	<sup>\$</sup> 6,960
Pension	<sup>\$</sup> 26,757	<sup>\$</sup> 26,852
Other	<sup>\$</sup> 14,218	<sup>\$</sup> 13,000
Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 199	6 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacan	cy Surveys

# Table 3.28Median Household Income in 1998 Dollars by Primary Source of IncomeNew York City 1995 and 1998

a None means household had zero income or a loss

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips, plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership

#### Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998

	Race/Ethnicity								
Source of Income	All	White	Black	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
None <sup>a</sup>	3.0%	2.7%	3.6%	3.5%	2.8%	3.2%	**		
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	71.8%	69.9%	72.0%	62.5%	76.2%	86.8%	68.5%		
Investment	1.4%	2.5%	0.2%*	**	**	1.4%	**		
Social Security	13.5%	17.5%	11.5%	12.3%	8.4%	5.7%	11.4%*		
Public Assistance	6.8%	2.8%	9.1%	19.2%	10.8%	1.7%	9.7%*		
Pension	3.0%	4.2%	3.0%	1.9%	1.1%	0.9%	**		
Other	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%*	0.5%*	**	**		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a None means household had zero income or a loss.

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips plus income

from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Notes:

households received their incomes primarily from earnings--62.5 percent, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group--while substantially more received it from Public Assistance--19.2 percent, the highest of any racial and ethnic group. Of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households, more received their incomes primarily from earnings (76.2 percent) or Public Assistance (10.8 percent), and fewer primarily from Social Security (8.4 percent) or pensions (1.1 percent). The distribution of primary income sources for Asian households was significantly different from those of the other major racial and ethnic groups. Of Asian households, close to nine in ten received their income primarily from earnings (86.8 percent), the highest proportion of any racial/ethnic group. Consequently, the proportions of Asian households that cited other primary income sources--such as Social Security, pensions, or Public Assistance--were very small. Only 1.7 percent cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group (Figure 3.5).





The 1998 distribution of households by primary sources of income is markedly different from that in 1995. In the three years, the proportion of households that cited Public Assistance as the primary source of their income was down by 3.0 percentage points, from 9.8 percent to 6.8 percent (Tables 3.29 and 3.30). Conversely, the proportion of households that cited earnings as their primary income source was up by an approximately commensurate 3.2 percentage points, to 71.8 percent. Of white households, the proportion that received income primarily from earnings increased by 2.4 percentage points to 69.9 percent, while the proportion whose income came primarily from Social Security declined by 1.9 percentage points to 17.5 percent.

Of black households, as of all households, the proportion that cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income dropped markedly by 4.1 percentage points to 9.1 percent during the three years between 1995 and 1998 (Tables 3.29 and 3.30). On the other hand, the proportion that cited earnings as their primary source of income climbed by a commensurate 4.0 percentage points to 72.0 percent. Of Puerto Rican households, the proportion that cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income plummeted by 8.0 percentage points to 19.2 percent, while the proportion that cited earnings rose by 4.9 percentage points to 62.5 percent. The proportion of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households that cited Public Assistance as their primary source of income dropped substantially by 6.2 percentage points to 10.8 percent, while the proportions that cited earnings or Social Security moved up by 4.5 percentage points to 76.2 percent and by 2.4 percentage points to 8.4 percent respectively.

On the other hand, for Asian households, there was no substantial change in the relative importance of the various sources of income that contributed most to the total household income in the three years, except that the proportion citing earnings as their primary income source declined slightly, while the proportion citing Social Security inched up (Table 3.29 and 3.30).

	Race/Ethnicity								
Source of Income	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
None <sup>a</sup>	2.9%	2.7%	3.9%	1.8%	2.6%	2.9%	**		
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	68.6%	67.5%	68.0%	57.6%	71.7%	88.5%	71.3%		
Investment	1.5%	2.7%	0.4%	0.4%*	0.5%*	0.6%*	**		
Social Security	13.9%	19.4%	11.2%	10.6%	6.0%	4.1%	13.0%*		
Public Assistance	9.8%	3.7%	13.2%	27.2	17.0%	2.3%	**		
Pension	2.6%	3.5%	2.6%	1.5%	1.5%	**	**		
Other	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.9%	0.6%*	1.1%	**		

Table 3.30Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity<br/>New York City 1995

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a None means household had zero income or a loss.

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips, plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Notes:
The second approach to analyzing sources of household income data looks at what percentage of household income comes from different sources of income. Using this approach, we see that close to nine in every ten dollars (87.5 percent) of the income of all households in 1998 came from earnings, while about two-thirds of the remainder came from Social Security (5.1 percent) or pensions (2.8 percent) (Table 3.31). The remainder came from investments (2.7 percent) or Public Assistance (1.4 percent). Compared to the proportional distribution of the aggregate income of all households by sources of income, white households received a relatively larger amount of their income from Public Assistance (2.4 percent) and much less from investments (0.7 percent). Puerto Rican households also received a relatively larger amount of household income from Public Assistance, 5.6 percent, the largest of any racial and ethnic group, while they received a much smaller proportion from investments (0.6 percent). Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households received nine in every ten dollars of their income from earnings, while most of the remainder came from Social Security (3.9 percent) or Public Assistance (3.6 percent). Most Asian households' incomes came from earnings (95.0 percent), while the remainder came mostly from investments and Social Security.

The overall distributional pattern of the aggregate income of all households by sources of income did not change markedly between 1995 and 1998 (Tables 3.31 and 3.32). For Puerto Rican households, the proportion of their incomes that came from earnings increased by 3.3 percentage points

	Race/Ethnicity							
Source of Income	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American	
All <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	87.5%	86.3%	87.6%	85.7%	90.1%	95.0%	87.2%	
Investment	2.7%	4.0%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	1.7%	3.1%	
Social Security	5.1%	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	3.9%	1.8%	4.1%	
Public Assistance	1.4%	0.5%	2.4%	5.6%	3.6%	0.5%	1.6%	
Pension	2.8%	3.3%	3.2%	2.0%	1.4%	0.7%	3.7%	
Other	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	

## Table 3.31 Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a Aggregate income over all households by sources of the income.

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips, plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

Notes:

to 85.7 percent, while the proportion that came from Public Assistance declined by 3.0 percentage points to 5.6 percent. Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic household incomes from earnings increased by 2.1 percentage points to 90.1 percent, while their proportion of household income from Public Assistance declined by 1.6 percentage points to 3.6 percent.

#### Sources of Household Income by Household Type

The distribution for all households by primary source of income did not repeat consistently within each household type; instead, it varied widely from one household type to another. Six in ten, a disproportionately larger proportion of single-elderly households (which consist of one adult 62 years old or older), cited Social Security as their primary source of income (60.6 percent) in 1998 (Table 3.33). Another two in ten cited pensions (10.0 percent) or Public Assistance (9.0 percent). Consequently, an extremely small proportion of single-elderly households, only 11.5 percent, cited earnings as their primary source of income, while 4.1 percent, a relatively very high proportion compared to the equivalent proportion of all households, cited investments. Of elderly households (which consist of two or more adults, one of whom is the householder and is 62 years old or older), four in ten cited earnings

Race/Ethnicity							
Source of Income	All	White	Black	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	86.7%	85.9%	87.0%	82.4%	88.0%	94.3%	89.6%
Investment	2.7%	3.8%	0.8%	0.9%	1.1%	1.5%	1.2%
Social Security	5.3%	6.1%	5.3%	5.5%	3.4%	1.6%	3.8%
Public Assistance	2.1%	0.7%	3.5%	8.6%	5.2%	0.7%	2.4%
Pension	2.6%	2.9%	2.9%	1.9%	1.6%	0.8%	2.8%
Other	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.8%	1.1%	0.3%

 Table 3.32

 Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income by Race/Ethnicity

 New York City 1995

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a Aggregate income over all households by sources of the income.

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

Notes:

(40.4 percent) as their primary source of income, while another four in ten cited Social Security (40.0 percent). In addition, one in ten cited pensions (9.4 percent), while 4.9 percent cited Public Assistance. As was the case for single-elderly households, a relatively high proportion of elderly households, 3.5 percent, cited investments as their primary source of income, compared to 1.4 percent of households overall (Figure 3.6).

Unlike elderly households and single-elderly households, more than eight in ten single-adult households (82.9 percent) cited earnings as their primary source of income (Table 3.33). The proportions of this household type that cited investments or Public Assistance as their primary source of income were only 1.3 percent and 5.6 percent respectively, similar to the comparable proportions of all households. However, the distribution of single-adult-with-children households was significantly different from that of single-adult households. Of the former, 58.3 percent received their income primarily from earnings, while 26.7 percent received it from Public Assistance.

Of adult households, more than nine in ten received their income primarily from earnings (92.1 percent), while most of the remainder received it from either Social Security (2.0 percent) or Public Assistance (2.6 percent) (Table 3.33). The distribution of adult-with-children households mirrored the

	Household Type							
Source of Income	All	Single Elderly	Single Adult	Single with Child(ren)	Elderly	Adult	Adult with Child(ren)	
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
None <sup>a</sup>	3.0%	4.1%	5.5%	7.1%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	71.8%	11.5%	82.9%	58.3%	40.4%	92.1%	90.0%	
Investment	1.4%	4.1%	1.3%	**	3.5%	0.5%	0.3%	
Social Security	13.5%	60.6%	2.9%	3.9%	40.0%	2.0%	2.3%	
Public Assistance	6.8%	9.0%	5.6%	26.7%	4.9%	2.6%	5.1%	
Pension	3.0%	10.0%	1.4%	1.1%	9.4%	1.1%	0.9%	
Other	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	2.6%	**	0.2%*	0.2%*	

# Table 3.33Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income within Household TypeNew York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey

a None means household had zero income or a loss

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips plus income from own business,

proprietorship, or partnership

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution

\*\* Too few households to report

Notes:



Figure 3.6 Primary Sources of Income within Household Type New York City 1998

distribution of adult households, except that the proportion of adult-with-children households that received their income primarily from Public Assistance was 5.1 percent, about double the comparable proportion of adult households.

The distributional pattern of aggregate household income by source of income within each household type was not similar to the comparable pattern of all households and was inconsistent from one type of household to another. Almost six in every ten dollars of the incomes of single-elderly households came from either Social Security (41.4 percent) or pensions (17.1 percent) (Table 3.34). At the same time, close to four in every ten dollars of their income came from either earnings (26.5 percent) or investments (9.6 percent), while the remainder came from Public Assistance (4.5 percent). Unlike single-elderly households, more than half of the incomes of elderly households came from earnings (54.0 percent), while about four in every ten of their income dollars came from either Social Security (24.7 percent) or pensions (13.3 percent); most of the remainder came from investments (5.8 percent).

	Household Type							
Source of Income	All	Single Elderly	Single Adult	Single with Children	Elderly	Adult	Adult with Children	
All <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	87.5%	26.5%	93.8%	83.1%	54.0%	94.5%	94.7%	
Investment	2.7%	9.6%	3.0%	1.2%	5.8%	2.1%	1.5%	
Social Security	5.1%	41.4%	0.8%	2.5%	24.7%	1.2%	1.3%	
Public Assistance	1.4%	4.5%	0.9%	8.9%	1.9%	0.6%	1.3%	
Pension	2.8%	17.1%	1.1%	1.4%	13.3%	1.2%	0.8%	
Other	0.5%	1.0%	0.4%	2.9%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	

## Table 3.34 Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income within Household Type New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Aggregate income over all households of each type by sources of the income.

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips, plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

Most of the incomes of single-adult households came from earnings (93.8 percent), while the remainder came from investments (Table 3.34). More than eight in every ten dollars of the incomes of single-adult-with-children households came from earnings (83.1 percent), while another close to one in ten dollars came from Public Assistance (8.9 percent), the highest proportion of any household type. On the other hand, close to all of the incomes of adult households came from earnings (94.5 percent), while the remaining very small proportion came from investments (2.1 percent), Social Security (1.2 percent), or pensions (1.2 percent). The distributional pattern of adult-with-children households was very similar to the pattern of adult households.

Between 1995 and 1998, the proportion of single-elderly households' incomes from earnings increased by 4.7 percentage points, while the proportions of such households' incomes from Social Security or investments decreased by 3.1 percentage points and 2.9 percentage points respectively (Tables 3.34 and 3.36). During the same three-year period, the proportion of single-adult-with-children households' incomes from earnings soared by 7.7 percentage points, while the proportion of such households' incomes from Public Assistance plummeted by 9.3 percentage points.

Turning to households by primary source of income, in the three years between 1995 and 1998, the proportion of all households that cited earnings as the primary source of their incomes increased by 3.2 percentage points to 71.8 percent, while the proportion that cited Public Assistance decreased by 3.0 percentage points to 6.8 percent (Tables 3.33 and 3.35). Of single-elderly households, the proportions that cited earnings or pensions as their primary income source moved up by 2.5 percentage points and 2.0 percentage points respectively, while the proportions that cited Social Security or investments dropped by 3.4 percentage points and 1.5 percentage points respectively. Of elderly households, those reporting earnings as their primary source of income increased by 2.5 percentage points, while those citing Social Security dropped by 3.1 percentage points. The distributional pattern of single-adult households remained practically constant over the three years, except that the proportion citing earnings as their primary source of slightly, while the proportion citing Public Assistance decreased slightly.

	Household Type						
Source of Income	All	Single Elderly	Single Adult	Single with Children	Elderly	Adult	Adult with Children
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
None <sup>a</sup>	2.9%	3.4%	5.9%	4.6%	1.1%	1.8%	1.4%
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	68.6%	9.0%	81.1%	46.2%	37.9%	90.3%	87.4%
Investment	1.5%	5.6%	1.1%	**	3.6%	0.6%	0.2%*
Social Security	13.9%	64.0%	2.6%	3.4%	43.1%	1.9%	1.4%
Public Assistance	9.8%	9.5%	6.8%	43.2%	5.4%	4.2%	8.4%
Pension	2.6%	8.0%	1.5%	0.5%*	8.6%	0.9%	0.8%
Other	0.6%	0.5%*	1.0%	1.6%	**	0.3%	0.3%*

Table 3.35 Distribution of Households by Primary Source of Income within Household Type New York City 1995

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a None means household had zero income or a loss.

b Earnings consists of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

The changes in the distributional pattern of single-adult-with-children households in the three years between 1995 and 1998 are worthy of note. The proportion of this household type citing earnings as their primary source of income soared by 12.1 percentage points, while the proportion citing Public Assistance plummeted by 16.5 percentage points (Tables 3.33 and 3.35). On the other hand, for adult households and adult-with-children households, the proportions citing earnings as the primary source of their income increased by 1.8 percentage points and by 2.6 percentage points respectively, while the proportions citing Public Assistance decreased by 1.6 percentage points and by 3.3 percentage points respectively.

Table 3.36
Distribution of Aggregate Household Income by Source of Income
within Household Type
New York City 1995

	Household Type						
Source of Income <sup>a</sup>	All	Single Elderly	Single Adult	Single with Children	Elderly	Adult	Adult with Children
All <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Earnings <sup>b</sup>	86.7%	21.8%	94.0%	75.4%	53.6%	94.5%	94.0%
Investment	2.7%	12.5%	2.4%	0.9%	6.0%	1.8%	1.6%
Social Security	5.3%	44.5%	0.8%	2.5%	26.1%	1.2%	1.1%
Public Assistance	2.1%	4.7%	1.1%	18.2%	1.9%	0.9%	2.0%
Pension	2.6%	15.6%	1.0%	1.0%	11.6%	1.1%	0.8%
Other	0.6%	0.9%	0.8%	2.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey

Notes:

a Aggregate income over all households of each type by sources of the income.

b Earnings consist of income from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, or tips plus income from own business, proprietorship, or partnership.

#### Poor Households (Households with Incomes below the Federal Poverty Level)

Another distinction of household incomes is the number of poor households (households with incomes below the federal poverty level) and the poverty rate (poor households' proportion of all households). The number of poor households in the City decreased by 6.4 percent, or by 37,000, from 573,000 in 1995 to 537,000 in 1998 (Table 3.37). Poor households included 533,000 children (under the age of 18) living below the poverty level.<sup>11</sup> Consequently, the poverty rate declined by 1.9 percentage points, from 20.6 percent to 18.7 percent.

	INU				
Desco (Editoria) da	Name	1995	Needland	Derrector De te	Change
Race/Ethnicity	Number	Poverty Rate	Number	Poverty Rate	in Percent
All	573,399	20.6%	536,521	18.7%	-1.9%
White	165,094	12.6%	152,580	11.5%	-1.1%
Black	177,626	26.5%	149,304	22.3%	-4.2%
Puerto Rican	107,866	37.6%	94,171	33.6%	-4.0%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	93,002	30.3%	103,855	28.7%	-1.6%
Asian	27,205	13.9%	33,817	15.5%	+1.6%
Native American	2,607*	19.9%	2,796*	21.8%	+1.9%

## Table 3.37 Number of Poor Households and Poverty Rate by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

The changes in the number of the poor and in the poverty rate vary from one race or ethnic group to another. For black households, the poverty rate dropped by 4.2 percentage points from 26.5 percent in 1995 to 22.3 percent in 1998, as the number of poor black households dropped by 28,000. The poverty rate for Puerto Rican households also dropped substantially, by 4.0 percentage points to 33.6 percent, while the number of poor Puerto Rican households fell by 14,000 in the three years. The number of poor non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households increased by 11,000, or by 11.7 percent, between 1996 and 1999. However, their poverty rate still decreased by 1.6 percentage points to 28.7 percent, because the number of non-poor non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households increased by a much larger 45,000, or by 20.9 percent.<sup>12</sup> For white households, the poverty rate decreased by 1.1 percentage points to 11.5 percent. Contrarily to the reduction in poverty rates for the other major racial and ethnic household groups, the number of poor Asian households rose by 7,000, with a resulting poverty rate increase of 1.6 percentage points to 15.5 percent.

<sup>11</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Although the overall poverty rate was 18.7 percent for all households, the rate of poverty ranged widely among the different household types. For single-adult-with-children households, it was 51.8 percent, the highest of any household type in 1998 and 2.8 times higher than the overall rate, although it dropped substantially by 7.0 percentage points from 1995, when it was 58.8 percent (Table 3.38). Single-elderly households also had an especially high poverty rate at 32.1 percent, 1.7 times the overall rate, although this was also down considerably, by 4.0 percentage points, from the rate of 36.1 percent in 1995. On the other hand, adult households, households composed of two or more adults, had a poverty rate of only 6.6 percent, the lowest of any household type and about one-third the overall rate.

	19	95	19	Change in	
Household Type	Number	<b>Poverty Rate</b>	Number	<b>Poverty Rate</b>	Percent
All	573,399	20.6%	536,521	18.7%	-1.9%
Single Elderly	125,684	36.1%	116,075	32.1%	-4.0%
Single Adult	99,790	17.4%	98,163	16.6%	-0.8%
Single w/ Child(ren)	138,694	58.8%	117,952	51.8%	-7.0%
Elderly	29,080	10.5%	34,060	12.2%	+1.7%
Adults	59,938	9.0%	43,820	6.6%	-2.4%
Adults w/ Child(ren)	120,212	17.7%	126,451	17.1%	-0.6%

## Table 3.38 Number of Poor Households and Poverty Rate by Household Type New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

The poverty rates for renter and owner households were profoundly different from the overall rate of 18.7 percent: 24.5 percent for renter households and 6.4 percent for owner households in 1998 (Table 3.39). Poverty rates also varied from borough to borough (Map 3.2). In 1998, the rate in the Bronx was 30.6 percent, still the highest of any borough in the City, as in 1995, and 11.9 percentage points higher than the overall rate for the City, although the rate in the borough did decline slightly during the three-year period. The poverty rate in Brooklyn declined by 3.9 percentage points to 21.4 percent in 1998, as the number of poor households dropped by 30,000 from the number in 1995. But the rate in the borough was still 2.7 percentage points higher than the citywide rate and the second-highest in the City, after the Bronx. During the same period, the poverty rates for renter and owner households in the borough declined by 4.0 percentage points to 26.9 percent and by 2.7 percentage points to 7.5 percent respectively.

In Manhattan, the poverty rate was down 2.8 percentage points to 16.1 percent, 2.6 percentage points lower than the citywide rate (Table 3.39). During the same three-year period, the rate for renter households in the borough declined by 3.0 percentage points to 19.1 percent, while the rate for owner households was 5.9 percent, not meaningfully different from the 1995 rate. In Staten Island, the poverty rate was only 10.5 percent, the same as in 1995 and 8.2 percentage points lower than the citywide rate in

Map 3.2 Percentage of Households Below the Federal Poverty Level New York City 1999



1998. In the borough, the rate for renter households increased by 3.2 percentage points to 20.4 percent, while the rate for owner households declined by 1.6 percentage points to 4.7 percent. On the other hand, the poverty rate in Queens increased by 1.1 percentage points to 13.3 percent in 1998, which was still 5.4 percentage points below the citywide rate. In the borough, the rate for renter households increased by 2.4 percentage points to 19.0 percent, while the rate for owner households remained virtually the same.

As discussed earlier, there is an important relationship between the level of household income and the number of employed persons in the household. Thus, it appears to be useful to analyze the relationship between the level of poverty and the number of workers in a household. Of all households, a quarter had no workers, two-fifths had one worker, a little more than another quarter had two workers, and the remaining less than a tenth had three or more workers (Table 3.40). On the other hand, of poor

		199	95	
	Number of		<b>Poverty Rate</b>	
Borough	Poor Households	All Households	Renter Households	Owner Households
All	573,399	20.6%	26.3%	7.5%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	133,120	32.3%	38.5%	8.0%
Brooklyn	205,756	25.3%	30.9%	10.2%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	132,843	18.9%	22.1%	6.2%
Queens	87,335	12.2%	16.6%	6.3%
Staten Island	14,346	10.5%	17.2%	6.3%
		199	8	
	Number of		<b>Poverty Rate</b>	
Borough	Poor Households	All Households	Renter Households	Owner Households
All	536,521	18.7%	24.5%	6.4%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	128,236	30.6%	37.3%	6.8%
Brooklyn	175,750	21.4%	26.9%	7.5%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	116,758	16.1%	19.1%	5.9%
Queens	100,631	13.3%	19.0%	6.1%
Staten Island	15,145	10.5%	20.4%	4.7%

# Table 3.39Number of Poor Households and Poverty Rate by Borough and Tenure<br/>New York City 1995 and 1998

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

households, two-thirds had no workers, while a little more than a quarter had one worker. Contrarily to the citywide poverty rate of 18.7 percent in 1998, the rate among households with no workers was 49.2 percent. In other words, one in every two households with no workers had incomes below the federal poverty level.

As an effort to shed additional light on the characteristics of poor households and the individuals in them and the implications for their potential housing requirements, it appears to be prudent to compare major characteristics of poor households to those of non-poor households. Of poor households, disproportionately large proportions were single-adult-with-children (22.0 percent) and single-elderly (21.6 percent) households, compared to proportions of these same household types in non-poor households: 4.7 percent and 10.5 percent respectively (Table 3.41). On the other hand, adult households' proportion of poor households was only 8.2 percent, much lower than the equivalent proportion of this type in non-poor households: 26.8 percent.

## Table 3.40 Number and Distribution of Households by Number of Workers in the Household by Poverty Status New York City 1998

		Percent of Poverty Level					
Number of Workers	All	< 100%	100-124%	125% or More			
All Households	2,868,415	536,521	157,902	2,173,992			
None	733,260	361,041	76,227	295,993			
One	1,154,969	146,650	62,179	946,141			
Two	786,930	24,634	15,624	746,672			
Three or More	193,255	4,197	3,872	185,186			
	Distribution wit	thin Poverty Stat	tus				
Number of Workers	All	< 100%	100-124%	125% +			
All Households	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
None	25.6%	67.3%	48.3%	13.6%			
One	40.3%	27.3%	39.4%	43.5%			
Two	27.4%	4.6%	9.9%	34.3%			
Three or More	6.7%	0.8%	2.5%	8.5%			
	Distribution within	n Number of Wo	orkers				
Number of Workers	All	< 100%	100-124%	125% +			
All Households	100.0%	18.7%	5.5%	75.8%			
None	100.0%	49.2%	10.4%	40.4%			
One	100.0%	12.7%	5.4%	81.9%			
Two	100.0%	3.1%	2.0%	94.9%			
Three or More	100.0%	2.2%	2.0%	95.8%			

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Of poor households, relatively large proportions of the householders, close to three in ten, were born in Puerto Rico (11.1 percent) or in another Caribbean country (16.7 percent), compared to the equivalent proportions of such householders in non-poor households: 4.5 percent and 11.5 percent respectively (Table 3.41). Of poor households, whites made up only 28.4 percent, while their proportion of non-poor households was 50.3 percent. Conversely, Puerto Rican households' and non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households' proportions of poor households were 17.6 percent and 19.4 percent respectively, compared to their equivalent proportions of non-poor households: only 8.0 percent and 11.1 percent respectively. Only a little more than half of poor householders had finished at least high school,

Household Type	Poor <sup>a</sup>	Non-Poor	Race/Ethnicity	Poor	Non-Poor
Single Adult	18.3%	21.1%	White	28.4%	50.3%
Single with Child(ren)	22.0%	4.7%	Black	27.8%	22.3%
Adult Household	8.2%	26.8%	Puerto Rican	17.6%	8.0%
Adult with Child(ren)	23.6%	26.3%	Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	19.4%	11.1%
Single Elderly	21.6%	10.5%	Asian	6.3%	7.9%
Elderly Household	6.3%	10.5%	Other	0.5%	0.4%
All Types	100.0%	100.0%	All Races	100.0%	100.0%
Householder Birth Country/Regional Country/Regio	Householder Educational Attainment				
U.S.A	46.1%	56.3%	At Least High School Graduate	53.4%	84.4%
Puerto Rico	11.1%	4.5%	At Least College Graduate	12.0%	37.6%
Other Caribbean	16.7%	11.5%	Householder Lab	or Force Part	icipation
Latin America	7.5%	7.3%	In Labor Force	32.2%	72.7%
Europe	10.2%	9.9%	Householder Gen	der/Combina	tion
Asia	6.1%	7.4%	Single Male	15.1%	20.5%
Africa	1.2%	1.1%	Single Female	63.2%	32.2%
Other	1.2%	2.0%	Couple	21.7%	47.3%
All Regions	100.0%	100.0%	All	100.0%	100.0%
		Median Income			
Median Income	<sup>\$</sup> 6,439	<sup>\$</sup> 41,600			

## Table 3.41 Selected Characteristics of Poor and Non-Poor Households New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note:

a A poor household is one with total income below 100% of the federal poverty threshold for a family of the same size and composition.

compared to more than eight in ten of non-poor householders. At the same time, only 32.2 percent of poor householders participated in the labor force, compared to 72.7 percent of non-poor householders. Of all poor householders, more than six in ten were single females, almost double their equivalent proportion among non-poor householders.

About four in ten of poor single-female-headed households (41.9 percent) sheltered children, while only 19.3 percent of non-poor single-female-headed households did so (Table 3.42). At the same time, of single-female-headed households with children, more than half were poor. Of poor single-female-headed households, another close to four in ten (35.9 percent) were single-elderly-female

		-			
		1998			
	All	Poor	Non-Poor		
All Single Female Headed Households <sup>a</sup>	770,476	263,154	507,322		
Single Female Elderly Households <sup>b</sup>	266,786	94,454	172,332		
Single Adult Female Headed Households without Child(ren)	295,782	58,564	237,217		
Single Female Headed Households with Child(ren)	207,909	110,136	97,773		
D	Distribution within Pov	erty Status			
	All	Poor	Non-Poor		
All Single Female Headed Households <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Single Female Elderly Households <sup>b</sup>	34.6%	35.9%	34.0%		
Single Adult Female Headed Households without Child(ren)	38.4%	22.3%	46.7%		
Single Female Headed Households with Child(ren)	27.0%	41.9%	19.3%		
Dist	ribution within Housel	hold Category			
	All	Poor	Non-Poor		
All Single Female Headed Households <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	34.2%	65.8%		
Single Female Elderly Households <sup>b</sup>	100.0%	35.4%	64.6%		
Single Adult Female Headed					

100.0%

100.0%

19.8%

53.0%

## Table 3.42 Number of Poor and Non-Poor Female Headed Households New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a No other adult present.

Single Female Headed Households with Child(ren)

b Age 62 or over, without children

Households without Child(ren)

80.2%

47.0%

households. Only half of poor single-female-headed householders had finished at least high school, 24.1 percent were in the labor force, and their median household income was \$6,000. Nine in ten of them were renters (Table 3.43).

As the above analysis of the relationship between the poverty rate and the number of workers in a household reveals that so few poor households in the City had workers in 1998, it appears to be analytically valuable, in explaining further the high poverty rate in the City, to examine the labor-force status of individuals in poor households without workers but with some household income. Among

Selected Characteristics	Poor	Non-Poor
All Single Female Householders	263,154	507,322
Percent Renters	90.0%	68.9%
Percent at Least High School Graduate	50.8%	86.8%
Percent in Labor Force	24.1%	65.7%
Percent with Children Present	41.9%	19.3%
Median Household Income	<sup>\$</sup> 6,000	<sup>\$</sup> 25,200
Single Elderly	<sup>\$</sup> 6,500	<sup>\$</sup> 15,000
Single Adult, No Child(ren)	<sup>\$</sup> 2,616	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000
Single with Child(ren)	<sup>\$</sup> 5,592	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000
Race/Ethnicity		
All	100.0%	100.0%
White	28.5%	54.5%
Black/African American	28.8%	27.3%
Puerto Rican	21.1%	6.7%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	17.6%	7.2%
Asian	3.3%	3.7%
Native American	0.7%*	0.7%

## Table 3.43 Selected Characteristics and Race/Ethnicity of Poor and Non-Poor Single Female Householders New York City 1998

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

Since the number of persons is small, interpret with caution.

individuals 18 years old or older in such poor households, 91.0 percent were not in the labor force in 1999 (Table 3.44). In other words, in the previous week--that is, in the week before the householder was interviewed for the 1999 HVS--more than nine out of ten individuals in such poor households did not work, were not temporarily absent or on layoff, and were not looking for work. Even among individuals in such poor households who were in the economically active age group of 25-54, 84.0 percent were not in the labor force.

## Table 3.44 Number and Distribution of Adult Persons in Poor Households where No Household Member Worked in 1998 and Some Household Income by Labor Force Status by Age Group New York City 1999

		Age Group			
Labor Force Status	All	Under 25	25-54	55 and Over	
Total	383,522	37,406	155,543	190,574	
Employed (in 1998)	13,413	2,827*	8,197	2,389*	
Unemployed	21,224	3,571	16,651	**	
Not in the Labor Force <sup>a</sup>	348,885	31,008	130,694	187,183	
	Distribution v	vithin Age Group	•		
Labor Force Status	All	Under 25	25-54	55 and Over	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Employed	3.5%	7.6%	5.3%	1.3%	
Unemployed	5.5%	9.5%	10.7%	0.5%*	
Not in the Labor Force <sup>a</sup>	91.0%	82.9%	84.0%	98.2%	
	Distribution withi	in Labor Force St	tatus		
Labor Force Status	All	Under 25	25-54	55 and Over	
Total	100.0%	9.8%	40.6%	49.7%	
Employed	100.0%	21.1%	61.1%	17.8%	
Unemployed	100.0%	16.8%	78.5%	4.7%*	
Not in the Labor Force <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	8.9%	37.5%	53.7%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Not in labor force means did not work last week, not temporarily absent or on layoff, and not looking for work.

\* Since the number of persons is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few persons to report.

Among all adults in poor households without workers but with some household income, almost four in ten reported that they were retired, while another four in ten cited ill health/physical disability (28.7 percent) or family responsibilities/childcare (12.9 percent) as the reason for not participating in the labor force (Table 3.45). However, major reasons were different for different age groups. Of such

Table 3.45
Reason Given by Adults in Poor Households with No Workers and Some Household Income
for Not Participating in Labor Force by Age Group

New York City 1999

			Age Group	
Reason Given	All	Under 25	25-54	55 and Over
All	348,885	31,008	130,694	187,183
Cannot Find Work <sup>a</sup>	14,446	2,187*	8,980	3,279
Ill Health, Physical Disability	99,375	3,057	56,488	39,830
Family Responsibilities or Cannot Arrange Child Care	44,633	7,111	30,164	7,358
In School or Other Training	29,188	17,448	10,736	**
Retired	133,464	**	6,434	127,030
Other Reasons/Don't Know	25,214	**	15,726	8,469
	Distributio	n within Age Gro	oup	
Reason Given	All	Under 25	25-54	55 and Over
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Cannot Find Work	4.2%	7.1%	7.0%	1.8%
Ill Health, Physical Disability	28.7%	9.9%	43.9%	21.3%
Family Responsibilities/Child Care	12.9%	23.1%	23.5%	3.9%
In School or Other Training	8.4%	56.6%	8.4%	0.5%*
Retired	38.5%	**	5.0%	67.9%
Other Reasons/Don't Know	7.3%	3.3%*	12.2%	4.5%
	Distribution	within Reason G	liven	
Reason Given	All	Under 25	25-54	55 and Over
All	100.0%	8.9%	37.5%	53.7%
Cannot Find Work	100.0%	15.1%	62.2%	22.7%
Ill Health, Physical Disability	100.0%	3.1%	56.8%	40.1%
Family Responsibilities/Child Care	100.0%	15.9%	67.6%	16.5%
In School or Other Training	100.0%	59.8%	36.8%	3.4%*
Retired	100.0%	**	4.8%	95.2%
Other Reasons/Don't Know	100.0%	4.0%*	62.4%	33.6%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

=

-

a This category includes the following reasons: 1) believes no work available in line of work or area; 2) could not find any work; 3) lacks necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience; and 4) employers think too young or too old.
 \* Since the number of persons is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few persons to report.

individuals under 25 years old, close to six in ten provided "going to school or getting training" as the reason for not being in the labor force, while another close to one-quarter cited family responsibilities/childcare as the reason. For two-thirds of those in the economically active 25-54 age group, major reasons were ill health/physical disability (43.9 percent) or family responsibilities/childcare (23.5 percent). Of those individuals 55 years old or older, two-thirds reported that they were retired, while a fifth said they were in ill health/were physically disabled and, thus, were not in the labor force.

Not every poor household received cash Public Assistance. Contrarily to intuition, only about half (51.5 percent) of the poor households in the City received cash Public Assistance, down from 54.2 percent in 1993. The proportion of poor households receiving it was inconsistent for each racial and ethnic group (Table 3.46). Only about a fifth of Asian and a third of white poor households received cash Public Assistance, while a little more than half of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic and black poor households and seven in ten poor Puerto Rican households received it.

Table 3.46
Percentage of Poor Households Receiving Cash Public Assistance
by Race/Ethnicity
New York City 1993 and 1999

	Percentage of Poor Households Receiving Cash Public Assistance			
Race/Ethnicity	1993	1999		
All	58.1%	51.5%		
White	32.8%	34.8%		
Black/African American	63.3%	57.1%		
Puerto Rican	81.9%	71.9%		
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	65.0%	55.0%		
Asian	16.5%	21.1%		
Native American	42.3%	72.0%*		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

## Cash-Public-Assistance-Recipient Households

In 1999, 16.7 percent of households in the City received cash Public Assistance, a 2.5 percentagepoint drop from 19.2 percent three years earlier in 1996 (Table 3.47). For the 1996 and previous HVSs, cash Public Assistance included money payments under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Home Relief, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) programs or other assistance programs, including the Shelter Allowance. For the 1999 HVS, reflecting changes in welfare reform, cash Public Assistance included money payments under Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) or Family Assistance (previously called AFDC), Safety Net (formerly Home Relief), and Supplemental Security Income (SSI), including aid to the blind and the disabled. Hereafter in this report, "Public Assistance" or "PA," without the word "cash," will be used to indicate these programs.

Table 3.47
Percentage of Households in Receipt of Public Assistance by Race/Ethnicity
New York City 1996 and 1999

Race/Ethnicity	1996	1999
All	19.2%	16.7%
White	8.3%	7.4%
Black/African American	26.4%	22.5%
Puerto Rican	41.7%	35.9%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	30.5%	26.8%
Asian	7.2%	7.5%
Native American	19.3%	20.2%
Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and	d 1999 New York City Housing and Va	cancy Surveys.

#### Table 3.48

## Selected Characteristics of Households Receiving/Not Receiving Public Assistance New York City 1999

Household Type	РА	Non-PA	Race/Ethnicity	РА	Non-PA
Single Adult	10.9%	19.0%	White	19.4%	48.9%
Single with Child(ren)	23.4%	5.4%	Black	31.7%	21.9%
Adult Household	11.7%	26.1%	Puerto Rican	22.6%	8.1%
2+ Adults with Child(ren)	28.4%	27.5%	Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	22.3%	12.1%
Single Elderly	15.6%	11.6%	Asian	3.5%	8.6%
Elderly Household	10.0%	10.3%	Native American	0.5%	0.4%
All Types	100.0%	100.0%	All Races	100.0%	100.0%
Householder Birth Country/Regi	on		Householder Educa	tional Attain	iment
U.S.A	46.5%	56.0%	At Least High School Graduate	49.6%	83.1%
Puerto Rico	14.0%	4.2%	At Least College Graduate	8.7%	36.1%
Other Caribbean	18.4%	11.3%	Householder Labor	· Force Partio	cipation
Latin America	6.6%	7.5%	In Labor Force	29.9%	71.4%
Europe	9.6%	10.1%	Householder Gende	er/Combinati	ion
Asia	3.2%	7.7%	Single Male	12.6%	19.3%
Africa	0.5%*	1.3%	Single Female	63.8%	32.8%
Other	1.2%	2.0%	Couple	23.6%	47.9%
All Regions	100.0%	100.0%	All	100.0%	100.0%
Median 1998 Income					

<sup>\$</sup>39,100

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

<sup>\$</sup>9,000

Note:

Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

Median Income

Except for Asian households, the proportion of households receiving Public Assistance declined for the major racial and ethnic groups during the three years between 1996 and 1999. The proportion of Puerto Rican households receiving Public Assistance plummeted by 5.8 percentage points to 35.9 percent, although this rate was still the highest of any racial/ethnic group in 1999 (Table 3.47). At the same time, the proportion declined by 3.9 percentage points to 22.5 percent for black households and by 3.7 percentage points to 26.8 percent for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households. For white households, the proportion declined slightly by 0.9 percentage points to 7.4 percent, while it remained virtually the same for Asian households during the three years.

Major characteristics of all households receiving Public Assistance mirror those of poor households. The proportion of households receiving Public Assistance that were single-adult-with children households was 23.4 percent, more than four times the proportion not receiving it, which was only 5.4 percent (Table 3.48). Also, the proportion of households receiving Public Assistance that were single-elderly households was 15.6 percent, compared to 11.6 percent of households not receiving it. On the other hand, single-adult households' and adult households' proportions of households receiving Public Assistance were 10.9 percent and 11.7 percent respectively, less than half the comparable proportions of such households not receiving it.

Of heads of households receiving Public Assistance, 14.0 percent came from Puerto Rico, more than three times the proportion not receiving it, and 18.4 percent came from other Caribbean countries, substantially higher than the comparable proportion of those not receiving it, 11.3 percent (Table 3.48).

Of householders receiving Public Assistance, 22.6 percent were Puerto Rican, while only 8.1 percent of householders not receiving it were Puerto Rican (Table 3.48). At the same time, 22.3 percent of householders receiving Public Assistance were non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, while only 12.1 percent of householders not receiving it were of this racial and ethnic group. Contrarily, the proportion of white householders receiving Public Assistance was far less than half their proportion of householders not receiving it: 19.4 percent versus 48.9 percent. Of householders receiving Public Assistance, only half had finished at least high school, 29.9 percent were in the labor force, and close to two-thirds were single females.

## **Occupational and Industrial Patterns**

#### Labor Force Participation

The labor force participation rate in the City stood at 61.9 percent in 1999, a considerable improvement over 1996, when it was 59.2 percent (Table 3.49). Through 1996, the rate had remained practically unchanged since 1991, when the HVS, for the first time, measured such labor market performance in the City.<sup>13</sup> The improvement in 1999 clearly reflects the steady expansion of the City's economy over the last several years. During the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, labor force participation rates in the boroughs of the Bronx, where the rate was the lowest of all the boroughs, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, and 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Brooklyn increased by 3.3 percentage points each to 55.1 percent and 59.6 percent respectively. In Manhattan, the rate soared by 4.4 percentage points to 67.9 percent, the highest of any of the boroughs. On the other hand, in Queens, where it was 63.3 percent in 1999, the rate remained virtually constant with the rate three years earlier, while in Staten Island it inched up by only 0.7 of a percentage point to 60.6 percent (Map 3.3).

	Inew	fork City 1996 and	1999		
Borough	Labor Participa	Force tion Rates	Unemployment Rates		
	1996	1999	1996	1999	
All	59.2%	61.9%	9.3%	6.5%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	51.8%	55.1%	12.8%	8.0%	
Brooklyn	56.3%	59.6%	11.3%	7.5%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	63.5%	67.9%	8.8%	6.1%	
Queens	63.2%	63.3%	7.3%	5.6%	
Staten Island	59.9%	60.6%	4.9%	3.9%	

## Table 3.49 Labor Force Participation and Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys

Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

The 1999 HVS reports that about four in ten individuals in the City 16 years old or older were not in the labor force. Thus, it is important to determine why so many New Yorkers were not in the labor force. Of those who were not in the labor force, four in ten said they were not because they were retired, while two in ten cited schooling or training as their reason (Table 3.50). Another three in ten reported that they were not in the labor force due to family responsibilities/childcare (16.1 percent) or ill health/physical disability (14.2 percent). Major reasons for not being in the labor force varied from one racial/ethnic group to another. The majority of white individuals (55.4 percent) cited retirement as the major reason, while well below half of the individuals in the other major racial and ethnic groups-34.0 percent of blacks, 30.7 percent of Asians, 25.3 percent of Puerto Ricans, and 22.8 percent of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics--cited this as the reason. Relatively smaller shares of whites cited ill health/physical disability (9.4 percent) or schooling/training (13.6 percent) as the reason, compared to all individuals who selected these two reasons: 14.2 percent and 20.6 percent respectively (Figure 3.7).

Map 3.3 Percentage of Population Age 16 to 64 Not in the Labor Force New York City 1999



Of black individuals who were not in the labor force, three in ten cited schooling or training as the reason they were not, while only two in ten individuals overall cited this reason. For black individuals, family responsibilities/childcare was not a widespread reason: only 8.7 percent cited this, about half the proportion of all individuals who cited it (Table 3.50). For Puerto Ricans, ill health or physical disability was a pervasive reason: 26.9 percent cited this as their reason for not working or looking for work, while only 14.2 percent of individuals overall cited it. On the other hand, a quarter of non-Puerto Rican Hispanics cited family responsibilities or childcare, compared to 16.1 percent of all individuals. At the

same time, the two major reasons cited by Asians were family responsibilities/childcare (26.2 percent) and going to school/getting training (27.1 percent), considerably larger proportions than those of all individuals not in the labor force who cited such reasons: 16.1 percent and 20.6 percent respectively. On the other hand, ill health/physical disability was not a major reason preventing Asians from participating in the labor force. Only 5.6 percent cited this reason, while 14.2 percent of all individuals not in the labor force cited it. The comparatively higher proportions among blacks, Asians, and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics citing schooling or other training as their reason for not currently being in the labor force may bode well for their later participation in the labor force and future earnings ability.

## Table 3.50 Reasons Given by Individuals Aged 16 and Over for Not Participating in Labor Force by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

	Race/Ethnicity						
Reason Given	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Can't Find Work <sup>a</sup>	2.9%	1.1%	4.0%	5.0%	4.5%	3.4%	**
Ill Health, Physical Disability	14.2%	9.4%	17.7%	26.9%	17.5%	5.6%	13.4%*
Family Responsibilities or Cannot Arrange Child Care	16.1%	14.9%	8.7%	17.8%	24.5%	26.2%	**
In School or Other Training	20.6%	13.6%	29.4%	19.1%	23.9%	27.1%	23.2%
Retired	40.1%	55.4%	34.0%	25.3%	22.8%	30.7%	40.5%
Other Reasons/Don't Know	6.1%	5.5%	6.3%	5.9%	6.9%	7.0%	11.7%*

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a This category includes the following reasons: 1) believes no work available in line of work or area; 2) could not find any work; 3) lacks necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience; and 4) employers think too young or too old.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

The labor force participation rate varied for individuals in different age groups. The rates for the three economically active age groups were markedly higher than the overall citywide rate of 61.9 percent: 80.4 percent for those in the 25-34 group; 82.1 percent for those aged 35-44, and 77.4 percent for those aged 45-54 (Table 3.51). This pattern of economically active age groups' higher rates than the overall rate holds true regardless of gender difference.



Figure 3.7 Reason for Not Participating in Labor Force by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

The labor force participation rate was not consistent across the board for every racial and ethnic group. The rates for whites and blacks, 61.6 percent and 62.1 percent respectively, were in parity with the overall citywide rate of 61.9 percent (Table 3.52). But the rates for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics and Asians, 64.7 percent and 65.5 percent respectively, were noticeably higher than the citywide rate, while the rate for Puerto Ricans, only 54.5 percent, was the lowest of any racial and ethnic group. Putting this another way, only one in every two Puerto Ricans 16 years old or older was in the labor force.

## Table 3.51 Labor Force Participation Rates of Individuals Aged 16 Years and Over by Age Group and Gender New York City 1999

	Gender			
Age Group	Both	Male	Female	
All	61.9%	70.4%	54.7%	
16-17	12.3%	10.3%	14.0%	
18-24	54.4%	57.7%	51.1%	
25-34	80.4%	89.5%	72.1%	
35-44	82.1%	91.0%	73.8%	
45-54	77.4%	84.8%	70.9%	
55-64	58.3%	65.2%	52.7%	
65-74	13.1%	15.6%	11.4%	
75 and Over	4.6%	6.9%	3.4%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

		5					
	Age Group						
Race/Ethnicity	All	16-24	25-54	55 & Over			
All	61.9%	45.4%	80.2%	29.4%			
White	61.6%	52.0%	84.1%	27.0%			
Black/African American	62.1%	38.0%	80.2%	34.9%			
Puerto Rican	54.5%	41.8%	69.3%	23.3%			
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	64.7%	52.3%	77.4%	32.4%			
Asian	65.5%	38.2%	79.7%	34.3%			
Native American	61.1%	40.9%*	84.5%	23.2%*			

#### Table 3.52 Labor Force Participation Rates of Individuals Aged 16 Years and Over by Age Group and by Race/Ethniticy New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

Note:

The 1999 HVS data on the labor force participation rates and educational attainment strongly support the positive relationship between the two--that is, of individuals aged 25-54, the higher the level of educational attainment, the higher the labor force participation rate. For individuals in the economically active age groups who did not finish high school, the labor force participation rate was only 61.9 percent (Table 3.53). However, the rate rose to 77.0 percent for those who had finished high school, to 82.5 percent for those who had finished some college work, and to 90.1 percent for those who had at least graduated from college. The upward pattern according to the level of educational attainment holds for each racial and ethnic group. For economically active Puerto Ricans, whose overall labor force participation rate was only 69.3 percent, the pattern was much more vividly maintained: from 47.3 percent for those who had finished some college work, to 94.1 percent for those who had at least graduated from college.

## Unemployment

Considering the findings of the analysis of educational attainment in the previous chapter, "Residential Population and Households," and the analyses of income and labor force participation in this chapter, it is not surprising to see that the City's unemployment rate for individuals aged 16 years or older dropped considerably by 2.8 percentage point to 6.5 percent in 1999 (Table 3.54). This is a back-to-back decrease in the rate from 12.9 percent in 1993 to 9.3 percent in 1996 and 6.5 percent in 1999.<sup>14</sup> The unemployment rate dropped in every borough. In the Bronx, it plunged by 4.8 percentage points to 8.0 percent, although this rate was still the highest of any of the boroughs. The rate also fell substantially in Brooklyn, by 3.8 percentage points, to 7.5 percent. In Manhattan, it fell markedly by 2.7 percentage points, to 6.1 percent, lower than the overall citywide rate of 6.5 percent. In Queens, the rate was 5.6 percent, reduced by 1.7 percentage points from three years earlier. The rate in Staten Island was 3.9 percent, down by 1.0 percentage point from the rate in 1996 and the lowest of all the boroughs, as in 1996 (Map 3.4).

The unemployment rate for individuals in renter households was 7.8 percent, more than double the rate of 3.8 percent for individuals in owner households (Table 3.54). Nevertheless, the rates for those in renter and owner households both fell significantly in all five boroughs during the three years between 1996 and 1999, as did the rates of those in all households in every borough.

The 1999 unemployment rate for males was considerably lower than the rate for females, as in 1996: 5.6 percent versus 7.4 percent in 1999 (Table 3.55). As the overall unemployment rate for individuals as a whole dropped in the City, the rates for males and females fell markedly: from 8.5 percent to 5.6 percent and from 10.3 percent to 7.4 percent respectively.

As the citywide overall unemployment rate dropped, the rates for major racial and ethnic groups also declined markedly. The level of decline was especially visible for three groups: the rates for Puerto Ricans, blacks, and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, which were significantly higher than the overall rate in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>Moon Wha Lee, Housing New York City, 1996, page 170.



Map 3.4 Percentage of Unemployed Individuals Age 16 to 64 New York City 1999

## Table 3.53 Labor Force Participation Rates of Individuals Aged 25-54 by Race/Ethnicity and by Educational Attainment New York City 1999

_	Educational Attainment					
Race/Ethnicity	All	Less than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	At Least College Graduate	
All	80.2%	61.9%	77.0%	82.5%	90.1%	
White	84.1%	63.2%	73.2%	83.8%	90.6%	
Black/African American	80.2%	57.3%	80.6%	83.7%	91.8%	
Puerto Rican	69.3%	47.3%	73.6%	80.1%	94.1%	
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	77.4%	69.1%	80.5%	81.1%	87.5%	
Asian	79.7%	70.5%	77.2%	75.4%	86.3%	
Native American	84.5%	*	85.3%	88.4%	89.0%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

\* Too few individuals to report.

Table 3.54
Unemployment Rates <sup>b</sup> of Individuals 16 Years and Over
by Tenure and by Borough
New York City 1996 and 1999

	Tenure					
	Α	11	Ren	Renters		ners
Borough	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	9.3%	6.5%	11.2%	7.8%	5.7%	3.8%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	12.8%	8.0%	15.1%	9.3%	5.6%	4.2%
Brooklyn	11.3%	7.5%	13.5%	8.8%	6.5%	4.7%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	8.8%	6.1%	9.6%	7.0%	5.5%	2.8%
Queens	7.3%	5.6%	8.3%	6.9%	5.8%	3.8%
Staten Island	4.9%	3.9%	7.5%	6.5%	3.7%	2.8%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

b A member of a surveyed household age 16 or over was classified as unemployed if he or she at the time of the survey, did no work during the previous week, and was either (i) on layoff from a job during the previous week or (ii) had been looking for work during the previous four weeks. The unemployment rate is estimated as the number of unemployed persons as a percentage of the total labor force, which is the sum of unemployed persons and persons who worked during the previous week. both 1996 and 1999, fell respectively by 4.0 percentage points to 9.3 percent, by 3.9 percentage points to 9.1 percent, and by 3.6 percentage points to 8.9 percent (Table 3.56). The rate for whites dropped by 2.3 percentage points to 3.9 percent, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group, while the rate for Asians dropped by 1.1 percentage points to 4.3 percent, substantially lower than the overall rate.

Gender	1996	1999
Both	9.3%	6.5%
Male	8.5%	5.6%
Female	10.3%	7.4%

Table 3.55Unemployment Rates of Individuals 16 Years and Over by Gender<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Table 3.56
Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 Years and Over by Age Group
and by Race/Ethnicity
New York City 1996 and 1999

	Age Group							
	A	11	16	-24	25	-54	55 &	Over
Race/Ethnicity	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	9.3%	6.5%	19.3%	14.0%	8.3%	5.8%	7.1%	4.2%
White	6.2%	3.9%	11.2%	7.1%	5.7%	3.5%	6.0%	4.4%
Black	13.0%	9.1%	29.5%	17.6%	11.4%	8.7%	8.6%	4.4%
Puerto Rican	13.3%	9.3%	29.4%	27.2%	11.3%	7.0%	6.9%*	**
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	12.5%	8.9%	18.3%	15.1%	11.5%	8.1%	10.4%	4.6%
Asian	5.4%	4.3%	10.2%	9.7%	4.7%	4.0%	5.9%*	**
Native American	14.1%*	**	**	**	10.3*	**	**	**

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

As the unemployment rate for all individuals in the economically active age group of 25-54 was the lowest of any age group, individuals in this age group in all racial and ethnic groups had lower unemployment rates than those in the other age groups (Table 3.56). The most remarkable improvement made in employment during the three years between 1996 and 1999 was the dramatic 11.9-percentage-point drop, to 17.6 percent, in the unemployment rate for young black individuals aged 16-24, compared to the 5.3-percentage-point drop for all individuals in the same age group (Table 3.57).

The earlier analysis of the relationship between the labor force participation rate and the level of educational attainment revealed that the better educated individuals were, the higher the labor force participation rate. This pattern also holds for the relationship between the unemployment rate and the level of educational attainment: the better educated individuals are, the lower the unemployment rate. That rate for individuals aged 25-54 who did not finish high school was 13.4 percent, more than double the rate of 5.8 percent for all individuals in the same age group (Table 3.58). However, the rate for those in this age group who did graduate from high school was only 6.7 percent, a 6.7-percentage-point difference. The rates for those who had finished some college work and those who had at least graduated from college were 5.2 percent and 3.0 percent respectively (Figure 3.8).

This relationship was maintained for the major racial and ethnic groups. However, the gradation of differentiated unemployment rates for different levels of educational attainment was most vivid for blacks. Among blacks in the 25-54 age group, the unemployment rate for those who did not finish high school was a disproportionately high 23.3 percent (Table 3.58). But the rate declined sharply as their level of educational attainment improved. For those who had graduated from high school, the rate plummeted to 9.5 percent, a 13.8-percentage-point drop. For those who had finished some college work and those who had at least graduated from college, the respective rates were only 6.3 percent and 3.6 percent.

The unemployment rate for individuals 16 years old or older varied from one occupational category to another. In this report, data on occupational categories will be classified in the following seven groups, and the terms in parentheses will be used to refer to each group by one simple term: (1) executive, administrative, and managerial (managerial); (2) professional specialty (professional); (3) technical, sales, and administrative support (technical); (4) service (service); (5) precision production, craft, and repair (craft); (6) operator, fabricator, and laborer (operator); and (7) other (other). The unemployment rates for the two highest-earnings categories, managerial and professional, were each 2.4 percent and 2.6 percent respectively, only 40.0 percent or less of the overall citywide rate of 6.5 percent in 1999 (Tables 3.59 and 3.61). The rates for those in the technical category, whose average weekly earnings were slightly lower than the overall average weekly earnings, were each 5.7 percent, also lower than the overall rate, while the rate for those in the craft category, whose average earnings were also slightly lower than the overall average earnings, was 5.4 percent, lower as well than the overall rate (Table 3.61). On the other hand, the rate for those in the overall rate of 6.5 percent.

As the unemployment rate for all individuals aged 16 or over fell significantly by 2.8 percentage points, from 9.3 percent in 1996 to 6.5 percent in 1999, the rate also declined for all major industrial

## Table 3.57Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 Years and Over by Race/Ethnicity<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

Race/Ethnicity	1996	1999
All	9.3%	6.5%
White	6.2%	3.9%
Black/African American	13.0%	9.1%
Puerto Rican	13.3%	9.3%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	12.5%	8.9%
Asian	5.4%	4.3%
Native American	14.1%*	**

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

## Table 3.58 Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 25-54 by Race/Ethnicity and by Level of Educational Attainment New York City 1999

_	Educational Attainment						
Race/Ethnicity	All	Less than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	At Least College Graduate		
All	5.8%	13.4%	6.7%	5.2%	3.0%		
White	3.5%	6.5%	4.3%	4.2%	2.8%		
Black/African American	8.7%	23.3%	9.5%	6.3%	3.6%		
Puerto Rican	7.0%	16.7%	6.5%	2.8%*	**		
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	8.1%	11.8%	7.4%	6.0%	4.6%		
Asian	4.0%	6.0%	4.7%	6.0%	2.5%		
Native American	**	**	**	**	**		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

Figure 3.8 Unemployment Rates by Race/Ethnicity and by Level of Education New York City 1999



sectors (Table 3.60). Specifically, the unemployment rate for the construction industry, which was the highest of all major industrial groups in 1996, dropped by 3.9 percentage points to 9.4 percent in 1999, although it still remained the highest of all industrial groups. The rate for the durable manufacturing group plummeted by 4.6 percentage points to 6.6 percent in 1999, and the rate for the entertainment industry group was down by 4.9 percentage points to 5.6 percent in 1999. At the same time, the rate for the financial/insurance/real estate (FIRE) group, which was low in 1996 compared to the rates for most other groups, slid further by 2.3 percentage points to 3.0 percent, the lowest of any industrial group other than government, in 1999.

## **Occupational Patterns**

As in the previous section, the presentation and discussion of data on occupational categories in this section will cover only City residents aged 16 years or over in the labor force. In 1998, the average weekly earnings for full-time employed individuals were \$794 (Table 3.61). (In this section, "full-time employed individuals" means individuals aged 16 years or over in the labor force working at least 35 hours a week for 50 or more weeks a year.) The average weekly earnings were widely different for the different occupational categories to which jobs belonged. Specifically, the highest average weekly

## Table 3.59Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 Years and Over by Occupational ClassificationNew York City 1996 and 1999

Occupational Classification <sup>a</sup>	1996	1999
All	9.3%	6.5%
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	3.4%	2.4%
Professional Specialty	3.4%	2.6%
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	6.9%	5.7%
Service	7.3%	5.7%
Precision Production, Craft, & Repair	9.2%	5.4%
Operator, Fabricator, & Laborer	9.7%	8.8%
Other	31.0%	8.8%*

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

u.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, Occupational Classification System.
 since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

## Table 3.60Unemployment Rates of Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Major Industry Group<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

	Unemployr	Absolute Change	
Major Industry Group	1996	1999	1996-99
All	9.3%	6.5%	-2.8%
Agriculture <sup>a</sup>	19.8%*	**	-19.8%
Construction	13.3%	9.4%	-3.9%
Manufacturing: Non-Durables	9.2%	7.6%	-1.6%
Manufacturing: Durables	11.2%	6.6%	-4.6%
Transportation	4.5%	4.4%	-0.1%
Wholesale Trade	6.8%	4.3%	-2.5%
Retail Trade	8.9%	7.9%	-1.0%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	5.3%	3.0%	-2.3%
Business Services	7.5%	6.3%	-1.2%
Personal Services	6.7%	4.3%	-2.4%
Entertainment	10.5%	5.6%	-4.9%
Professional Services	4.3%	3.4%	-0.9%
Government	3.0%	2.4%	-0.6%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Mainly employment in landscaping.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

=

#### Table 3.61 Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force by Race Ethnicity and Average Weekly Earnings of Individuals Working at Least 35 Hours per Week 50 Weeks or More by Occupational Classification New York City 1999

		Race/Ethnicity							
Occupational <sup>a</sup> Classification	1998 Average Weekly Earnings <sup>b</sup>	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American	
All	\$794	100.0%	41.3%	24.0%	8.3%	16.2%	9.8%	0.4%	
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	\$1,120	100.0%	59.3%	15.5%	6.8%	7.0%	10.9%	0.5%	
Professional Specialty	\$1,096	100.0%	61.9%	17.7%	4.2%	6.8%	9.0%	0.4%	
Technical, Sales, Administrative Support	\$747	100.0%	42.1%	25.7%	8.6%	13.4%	9.8%	0.5%	
Service	\$509	100.0%	23.3%	33.0%	10.7%	23.8%	8.9%	0.3%*	
Precision Production, Craft, & Repair	\$708	100.0%	42.5%	20.0%	8.9%	19.6%	8.8%	**	
Operator, Fabricator, & Laborer	\$508	100.0%	19.2%	23.9%	10.0%	33.5%	13.0%	0.4%*	
Other	\$561	100.0%	37.7%	41.1%	11.7%*	**	**	**	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, Occupational Classification System.

b Includes self-employment income.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

earnings were \$1,120 for those in the managerial category, followed by \$1,096 for those in the professional category. The average weekly earnings for the technical and craft categories were \$747 and \$708 respectively, while, for the service and operator categories, they were \$509 and \$508 respectively.

In 1999, a little more than three in ten individuals aged 16 or older who were in the labor force worked in the two best-paid occupational categories of managerial (13.0 percent) or professional (18.3

percent) (Table 3.62). Another three in ten had jobs in the technical category, while one in five worked in the service category. The remaining one in five earned their incomes by working in either the craft category or the operator category.

	Race/Ethnicity								
Occupational <sup>a</sup> Classification	All	White	Black/ African American	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	13.0%	18.5%	8.5%	10.8%	5.7%	14.3%	15.8%		
Professional Specialty	18.3%	27.1%	13.6%	9.4%	7.7%	16.7%	19.1%		
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	30.0%	30.3%	32.4%	31.5%	24.9%	29.6%	36.2%		
Service	19.6%	11.0%	27.3%	25.8%	28.9%	17.7%	12.4%*		
Precision Production, Craft & Repair	7.3%	7.5%	6.1%	7.9%	8.9%	6.5%	**		
Operator, Fabricator, & Laborer	11.5%	5.3%	11.5%	14.0%	23.8%	15.1%	12.2%*		
Other	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	0.6%*	**	**	**		

#### Table 3.62 Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force by Occupational Classification and by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, Occupational Classification System.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

Substantially more whites in the City were employed in one of the two highest-earning categories of managerial or professional, while fewer of them had jobs in the lowest-earning categories of service or operator, compared to the equivalent proportions of all individuals in the respective categories (Table 3.62). Specifically, close to half of whites had jobs in either the managerial (18.5 percent) or professional (27.1 percent) categories. On the other hand, more blacks had jobs in the service category (27.3 percent), and fewer blacks had jobs in the managerial (8.5 percent) or professional (13.6 percent) categories. The occupational pattern of Puerto Ricans was very similar to that of blacks, except that fewer Puerto Ricans

were employed in the professional category (9.4 percent). More non-Puerto Rican Hispanics had jobs in the operator category (23.8 percent), even substantially more than the comparable proportions of blacks and Puerto Ricans, while considerably smaller proportions than those of blacks had jobs in the managerial (5.7 percent), professional (7.7 percent), and technical (24.9 percent) categories. The occupational pattern of Asians resembled that of all individuals.

There was no substantial change in the occupational patterns of New Yorkers' employment between 1996 and 1999, except that slightly more New Yorkers had jobs in one of the two best-paid categories, professional or managerial, and slightly fewer had jobs in the lowest-paid category, laborer, in 1999 (Table 3.63). In 1999, compared to the occupational distribution of all individuals, fewer individuals in renter households had jobs in the managerial category (11.0 percent), while more were employed in the service category (22.2 percent). On the other hand, more individuals in owner households worked in the top three highest-earning occupational categories of managerial (16.7 percent), professional (20.5 percent), and technical (31.2 percent), while fewer had jobs in the two lowest-earnings categories of service (14.7 percent) and operator (8.1 percent).

	Tenure							
	All		Renters		Owners			
Occupational Classification <sup>a</sup>	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999		
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Executive, Administrative, Managerial	12.5%	13.0%	10.9%	11.0%	15.7%	16.7%		
Professional Specialty	17.3%	18.3%	15.7%	17.1%	20.5%	20.5%		
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	29.8%	30.0%	28.7%	29.3%	31.8%	31.2%		
Service	19.9%	19.6%	22.8%	22.2%	14.3%	14.7%		
Precision Production, Craft, & Repair	7.6%	7.3%	6.8%	6.7%	9.0%	8.5%		
Operator, Fabricator, & Laborer	12.6%	11.5%	14.8%	13.2%	8.3%	8.1%		
Other	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%		

Table 3.63
Distribution of Individuals Age 16 and Over in the Labor Force
by Occupational Classification by Tenure
New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, Occupational Classification System.

Note:
Between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of individuals in renter households who had jobs in the professional category increased slightly, while their proportion in the operator category declined (Table 3.63). At the same time, the occupational distribution of individuals in owner households remained constant, without any major changes.

Compared to the occupational distribution of all individuals in the City, fewer individuals in the Bronx participated in the two highest-earning categories of managerial (9.1 percent) and professional (11.6 percent), while more worked in the two lowest-earning categories of service (26.8 percent) and operator (13.7 percent) (Table 3.64). As was the case in the Bronx, of individuals in Brooklyn, fewer had jobs in the managerial (9.5 percent) and professional (15.7 percent) categories, and more worked in the operator category (14.0 percent). Contrarily to these distributions in the Bronx and Brooklyn, substantially more individuals in Manhattan had jobs in the managerial (18.6 percent) or professional (30.4 percent) categories. Distributions of individuals in Queens and Staten Island were in general parity with the overall distribution of all individuals in the City, except for the following differences: fewer individuals in Queens had jobs in the professional category (13.1 percent), and slightly more had jobs in the craft (9.1 percent) and operator (12.8 percent) categories; in Staten Island, slightly more individuals

	Borough					
Occupational						Staten
Classification <sup>a</sup>	All	<b>Bron</b> x <sup>b</sup>	Brooklyn	<b>Manhattan<sup>b</sup></b>	Queens	Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Executive, Managerial, Administrative	13.0%	9.1%	9.5%	18.6%	13.0%	14.3%
Professional Specialty	18.3%	11.6%	15.7%	30.4%	13.1%	18.3%
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	30.0%	30.5%	31.0%	26.7%	30.9%	33.9%
Service	19.6%	26.8%	21.1%	13.8%	20.7%	16.1%
Precision Production, Craft & Repair	7.3%	7.9%	8.3%	3.2%	9.1%	10.1%
Operator, Fabricator, & Laborer	11.5%	13.7%	14.0%	6.9%	12.8%	6.5%
Other	0.4%	0.3%*	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.8%*

Table 3.64
Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force
by Occupational Classification and by Borough
New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population, Occupational Classification System.

b Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

had jobs in the managerial (14.3 percent), technical (33.9 percent), and craft (10.1 percent) categories, and fewer had jobs in the service (16.1 percent) and operator (6.5 percent) categories.

As the analysis of the relationship between the level of educational attainment and labor force participation rate or unemployment rate suggests, an analysis of the relationship between the level of educational attainment and occupational distribution also illustrates the importance of higher educational attainment levels in getting jobs in higher-earning occupational categories. Of all individuals aged 16 years or older in the labor force, 15.2 percent had not graduated from high school, while 26.6 percent had finished only high school. At the same time, 21.0 percent had completed some college work, while 37.1 percent had graduated at least from college (Table 3.65). Compared to this general educational distribution of all individuals 16 years old or older in the labor force, those individuals in the top two highest-earnings occupational categories had significantly higher levels of educational attainment. Only 3.5 percent and 1.3 percent respectively of individuals in these two categories did not finish high school. At the same time, 13.4 percent and 5.5 percent respectively of individuals in these two categories did not finish high school. At the same time, 13.4 percent and 5.5 percent respectively of individuals in these two categories had graduated at least from

	Educational Attainment					
Occupational Classification <sup>a</sup>	All	Less Than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	College Graduate	17 Years or More
All	100.0%	15.2%	26.6%	21.0%	19.5%	17.6%
Executive, Managerial, Administrative	100.0%	3.5%	13.4%	20.2%	33.7%	29.2%
Professional Specialty	100.0%	1.3%	5.5%	13.6%	32.5%	46.9%
Technical, Sales, and Administrative Support	100.0%	9.5%	28.7%	29.2%	20.4%	12.2%
Service	100.0%	27.4%	39.3%	20.1%	8.3%	5.0%
Precision Production, Craft & Repair	100.0%	21.7%	41.8%	20.2%	10.1%	6.3%
Operator, Fabricator, & Laborer	100.0%	36.0%	38.6%	14.9%	7.3%	3.2%
Other	100.0%	30.2%	29.9%	21.4%	11.6%*	**

Table 3.65
Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force
by Occupational Classification and by Level of Educational Attainmen
New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Occupational Classification System.

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

college. Of individuals who had jobs in the technical category, only 9.5 percent had not finished high school. However, of individuals in the relatively lower-earning occupational categories, the proportions of those who had not finished high school were very high, while the proportions of those who had graduated at least from college were very low. Of individuals in the service and craft categories, the proportions of individuals who had not finished high school were 27.4 percent and 21.7 percent respectively. On the other hand, the proportions of individuals in these two categories who had graduated at least from college were only 13.3 percent and 16.4 percent respectively. The levels of educational attainment for individuals who had jobs in the operator category, which was one of the two lowest-earning categories, were the lowest: 36.0 percent had not finished high school, while only 10.5 percent had graduated at least from college.

#### Employment by Major Industry Groups

The proportional distribution of City residents' employment by industrial groups in 1999 was very similar to what it had been three years earlier, without any significant changes. In 1999, as in 1996, professional services, the largest industry in the City, employed 29.3 percent of the employed individuals in the City, or close to a million people. The second-largest industry, retail trade, employed 14.1 percent of the City's employed individuals, or 461,000 people (the wholesale trade industry employed 3.3 percent of the City's employed individuals, or another 108,000 people). The financial/insurance/real estate (FIRE) industry, the third largest industry, employed 10.7 percent of the City's workers, or another 350,000 people (Table 3.66). In addition, one in eight of the City's employed individuals worked in either business services (8.0 percent) or professional services (4.5 percent). One in ten worked in transportation, while another close to one in ten had jobs in the durable (2.8 percent) or non-durable (5.6 percent) manufacturing industries. The proportion of individuals employed in construction or government<sup>15</sup> was 4.5 percent each, while the proportion in entertainment was 2.7 percent.

Compared to the overall employment patterns by industry groups, the proportions of whites employed in the categories of professional services (31.0 percent), financial/insurance/real estate (12.6 percent), and entertainment (4.2 percent) were higher, while their proportions in non-durable manufacturing (4.9 percent) and retail trade (11.0 percent) were lower (Table 3.67). A disproportionately large number of blacks had jobs in professional services (35.5 percent), and a larger proportion also worked in transportation (11.9 percent). On the other hand, relatively smaller proportions of blacks worked in durable (1.4 percent) or non-durable (3.4 percent) manufacturing or in retail trade (11.7 percent). The employment pattern of Puerto Ricans by industrial category mirrored the overall pattern, except that a relatively larger proportion of Puerto Ricans had jobs in government (6.5 percent), the largest proportion, in fact, of any racial and ethnic group.

The employment pattern by industrial category for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics was significantly different from the overall pattern as well as from that of other racial and ethnic groups. Almost a quarter had jobs in retail trade (24.1 percent), the largest proportion of any racial and ethnic group; and close to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Professionals employed by government entities--such as municipal hospitals and public schools--are categorized in the industry group of Professional Services rather than Government.

one in six worked in durable (5.5 percent) or non-durable (9.9 percent) manufacturing, again the largest proportion of any racial and ethnic group (Table 3.67). On the other hand, compared to the overall pattern, relatively smaller proportions worked in transportation (7.7 percent), FIRE (6.3 percent), or government (1.6 percent), the lowest proportion of any racial and ethnic group. Asians' employment pattern by industrial group was roughly consistent with the overall pattern, except that, as was the case for non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, relatively large proportions worked in retail trade (20.4 percent) or non-durable manufacturing (9.2 percent), while smaller proportions worked in professional services (21.4 percent) or government (2.2 percent).

		2			
	199	6	199	<b>9</b> <sup>a</sup>	Absolute
Major Industry Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Change in Percent
All	2,595,529	100.0%	3,271,780	100.0%	
Agriculture <sup>b</sup>	5,108	0.2%	6,081	0.2%	0.0%
Construction	105,999	4.4%	146,372	4.5%	+0.1%
Manufacturing: Non-Durables	149,467	6.2%	184,395	5.6%	-0.6%
Manufacturing: Durables	67,382	2.8%	92,514	2.8%	0.0%
Transportation	235,481	9.8%	320,416	9.8%	0.0%
Wholesale Trade	65,830	2.7%	108,246	3.3%	+0.6%
Retail Trade	340,797	14.2%	460,680	14.1%	-0.1%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	256,594	10.7%	349,563	10.7%	0.0%
Business Services	175,810	7.3%	262,507	8.0%	+0.7%
Personal Services	115,926	4.8%	147,038	4.5%	-0.3%
Entertainment	54,878	2.3%	89,456	2.7%	+0.4%
Professional Services	715,192	29.7%	957,882	29.3%	-0.4%
Government <sup>c</sup>	118,320	4.9%	146,629	4.5%	-0.4%
Not Reported <sup>a</sup>	188,745				

Table 3.66 Number and Distribution of Employed Individuals Aged 16 and Over by Major Industry Group New York City 1996 and 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993 and 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Industrial Classification System.

Unlike 1996, in 1999 the Census Bureau allocated labor force status and major industrial group where it was not reported. Mainly employment in landscaping.

c Professionals employed by government entities, such as municipal hospitals and public schools, are categorized in the industry group, Professional Services, rather than Government.

Notes:

The pattern of educational attainment of resident workers for each industry was not consistent with the overall pattern of all resident workers. Compared to the overall pattern, City individuals employed in construction had the lowest level of educational attainment: two-thirds had finished only high school or less (Table 3.68). Individuals who had jobs in retail and wholesale trade or personal services also had lower levels of educational attainment: about six in ten in each category had completed only high school or less. Individuals working in the durable or non-durable manufacturing categories had

INEW FORK City 1999							
				Race/Ethni	city		
Major Industrial Group	All	White	Black	Puerto Rican	Non- Puerto Rican Hispanic	Asian	Native American
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Agriculture	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%*	**	**	**	**
Construction	4.7%	4.9%	4.5%	4.3%	5.2%	3.6%	**
Manufacturing: Non-Durables	5.8%	4.9%	3.4%	5.0%	9.9%	9.2%	**
Manufacturing: Durables	2.9%	2.7%	1.4%	3.2%	5.5%	2.6%	**
Transportation	9.7%	9.0%	11.9%	10.2%	7.7%	10.5%	16.5%
Wholesale Trade	3.3%	3.3%	2.1%	3.6%	3.8%	4.8%	**
Retail Trade	14.5%	11.0%	11.7%	14.6%	24.1%	20.4%	15.2%
Finance/Insurance/ Real Estate	10.5%	12.6%	9.6%	10.9%	6.3%	10.1%	8.1%*
<b>Business Services</b>	8.1%	8.4%	7.4%	7.7%	8.7%	8.0%	14.4%
Personal Services	4.5%	3.2%	4.9%	3.8%	6.9%	5.6%	**
Entertainment	2.8%	4.2%	1.5%	2.1%	2.0%	1.5%	**
Professional Services	28.8%	31.0%	35.5%	28.0%	18.2%	21.4%	29.7%
Government	4.4%	4.5%	6.1%	6.5%	1.6%	2.2%	**

## Table 3.67 Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force by Major Industrial Group and by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

lower levels of educational attainment as well: more than half had finished only high school or less. On the other hand, individuals who had jobs in entertainment or professional services had higher educational attainment levels: more than half had at least received college degrees. Individuals employed in the FIRE or government categories also had relatively higher levels of educational attainment: more than seven in ten had finished at least some college work. Also, residents who had jobs in the transportation category had higher than average levels of educational attainment: six in ten had finished high school or had done some college work.

New Tork City 1999						
_		L	evel of Education	al Attainm	ent	
Major Industrial Group	All	Less Than 12 Years	High School Graduate	13-15 Years	College Graduate	17 Years or More
All	100.0%	15.2%	26.6%	21.0%	19.5%	17.6%
Agriculture	100.0%	27.2%*	17.1%*	**	20.0%*	22.9%*
Construction	100.0%	25.2%	40.8%	18.1%	9.6%	6.4%
Manufacturing: Non-Durables	100.0%	29.0%	25.1%	13.6%	19.2%	13.0%
Manufacturing: Durables	100.0%	26.8%	25.7%	15.3%	17.4%	14.7%
Transportation	100.0%	11.4%	34.0%	27.4%	16.3%	10.9%
Wholesale Trade	100.0%	15.8%	36.3%	14.7%	21.7%	11.4%
Retail Trade	100.0%	26.3%	33.8%	19.7%	13.6%	6.6%
Finance/Insurance/ Real Estate	100.0%	5.6%	22.8%	23.1%	29.0%	19.5%
<b>Business Services</b>	100.0%	13.4%	27.6%	22.5%	22.5%	14.0%
Personal Services	100.0%	24.8%	38.2%	17.7%	12.4%	6.9%
Entertainment	100.0%	8.8%	18.0%	19.4%	28.5%	25.3%
Professional Services	100.0%	8.3%	18.7%	21.3%	21.0%	30.6%
Government	100.0%	4.2%	20.4%	28.9%	24.8%	21.7%

### Table 3.68 Distribution of Individuals Aged 16 and Over in the Labor Force by Major Industrial Group and by Level of Educational Attainment New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

\* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few individuals to report.

## 4 New York City's Housing Inventory

#### Introduction

This chapter opens with a discussion of the number and composition of housing units, in terms of tenure category (whether they are rental or owner units) and occupancy (whether they are occupied or vacant). But there is another group of housing units not covered in the above tenure and occupancy categories. This residual category is comprised of vacant units not available for sale or rent for various reasons; consequently, these units cannot be classified by tenure. In the first part of this chapter, temporal net changes and comparisons of the number of housing units in each of the above three categories of the housing stock in the City as a whole over the years will be discussed. Reasons for the unavailability of vacant-unavailable units will be analyzed in detail in Chapter 5, "Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates."

The chapter will then cover components of inventory change. The inventory gains and loses units, adjusting to market and non-market conditions. Thus, the size of the housing inventory is a net result of additions and losses in the various components of the inventory, and net changes in the inventory over time are cumulative consequences of different gross changes in different components of the inventory. A detailed analysis of gross changes in the inventory, the numbers and characteristics of housing units added to and removed from the inventory as they have evolved to 1999, will provide insight into the causes and/or sources of net increases or decreases in the housing inventory. It will also add to understanding of how the City's housing market and public policies have adjusted to or caused changes in the supply of and demand and need for housing services.

The next part of the chapter will present and analyze the marginal variations in recent patterns and trends important to the housing requirements of households in the City. The change in the total inventory will be discussed by tenure, occupancy, location, building structure class, building size, and unit size. The change in the rental housing inventory will be analyzed by rent-regulation status, in addition to the characteristics by which the total inventory is analyzed. Then, the change in the housing inventory in cooperatives and condominiums will be analyzed in detail. The number of rental units in such buildings can change to reflect changes in rental housing market or owner housing market situations, since the tenure of housing units in cooperatives and condominiums can change from rental to owner and vice versa, as witnessed by the fact that the number of rental units in cooperatives and condominiums has changed considerably in recent years. Next, the owner housing inventory will be discussed by the following additional issues not covered in the analysis of the total housing inventory: changes in the ownership rate, owner units by year of home purchase, and owner units by estimated current value and purchase price. The last portion of the chapter will present and analyze data on housing units accessible to physically disabled persons.

## Size of the Housing Inventory

The 1999 Housing and Vacancy Survey reports that the total inventory of residential units in New York City in 1999 was over 3 million for the first time (Table 4.1). Housing units created in the City were at a very low ebb in the two-year period between 1991 and 1993, when there was no appreciable change in the number of residential accommodations. But in the next three years, the housing inventory began to grow, as the total number of housing units increased by 18,000, from 2,977,000 to 2,995,000 in 1996. In the following three years, the inventory increased by 44,000 units, to 3,039,000 in 1999, a back-to-back increase.

The 1999 HVS data on the number and composition of housing units by tenure and occupancy show that the net increase of 44,000 housing units in the City between 1996 and 1999 was the net result of an outpacing increase in the total number of units in the owner sector, which substantially compensated for the decrease in the rental sector and in the vacant-unavailable sector (Table 4.1). During the three-year period, the total number of owner units, occupied and vacant together, increased markedly by 74,000, or by 8.7 percent, while the total number of rental units, occupied and vacant together, decreased by 10,000 units. At the same time, the total number of units that were vacant and not available for sale or rent decreased substantially by 21,000, or by 19.2 percent. However, rental units still accounted for the preponderant majority of the overall housing stock in the City in 1999. Of all 3,039,000 housing units in the City in 1999, 66.4 percent were rental units and 30.7 percent were owner units, while the remaining 2.9 percent were vacant units that were unavailable for sale or rent (Figure 4.1).

The net decrease of 10,000 rental units in the three years between 1996 and 1999 resulted from the combination of the decrease in vacant rental units and the increase in occupied rental units. In the three years, the number of vacant rental units decreased by 17,000, or by 20.7 percent, while the number of occupied rental units increased by only 7,000 (Table 4.1). On the other hand, as the number of owner units increased, the utilization of these units also increased. In the same three years, the number of occupied owner units increased by 81,000, or by 9.7 percent, while the number of vacant owner units decreased by 7,000. As a result, the total number of owner units amounted to 932,000, with a net increase of 74,000 units.

According to the Census 2000, there were 3,201,000 housing units in the City in 2000, or 162,000 more units than the number reported from the 1999 HVS (Table 4.2). As explained in Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households," the difference is not just because of the one year's difference in time between the two surveys; there are the following reasons as well. First, the term "housing unit" is defined differently for the two surveys. For the 1999 HVS, which was based on the 1990 census, the U.S. Bureau of the Census defined a housing unit as a house, apartment, single room, or group of rooms occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters were those in which the occupants lived and ate separately from any other persons in the building and which had direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. For vacant units, the criteria of separateness

	199	1	199	33	199	6	199	6	Change	1996-1999
Inventory	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Housing Units	2,980,762	100.0%	2,976,837	100.0%	2,995,276	100.0%	3,038,796	100.0%	+43,520	+1.5%
<b>Total Rental Units</b>	2,028,303	68.0%	2,040,470	68.5%	2,027,421	67.7%	2,017,701	66.4%	-9,720	-0.5%
Renter-Occupied	1,951,576	65.5%	1,970,355	66.2%	1,946,165	65.0%	1,953,289	64.3%	+7,124	+0.4%
Vacant for Rent	76,727	2.6%	70,115	2.4%	81,256	2.7%	64,412	2.1%	-16,844	-20.7%
<b>Total Owner Units</b>	858,108	28.8%	825,329	27.7%	857,765	28.6%	932,123	30.7%	+74,358	+8.7%
Owner-Occupied	829,135	27.8%	804,870	27.0%	834,183	27.8%	915,126	30.1%	+80,943	+9.7%
Vacant for Sale	28,973	1.0%	20,459	0.7%	23,581	0.8%	16,997	0.6%	-6,584	-27.9%
Total Vacant Units Not Available for Sale or Rent	94,351	3.2%	111,038	3.7%	110,090	3.7%	88,973	2.9%	-21,117	-19.2%
Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Cens	sus, 1991, 1993,	1996 and 199	9 New York Cit	y Housing and	Vacancy Survey	<i>i</i>				

Size and Composition of the Housing Inventory by Tenure, Occupancy Status, and Availability New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999 Table 4.1





Table 4.2Differences in Number of Housing Units1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey and Decennial 2000 Census<br/>New York City

		_	Difference 1999 HVS and	e between 1 2000 Census
Borough	1999 HVS	2000 Census	Number	Percent
All	3,038,796	3,200,912	162,116	5.3%
Bronx	449,271	490,659	41,388	9.2%
Brooklyn	868,708	930,866	62,158	7.2%
Manhattan	782,052	798,144	16,092	2.1%
Queens	786,072	817,250	31,178	4.0%
Staten Island	152,694	163,993	11,299	7.4%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey and 2000 Census.

and direct access were applied to the intended occupants. The Census Bureau modified the housing unit definition for the Census 2000 by removing the requirement that occupants had to eat separately in order for the living quarters to be considered a housing unit. Under the new definition, a small number of living quarters not previously considered housing units were counted as housing units in the Census 2000. For the HVS, housing units in "special places" are considered beyond the scope of the survey. Special places include transient hotels, rooming and boarding houses, prisons, dormitories, and nursing homes.<sup>1</sup> In the Census 2000, all housing units were counted. The second reason for the difference is that the City provided the Census Bureau with more than 370,000 housing unit addresses that were added during the 1990 decade or missed in the 1990 census, as mentioned in Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households," of this report. Third, the Census Bureau made an effort to find and count every housing unit and to reduce the undercount in 2000. The 1999 HVS sample was originally selected from the 1990 census, where the undercount was higher, and the weighting for the HVS used estimates based on the 1990 census. Finally, for the HVS, data were collected by survey interviewers, while, for the Census 2000, data were primarily gathered by mail. Moreover, the HVS is a sample survey--that is, only households in the selected sample were interviewed--while the census is a complete count of all people and housing units in the City. A confluence of the preceding reasons makes the HVS count of housing units different from the Census 2000 count. The first three reasons, and particularly the second, make the count of housing units greater in the Census 2000 than in the 1999 HVS.

## **Components of Inventory Change**

The housing inventory in the City is not only vast in its number, it is also diverse in its sources of change. As previously indicated, the 1999 HVS reports a net inventory increase of 44,000 units during the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, or an increase of 15,000 units per year, the largest increase since 1991. The net increase in the total number of housing units is the outcome of variations between gross additions to and gross losses from each component of the inventory over the period between the two survey years. Thus, by carefully observing gross changes in each of the components of the inventory, we can gain important insights into how changes in each of the components result in the net change and in the total number of housing units in the City. The components are of two categories: first, **additions** to the stock through units newly constructed or gut-rehabilitated, conversions from non-residential to residential use, returned losses (previously lost units that have returned to the active housing inventory), and conversions within the residential sector (such as larger units broken up into smaller units); and, second, **gross losses** from the stock through merging smaller units into larger ones, conversion of residential units to non-residential use, demolition, condemnation, boarded-up/burned-out units, and other losses through market and non-market mechanisms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For a complete definition of a housing unit, see Appendix B, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary." For information on living quarters excluded from the 1999 and previous HVSs, see Appendix D, "1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design, Estimation Procedure, Accuracy Statement, and Topcoding."

#### Additions to the Stock

The 1999 HVS reports that, over the three years between 1996 and 1999, 87,000 housing units, or 29,000 per year, were added to the inventory (Table 4.3). Gross additions to the housing inventory in the City have increased since the early 1990s. Yearly gross additions were about 12,000 for the period between June 1991 and May 1993<sup>2</sup> and about 18,000 for the period between June 1993 and May 1996. However, for the period between June 1996 and May 1999, the yearly gross additions were about 29,000. This is 2.4 times the annual gross addition for the 1991-1993 period and 1.6 times the annual gross

Components of Change <sup>a</sup>	1984-1987 <sup>d</sup>	1993-1996	1996-1999
Actual inventory at beginning of the period	2,803,000	2,977,000	2,995,000
Gross Additions to the Stock:	+79,000	+54,000	+87,000
New construction	27,000	16,000	21,000
Conversions (from non-residential to residential use and within the residential sector)	9,000	7,000	5,000
Returning losses	43,000	30,000 <sup>b</sup>	34,000 <sup>b</sup>
Other Additions <sup>c</sup>		1,000	27,000
Gross Losses from the Stock:	-41,000	-36,000	-43,000
Actual Inventory at end of period	2,840,000	2,995,000	3,039,000
Net Change:	+37,000	+18,000	+44,000

#### Table 4.3 **Components of Inventory Change** New York City 1984-1987, 1993-1996 and 1996-1999

Sources: Data for 1984-1987 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey; data for 1993-1996 and 1996-1999 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

Because the 1991 HVS used a new sample based on the 1990 census, it was not possible to identify new losses for the а period between 1987 and 1991. This number only includes units that were in the 1990 decennial census and were lost and returned to the inventory

b since the census. It does not include units lost prior to 1990 that were returned after the census.

Other additions identifies units that were not in the housing inventory at the time of the 1990 decennial census but were с added by means not measured by new construction or conversions. This would include the decoupling of units in which units are added to the inventory and the rehabilitation of buildings, which results in more units than were there before. It also reflects changes made to the methodology used to develop "control" estimates between the 1993, 1996 and 1999 surveys. These estimates are developed independently of the survey and are used to control for under or over coverage of housing units in the survey.

d Numbers may not add up to the total due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

addition for the 1993-1996 period. Almost four in ten of the additions for the 1996-1999 period came from returned losses (34,000 units), while about a quarter came from newly constructed units (21,000 units). At the same time, a little more than a third came from either conversions within the residential sector or from the non-residential to the residential sector (5.7 percent or 5,000 units) or from other additions (31.0 percent or 27,000 units). According to the Census Bureau, "other additions" identifies units that were not in the housing inventory at the time of the 1990 decennial census but that were added by means not measured by new construction, conversions, or other methods used in the HVS to identify new units. This includes the decoupling of once merged larger units into smaller ones, by which units are added to the inventory, and the rehabilitation of buildings, which results in more units than there were before. The term also reflects changes made to the methodology used to develop "control" estimates between the 1993, 1996, and 1999 surveys. These estimates are developed independently of the survey and are used to control for under- or over-coverage of housing units in the survey.

#### **Returning Losses**

For many years in New York City, the change in the size of the housing supply has been significantly determined by the level of new housing losses and the level of returned losses, rather than by the level of newly constructed units.

Since the 1975-1978 period, when the HVS for the first time provided data on returning losses (previously lost units that had returned to the active housing inventory), returning losses have accounted for the largest single source of all additions to the housing stock in New York City. The number of previously lost units that have returned to the inventory through gut-rehabilitation or changes in use or physical characteristics has always been much higher than the number of newly constructed units for all HVS survey periods in the City. Specifically, the number of returned units in the 1996-1999 period was 34,000, or 1.6 times the 21,000 newly constructed units the 1999 HVS reports for the same period (Table 4.3). Proportionately, this is equivalent to more than nine in ten units lost from the housing inventory in the previous three-year period between 1993 and 1996.

In addition to data on returning losses from the 1999 HVS, the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses, which is a separate, independent survey from the main 1999 HVS, estimates that an additional 10,000 units lost between 1970 and 1987 and not returned through 1987, as the 1987 HVS reports, were returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999 through various return mechanisms, such as gut-rehabilitation, subdivision, or conversion from non-residential to residential units (Table 4.4).<sup>3</sup>

Due to the longitudinal nature of the HVS, from 1975 to 1987, the Census Bureau was able to provide an estimate of units that had been classified as "lost from the housing inventory" in a prior survey year and subsequently returned to the inventory up to the 1987 survey year. However, for the 1991 HVS, a new sample was selected from the 1990 census, and an estimate of returning losses from 1987 to 1991 was not available as part of the 1991 HVS. Therefore, in order to provide a measure of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> These units were probably counted in the Census 2000, as the City provided the Census Bureau with 370,000 additional housing unit addresses.

#### Table 4.4 Units Returned from 1987 Inventory Losses by Occupancy Status New York City 1996-1999

1998 Status	Units Still Lost by 1996	Percent
All <sup>a</sup>	62,018	100.0%
Units Returned <sup>b</sup>	10,357	16.7%
Occupied	4,217	6.8%
Vacant	*	*
Occupancy status unknown	5,601	9.0%
Continuing Losses	51,661	83.3%
Construction on Site	3,412	5.5%
All Other Continuing Losses	48,249	77.8%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey--Survey of Returning Losses. Notes:

a Number rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

b The number of units which were classified as lost to the inventory in the 1987 HVS and which were returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999 according to the 1999 HVS--Survey of Returning Losses.

\* Too few to report.

how many units returned to the inventory between 1987 and 1991, the Census Bureau, by carrying out the 1991 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses, observed all units classified as "lost from the housing inventory" by the 1987 HVS to determine their status as of December 1990. Similarly, the Census Bureau conducted the 1993 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses to provide a measure of returning losses in 1993 by returning to lost units from the 1987 HVS, which were classified in December 1990 as still "lost from the housing inventory." Again, to evaluate the number and characteristics of units lost from the housing inventory from the 1987 HVS that remained lost from the inventory based on the results of the 1993 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses, the Census Bureau conducted the 1996 and 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses.

None of the returned units that the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses found were covered in any components of the housing inventory estimated by the main 1999 HVS because they were not part of the housing inventory in the 1990 decennial census, which was the primary source for the sample used for the 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 HVSs; nor were they included in the lists of new constructions and conversions from which the remaining sample was drawn.

When the number of returned units from the 1999 HVS is combined with the number of returned units from the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses, the total number of returned units is 44,000, more than double the number of newly constructed units between 1996 and 1999 that the 1999 HVS reports.

Units Returned <sup>a</sup>
34,000
100.0%
6.0%
13.2%
14.4%
59.5%
4.9%*
**

#### Table 4.5 1996 Status of Units Returned to the Inventory in 1999 New York City

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Number rounded to the nearest thousand. Percentages are computed from unrounded numbers.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

Based on the 1996 status of units returned between 1996 and 1999 that the main 1999 HVS reports, 24.1 percent of the 34,000 units returned between 1996 and 1999, from the main 1999 HVS, were either vacant, boarded-up/burned-out (13.2 percent) or condemned or undergoing renovation (10.9 percent). Thus, it is reasonable to infer that only 24.1 percent, or about 8,000, of the 34,000 returned units could have been returned through gut-rehabilitation, major renovation, or other housing-creation mechanisms, rather than the decoupling of once-merged units, which provided 59.5 percent of the City's returning losses (Table 4.5). In the meantime, 70.0 percent of the 10,000 returned units that were lost between 1970 and 1987 and not returned through 1987 but returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999 were either vacant, boarded-up/burned-out (42.0 percent) or in the process of rehabilitation or construction (28.0 percent) in 1996. Therefore, 70.0 percent, or 7,000, of the 10,000 returned units from the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses were likely to have been returned through rehabilitation or new construction, rather than through decoupling (Table 4.6). Combining the 21,000 newly constructed units and the 15,000 units returned (8,000 units plus 7,000), a total of 36,000 units were added to the housing inventory through rehabilitation or new construction.

## Table 4.61996 Status of Units Returned from 1987 Inventory Losses to the Inventory in 1999New York City

1996 Status	Units Returned <sup>a</sup>
All (Number) <sup>b</sup>	10,000
All (Percent)	100.0%
Rehabilitation or construction in progress	28.0%
Vacant, boarded-up/burned-out	42.0%
Conversion to non-residential	16.8%*
Merged	9.7%*
Special place/Transient hotel	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey--Survey of Returning Losses. Notes:

a Number rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

b The number of units which were classified as lost to the inventory in the 1987 HVS and which were returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999 according to the 1999 HVS--Survey of Returning Losses. The survey was completed in December 1998.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report

During the same period of time as that between the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, HPD created 9,574 affordable units through new construction and gut-rehabilitation programs.<sup>4</sup> In addition, 12,666 new units were constructed through HPD's tax incentive programs (421A and 421B).<sup>5</sup> Altogether, 22,240 units were created with HPD's assistance. This is 61.8 percent of the 36,000 units added to the City's housing inventory by rehabilitation, new construction, or other housing-creation mechanisms (excluding decoupling) over the three years. In other words, about six in ten of the new units created through rehabilitation or new construction in the City over this period of time were added with HPD's assistance.

As New York City's economic boom continued in the late 1990s, the number of employed City residents increased and, consequently, household incomes rose considerably more than inflation, as discussed in Chapter 3, "Household Incomes in New York City," of this report. As a result, in the three years from 1996 to 1999, with higher incomes and lower interest rates, housing demand expanded rapidly. In other words, more households in the City had more money to purchase more and better housing services than in the previous three-year period. In response to this strong demand, many previously lost units were returned to the active housing stock through gut-rehabilitation, new construction, conversion from non-residential to residential use, or the decoupling of once merged larger units into smaller ones.

<sup>4</sup> New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Office of the Commissioner, Division of Policy and Program Analysis.

<sup>5</sup> New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Office of Development, Division of Housing Finance, Tax Incentive Program.

#### Tenure and Occupancy Status of Returned Losses

The main 1999 HVS reports that one in two units lost between 1993 and 1996 and returned between 1996 and 1999 was renter-occupied in 1999, while another three in ten were owner-occupied (Table 4.7). The proportion of returned units that were vacant in 1999 was negligible, and the proportion of returned units that were vacant-unavailable was only 6.4 percent.

The 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses does not provide data on the tenure pattern of returned units from 1987 inventory losses. According to the survey, the occupancy status of four in ten units returned between 1996 and 1999 from 1987 inventory losses was "occupied" and that of another five in ten was "unknown" (Table 4.4).

	1996 Occupancy Status	1999 Occupancy Status
Occupancy Status	New Losses <sup>a</sup>	Returned Losses <sup>a</sup>
All (Number)	43,000	34,000
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%
Owner occupied	23.3%	30.7%
Renter occupied	45.8%	51.5%
Vacant for Rent	6.2%	**
Vacant for Sale	4.3%*	**
Unavailable Vacant	14.4%	6.4%
Non-Interview	6.0%	8.6%

#### Table 4.7 New and Returned Losses by Occupancy Status New York City, 1996-1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Numbers rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

#### Location of Returned Units

The main 1999 HVS reports that four in ten units returned between 1996 and 1999 were in Brooklyn, where an equivalent proportion of units were lost during the same three years (Table 4.8). Another five in ten returned units were located in either Manhattan (28.3 percent) or Queens (20.3 percent), where a similar proportion of lost units were located (20.4 percent in Manhattan and 28.6 percent in Queens).

The locational pattern of returned losses from 1987 inventory losses was noticeably different from that of returned losses from the main 1999 HVS. According to the 1999 HVS-Survey of Returning Losses, almost half of the units returned between 1996 and 1999 from 1987 inventory losses were located in Brooklyn, while four in ten were in Manhattan (Table 4.9).

New Losses <sup>a</sup>	<b>Returned</b> Losses <sup>a</sup>
43,000	34,000
100.0%	100.0%
9.0%	8.7%
39.2%	41.6%
20.4%	28.3%
28.6%	20.3%
2.9%*	**
	New Losses <sup>a</sup> 43,000 100.0% 9.0% 39.2% 20.4% 28.6% 2.9%*

#### Table 4.8 New Losses and Returned Losses by Borough New York City 1996-1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Notes:

a Numbers rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Table 4.9 Units Returned from 1987 Inventory Losses by Borough New York City 1996-1999

Borough	Units Returned <sup>a</sup> (1996-1999) <sup>b</sup>
All (Number)	10,000
All (Percent)	100.0%
Bronx	11.3%*
Brooklyn	47.8%
Manhattan	39.4%
Queens	**
Staten Island	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey--Survey of Returning Losses. Notes:

a Number rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

b The number of units which were classified as lost to the inventory in the 1987 HVS and which were returned to the inventory between 1996 and 1999 according to the 1999 HVS--Survey of Returning Losses.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

#### Previous Status of Returned Losses

Six in ten of the returned losses between 1996 and 1999 that the main 1999 HVS reports were decoupled--that is, in 1996 they were reported to be smaller units merged into larger ones (Table 4.5). This mechanism is the source of by far the majority of lost units that were returned during the three-year period. Particularly in Brooklyn, where more than four in ten returned units in the City were located, two-thirds of the returned units were merged into larger units in 1996.<sup>6</sup> This implies that these units returned through the decoupling process and other small units could be merged in the future if the demand for larger housing units is stronger than the demand for smaller units. Another close to three in ten returned units came from units found in 1996 to be either vacant, boarded-up/burned-out units (13.2 percent) or units converted from non-residential use (14.4 percent).

The previous status of units returned between 1996 and 1999 from 1987 inventory losses was significantly different from that of units returned for the same period from 1993-1996 inventory losses. Seven in ten of the units returned between 1996 and 1999 from 1987 losses were either vacant, boarded-up/burned-out units (42.0 percent) or units in the middle of the rehabilitation or construction process (28.0 percent) in 1996 (Table 4.6). This means that most units returned between 1996 and 1999 from 1987 losses came back into the active inventory through rehabilitation or construction; and, unlike units returned from 1993-1996 losses, for the 1996-1999 period, "merged" was the previous status of only one in ten units returned from 1987 losses. In other words, 1987 losses returned between 1996 and 1999 were not the result of decoupling smaller units previously merged into larger units. Instead, they were returned through rehabilitation or new construction.

#### Newly Constructed Units (Provided by New York City's Department of City Planning)

For many years, New York City's Department of Buildings has provided the Census Bureau with data on newly constructed units, which the Census Bureau again used for the 1999 HVS, as it had done for previous HVSs. In addition, the City's Department of City Planning publishes a report on the data on newly constructed units. Recently, the Planning Department developed and used a new method and procedures to determine the number of newly constructed units and provided revised data on newly constructed units for the City as a whole and each of the five boroughs, by year. It is useful to review these data in order to understand better the number of and changes in newly constructed units in the City and each of the five boroughs in recent years.

According to data on newly constructed units provided by the City's Department of City Planning, from 1991 through 1997 the number of newly constructed residential units per year in New York City was much smaller than that in the previous five years. Between 1981 and 1985, an average of 8,539 units were constructed each year. In the following five years between 1986 and 1990, an average of 13,111 units were constructed each year (Table 4.10 and Figure 4.2). During this period, the City developed and implemented the Ten-Year Plan for creating a great number of affordable housing units. In the next four years, the number of newly constructed units averaged 7,165 per year. However, in 1998

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Year	Total	Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Staten Island
1981	8,734	396	454	4,416	1,152	2,316
1982	7,249	997	332	1,812	2,451	1,657
1983	9,021	757	1,526	2,558	2,926	1,254
1984	10,285	242	1,975	3,500	2,291	2,277
1985	7,407	557	1,301	1,739	1,871	1,939
1986	12,123	968	2,398	4,266	1,776	2,715
1987	12,757	1,177	1,735	4,197	2,347	3,301
1988	13,220	1,248	1,631	5,548	2,100	2,693
1989	14,685	847	2,098	5,979	3,560	2,201
1990	12,772	872	929	7,260	2,327	1,384
1991	7,611	656	764	2,608	1,956	1,627
1992	8,523	802	1,337	3,750	1,498	1,136
1993	5,579	886	616	1,810	801	1,466
1994	6,948	891	1,035	1,927	1,523	1,572
1995	7,874	1,148	1,647	2,798	1,013	1,268
1996	7,122	1,079	1,583	1,582	1,152	1,726
1997	6,881	1,327	1,369	816	1,578	1,791
1998	10,089	567	1,333	5,175	1,263	1,751
1999	8,937	1,218	1,025	2,341	2,119	2,234
Average Per Year						
1981-85	8,539	590	1,118	2,805	2,138	1,889
1986-90	13,111	1,022	1,758	5,450	2,422	2,459
1991-95	7,307	877	1,080	2,579	1,358	1,414
1996-99	8,257	1,048	1,328	2,479	1,528	1,876

#### Table 4.10 New Housing Construction by Borough New York City 1981-1999

Source: New York City Department of City Planning, 2001

Note: Some numbers for 1990 through 1999 are different from numbers previously published because the Department of City Planning revised them for accuracy and consistency. Housing Completions after 1989 for Manhattan were compiled from the Yale Robbins, Inc. *Residential Construction in Manhattan Newsletter* and Final Certificate of Occupancy Issued listings from the Department of Buildings. For all other boroughs the information was from Final Certificate listings only. Removal of duplicate Final Certificate of Occupancy records significantly altered housing completions for Queens for the years 1990-1999.



Figure 4.2 New Housing Completions New York City, Selected Years 1981-1999

and 1999, the number of newly constructed units in the City increased substantially, reaching 10,089 in 1998, the highest level since 1991. Particularly in Manhattan, the number of newly constructed units soared to 5,175, 6.3 times the number built a year earlier in the borough. In 1999, the number of newly constructed units in the City stood at 8,937, the second highest level since 1991. In the same year, the number of newly constructed units in the Bronx was 1,218, more than twice the number in the previous year. At the same time, in Queens and Staten Island, the numbers also increased substantially between 1998 and 1999: from 1,263 to 2,119, or an increase of 67.8 percent, in Queens; and from 1,751 to 2,234, or an increase of 27.6 percent, in Staten Island. In Manhattan, the number remained high, at 2,341 in 1999.

#### Losses from the Stock

During the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, 43,000 units, or 14,000 units annually, were lost from the active housing inventory. This is 16.7 percent higher than the annual gross loss of 12,000 for the previous three years between 1993 and 1996 (Table 4.11). However, in order to understand the meaning of this increase, sources of loss should be analyzed.

Period	Number of Units Lost <sup>a</sup>	Annual Average Lost Units <sup>a</sup>	Percent Change from Previous Period
March 1981 - March 1984	69,000	23,000	
March 1984 - March 1987	41,000	14,000	-39.1%
March 1991 - March 1993	37,000	19,000	+35.7%
March 1993 - March 1996	36,000	12,000	-36.8%
March 1996 - March 1999	43,000	14,000	+16.7%

#### Table 4.11 Gross Losses from the Inventory for Selected Periods New York City 1981-84, 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99

Sources: Data for 1981-1984 and 1984-1987 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey; data for 1991-1993, 1993-1996 and 1996-1999 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

a Numbers rounded to the nearest thousand.

#### Sources of Losses

Looking at losses by type of loss provides an insight into the sources and/or causes of losses and the potential for lost units to return to the active inventory in the future as the supply of and demand for different types of housing in different locations change. Mergers (the consolidation of smaller units into larger ones) have been the preponderate source of losses in the City. In the 1984-1987 period, 48.8 percent of losses were through mergers (Table 4.12). In the 1996-1999 period, the figure was 56.7 percent. In other words, close to six in ten losses during the latter period were through mergers. As household income has grown steadily in the City, demand for larger units has increased. As a result, activities to create larger units through the merger of smaller units into larger ones have expanded. On the other hand, if the demand for smaller units becomes greater than the demand for larger units, most of the units lost through mergers could return to the inventory through decoupling. Another 21.1 percent of losses came through units that were converted to non-residential units, such as commercial units.

The proportion of losses through units that were boarded-up/damaged by fire, usually termed "abandoned," was only one in ten for the period between 1996 and 1999, half the proportion for the previous period between 1993 and 1996. Judging from this analysis, it appears clear that the increase in losses between 1996 and 1999, compared to the previous three-year period, was primarily the result of more mergers, not abandonment. In this regard, it should be noted that HPD has developed and implemented in a structurally organized and coordinated manner comprehensive anti-abandonment policies and programs to break the cycle of abandonment. Specifically, the agency has prevented

Turne of Loop	1004 078	1001 028	1002 078	1007 00 8
Type of Loss	1964-6/	1991-93	1993-90	1990-99
All (Number)	41,000	37,000	36,000	43,000
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Demolished	9.9%	**	**	**
Condemned	2.5%*	**	**	**
Boarded-up/damaged by fire	21.1%	17.4%	20.2%	9.8%
Non-residential	16.9%	18.1%	15.1%	21.1%
Merged	48.8%	51.0%	53.7%	56.7%
Undergoing major renovation	-	3.7%*	3.0%*	**
Other	**	7.4%	4.5%*	6.3%

# Table 4.12Losses from the Inventory by Type of LossNew York City 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99

Sources: For data for 1984-1987, see Michael Stegman, *Housing and Vacancy Report, New York City, 1987*, p. 202. Data for 1991-1993, 1993-1996 and 1996-1999 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Numbers rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

abandonment through providing low-interest loans, at an early stage, to owners whose buildings are at risk of abandonment. It has also developed and conducted education programs designed to teach owners how to maintain buildings, build and keep good relationships with tenants, and manage building finances. In addition, it has expanded housing maintenance code inspections and litigation efforts and support for tenant-initiated actions. Furthermore, together with the Police Department, the Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office, and local development groups, HPD has launched the Safe at Home initiative to combat illegal drug activity and to improve neighborhood quality of life in targeted neighborhoods. All of these programs have apparently helped prevent abandonment and, thus, improve the condition of privately owned housing in the City.

#### Location of Losses

The locational pattern of housing losses in the City has not remained constant over the last three decades since 1970, when HVS data on losses became available. Instead, each borough's share of the City's housing losses has fluctuated significantly. Between 1970 and 1981, one-third of the housing losses in the City were in the Bronx, while another third were in Brooklyn and a quarter were in Manhattan (Table 4.13). However, the locational pattern in the 1970s changed substantially in the 1980s. From 1984 to 1987, Brooklyn alone experienced the largest proportion of the City's housing losses, reaching 46.3 percent of all housing units lost in the City while losses in the Bronx plummeted to only 12.8 percent. In the meantime, Queens' share of the City's housing losses almost tripled, from 6.9 percent in the 1970-

1981 period to 18.6 percent in the 1984-1987 period. Between 1991 and 1993, Brooklyn alone still experienced four in ten of the losses in the City, while the Bronx's share of losses further declined to only 9.8 percent. In the meantime, the proportion in Manhattan fell to 21.9 percent in the 1984-1987 period and then grew again to 30.6 percent in the 1991-1993 period, while the proportion in Queens declined slightly to 14.3 percent between 1991 and 1993.

In the following three years between 1993 and 1996, Brooklyn's share of the City's housing losses surged to 46.8 percent (Table 4.13). In other words, close to one in every two housing losses in the City in the three years was located in Brooklyn. In the meantime, the proportion of losses in the Bronx

Table 4.13

N	Losses ew York City 19	s from the Inv 970-81, 1984-87	entory by Boro 7, 1991-93, 1993	ough -96 and 1996-9	9
Borough	1970-81 <sup>a</sup>	<b>1984-87<sup>a</sup></b>	1991-93 <sup>a</sup>	1993-96 <sup>a</sup>	1996-99 <sup> a</sup>
All (Number)	321,000	41,000	37,000	36,000	43,000
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Bronx	33.8%	12.8%	9.8%	10.5%	9.0%
Brooklyn	32.8%	46.3%	40.2%	46.8%	39.2%
Manhattan	25.5%	21.9%	30.6%	21.8%	20.4%
Queens	6.9%	18.6%	14.3%	17.3%	28.6%
Staten Island	1.0%	**	5.0%*	3.6%*	2.9*%

Sources: For data for 1970-1981 see Michael Stegman, *The Dynamics of Rental Housing in New York City*, 1981, p. 177 and for data for 1984-1987, see Michael Stegman, *Housing and Vacancy Report, New York City*, 1987, p. 200. Data for 1991-1993, 1993-1996 and 1996-1999 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a Numbers rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

remained constant, while the proportion in Manhattan dropped to 21.8 percent. On the other hand, the proportion in Queens moved up to 17.3 percent, from 14.3 percent for the period between 1991 and 1993. In the three years between 1996 and 1999, Brooklyn still captured the largest proportion of the City's housing losses: four in every ten, while the Bronx's share dwindled further to only fewer than one in every ten. On the other hand, Queens accounted for almost three in every ten housing losses in the City during the period, the borough's highest proportion of losses since 1970 and two-thirds higher than the rate of the previous period. Manhattan's share remained almost constant, one in every five losses in the City.

The pattern of occupancy status of housing inventory losses at the beginning of the 1996-1999 period was similar to that in the 1993-1996 period, without any appreciable changes. Close to half of

Notes:

the units lost between 1996 and 1999 were renter-occupied units (45.8 percent) in 1996, while another close to a quarter were owner-occupied (23.3 percent) (Table 4.14). Almost a quarter of the units lost in the 1991-1993 period were units that were not available for sale or rent (23.3 percent) at the beginning of the period. However, the proportion dropped to 16.8 percent at the beginning of the 1993-1996 period and slid further to 14.4 percent at the beginning of the 1996-1999 period. In other words, the slight increase in lost units in the latest period--from 36,000 units to 43,000 units--did not originate from units that were not available for sale or rent. It came from the vacant-units-for-rent or vacant-units-for-sale category.

Previous Occupancy Status	<b>1984-87</b> <sup>a</sup>	1991-93 <sup>a</sup>	1993-96 <sup>a</sup>	1996-99 <sup>a</sup>
All (Number)	41,000	37,000	36,000	43,000
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Owner occupied	24.0%	21.9%	22.3%	23.3%
Renter occupied	52.9%	43.0%	45.6%	45.8%
Vacant for rent	7.0%	5.7%	**	6.2%
Vacant for sale	**	**	**	4.3%*
Not available vacant	9.9%	23.3%	16.8%	14.4%
Special place <sup>b</sup>	4.1%*	**	**	**
New construction	**	**	**	**
Other (Non-Interview)	**	5.1%*	10.3%	6.0%

#### Table 4.14 Inventory Losses by Occupancy Status at the Beginning of the Period New York City 1984-87, 1991-93, 1993-96 and 1996-99

Sources: For data for 1984-1987, see Michael Stegman, *Housing and Vacancy Report, New York City, 1987*, p. 200. Data for 1991-1993, 1993-1996, and 1996-1999 from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a Numbers rounded to the nearest thousand. Percents calculated using actual numbers.

b A special place is a place -- such as a transient hotel, rooming or boarding house, dormitory, or institution -- in which the occupants have special living arrangements.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

## Changes in the Composition of the Housing Inventory

#### Tenure and Location

In 1999, the locational distribution of the 3,039,000 housing units in the City throughout the five boroughs was uneven. Of all housing units in the City, almost three in ten, or 869,000 units, were located in Brooklyn (28.6 percent), while five in ten were evenly distributed in the two boroughs of Queens (786,000 units or 25.9 percent) and Manhattan (782,000 units or 25.7 percent) (Table 4.15). The

Notes:

remaining one in five units in the City were in either the Bronx (449,000 units or 14.8 percent) or Staten Island (153,000 units or 5.0 percent) (Figure 4.3).

The locational distribution of rental units in the City was noticeably different from the distribution of all units. Of the 2,018,000 rental units in the City, three in ten were in Brooklyn (608,000 units or 30.1 percent) and almost three in ten were in Manhattan (576,000 units or 28.6 percent) (Table 4.15). Another four in ten were in either Queens (433,000 units or 21.4 percent) or the Bronx (345,000 units or 17.1 percent), while the remaining relatively small number of rental units in the City were in Staten Island (56,000 units or 2.8 percent).

The distribution of occupied rental units mirrored that of all rental units. On the other hand, the locational distribution of vacant rental units was significantly different from that of all rental units. Of the 64,000 vacant rental units in the City, eight in ten were in either the Bronx (27.0 percent), Manhattan (23.0 percent), or Brooklyn (30.8 percent) (Table 4.15). The remaining two in ten were in either Queens (14.1 percent) or Staten Island (5.1 percent).

The locational distribution of all owner units was quite different from that of all renter units. Of the 932,000 owner units in the City, more than a third, or 338,000 units, were located in Queens (36.2





Size an	id Compc	sition o	f the Ho	using In	iventory b New J	oy Tenure (ork City	, Occupai 1999	ncy Statu	s and Ava	ilability b	y Boroug	- <b>C</b>
	To	tal	Bro	nx <sup>a</sup>	Broo	klyn	Manh	attan <sup>a</sup>	Que	ens	Staten	sland
Inventory	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Housing Units	3,038,796	100.0%	449,271	14.8%	868,708	28.6%	782,052	25.7%	786,072	25.9%	152,694	5.0%
Total Rental Units	2,017,701	100.0%	344,829	17.1%	607,599	30.1%	576,349	28.6%	432,514	21.4%	56,409	2.8%
Renter- Occupied	1,953,289	100.0%	327,444	16.8%	587,780	30.1%	561,534	28.7%	423,405	21.7%	53,126	2.7%
Vacant for Rent	64,412	100.0%	17,385	27.0%	19,819	30.8%	14,816	23.0%	9,109	14.1%	3,283	5.1%
Total Owner Units	932,123	100.0%	92,823	10.0%	237,334	25.5%	171,779	18.4%	337,515	36.2%	92,672	9.9%
Owner- Occupied	915,126	100.0%	91,596	10.0%	233,513	25.5%	165,904	18.1%	332,332	36.3%	91,781	10.0%
Vacant for Sale	16,997	100.0%	* *	7.2%*	3,821	22.5%	5,875	34.6%	5,184	30.5%	* *	* *
Total Vacant Units Not Available for Sale or Rent	88,973	100.0%	11,619	13.1%	23,775	26.7%	33,923	38.1%	16,042	18.0%	3,613	4.1%
Source: U.S. Bure Note:	au of the Cen	sus, 1999 N	lew York Cit	y Housing ar	nd Vacancy S	urvey						

\* \* 50

Marble Hill in the Bronx Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution. Too few to report.

Table 4.15

percent) and a quarter, or 237,000 units, were located in Brooklyn, while close to a fifth, or 172,000 units, were located in Manhattan (18.4 percent) (Table 4.15). The remaining 185,000 owner units, a fifth of all owner units in the City, were more or less evenly distributed between the Bronx (10.0 percent) and Staten Island (9.9 percent). The distribution of the 915,000 occupied owner units very much resembled that of all owner units. The distribution of vacant owner units also resembled that of all owner units, except that Manhattan alone captured more than a third of all vacant owner units.

Of the 89,000 vacant units not available for sale or rent, almost two-thirds were located in either Manhattan (38.1 percent) or Brooklyn (26.7 percent), while most of the remainder were located in either Queens (18.0 percent) or the Bronx (13.1 percent) (Table 4.15).

#### Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Structure Class

The New York State Multiple Dwelling Law divides residential structures into a number of structural categories, based mainly on when the structures were built and how they are used, as well as on their size. Structural characteristics are useful because, in reflecting the age and initial design of the structure, they provide some useful information on the types of structures and their structural condition, which can provide the basis for approximating the relative level of maintenance and repair probably needed for the upkeep of the building at an adequate level for providing basic housing services, compared with units in other structure types.

Of all occupied and vacant-available units in the City in 1999, more than seven in ten were units in multi-family buildings (72.0 percent), while the remaining almost three in ten were in one- and two-family houses (28.0 percent) (Table 4.16). (In this and the following sub-sections of the "Changes in the Composition of the Housing Inventory" section, the words "occupied and vacant-available" will not be repeated but will, instead, be understood when such units are referred to, unless otherwise specified.) Of all units in the City, three in ten, or 859,000 units, were in either Old-Law tenement (7.0 percent) or New-Law tenement (23.5 percent) multi-family structures. Old-Law tenement buildings were built before 1901. Many of these were initially constructed with inadequate light, ventilation, and sanitation. The number of units in this kind of structure was 197,000 in 1999, almost all of which were in two boroughs: Manhattan (121,000 units or 61.3 percent) and Brooklyn (70,000 units or 35.5 percent). Because of their age and the inadequacies of their initial structural design and construction, the physical condition of Old-Law buildings and the units in them has been an issue of concern.

New-Law tenement buildings were built between 1901 and 1929, according to standards set forth in the Tenement Law of 1901. Of all units in the City, 661,000, or 23.5 percent, were in New-Law tenement buildings in 1999 (Table 4.16). Almost nine in ten New-Law tenements were located in three boroughs: Manhattan (209,000 units or 31.7 percent), Brooklyn (204,000 units or 30.8 percent), and the Bronx (163,000 units or 24.7 percent). The remainder of these buildings were mostly in Queens (84,000 units or 12.6 percent).

Of all the major structure classes in the City in 1999, the most numerous was the multiple dwelling built after 1929. There were 981,000 units in such structures, or 34.8 percent of all units (Table 4.16).

Structure Classification	All	Bronx <sup>c</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>c</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All <sup>a</sup>	2,949,824	437,652	844,933	748,128	770,029	149,081
Multifamily Buildings <sup>a</sup>	2,161,608	364,144	589,011	743,109	437,503	27,841
Old-Law Tenement	197,320	3,318	70,112	121,019	2,871*	**
New- Law Tenement	661,474	163,217	203,751	209,409	83,620	**
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	981,025	162,270	213,950	308,331	277,445	19,028
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	117,962	11,600	52,969	36,906	16,089	**
Other <sup>d</sup>	69,300	**	8,283	58,408	**	**
1-2 Family Houses	788,215	73,508	255,922	5,019	332,527	121,239
Distribution Within Borough						
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Multifamily Buildings <sup>b</sup>	72.0%	82.3%	<b>68.2</b> %	<b>99.3</b> %	53.4%	14.7%
Old-Law Tenement	7.0%	0.8%	8.7%	16.4%	0.4%	**
New-Law Tenement	23.5%	39.3%	25.3%	28.3%	11.7%	1.0%*
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	34.8%	39.1%	26.6%	41.7%	38.8%	13.4%
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	4.2%	2.8%	6.6%	5.0%	2.3%	**
Other <sup>d</sup>	2.5%	**	1.0%	7.9%	0.2%*	**
1-2 Family Houses	28.0%	17.7%	31.8%	0.7%	46.6%	85.3%
Distribution Within Structure	Classification					
All <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	14.8%	28.6%	25.4%	26.1%	5.1%
Multifamily Buildings <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	16.8%	27.2%	34.4%	20.2%	1.3%
Old-Law Tenement	100.0%	1.7%	35.5%	61.3%	1.5%	**
New-Law Tenement	100.0%	24.7%	30.8%	31.7%	12.6%	0.2%*
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	100.0%	16.5%	21.8%	31.4%	28.3%	1.9%
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	100.0%	9.8%	44.9%	31.3%	13.6%	**
Other <sup>d</sup>	100.0%	**	12.0%	84.3%	2.4%*	**
1-2 Family Houses	100.0%	9.3%	32.5%	0.6%	42.2%	15.4%

#### Table 4.16 Number and Distribution of All Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Structure Classification and by Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a Includes units whose structure class within multifamily buildings was not reported.

b Excludes units whose structure class within multifamily buildings was not reported.

c Marble Hill in the Bronx.

d Multi-family structures including apartment hotels built before 1929, commercial buildings altered to apartments, and other units in miscellaneous Class B structures.

\* Since the number of units is small, or the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

Notes:

By definition, this structure class is a continuously growing segment of the housing stock in the City, since all newly built units are included in this class. The locational distribution of units in this class resembled very much that of all units in multiple dwellings, except that more of such units were located in Queens, where many units were relatively new, and fewer were located in Brooklyn, where most units were in older structures.

In 1999, three-quarters of the 788,000 units in one- and two-family houses in the City were located in either Queens (333,000 units or 42.2 percent) or Brooklyn (256,000 units or 32.5 percent) (Table 4.16). The remainder were mostly located in either Staten Island (121,000 units or 15.4 percent) or the Bronx (74,000 units or 9.3 percent).

#### Inventory Composition by Building Size

The composition of all occupied and vacant-available housing units, rental and owner units combined, in New York City by building size remained constant between 1996 and 1999, without any appreciable changes. Close to half of all occupied and vacant-available units in the City were located in small buildings with fewer than twenty units (48.1 percent); 26.7 percent of these were in buildings with one or two units (Table 4.17). Another about three in ten of all units were in buildings with 20-99 units (17.2 percent in buildings with 20-49 units and 14.6 percent in buildings with 50-99 units), while the remaining one in five were in the largest buildings with 100 or more units (20.1 percent).

The compositional distribution of all occupied and vacant-available units by building size varied from borough to borough. In the Bronx, more units were located in buildings with 20-99 units, while

				Numbe	r of Units in	Building	
Borough	Number	All	1-2	3-19	20-49	50-99	100 or More
All	2,949,824	100.0%	26.7%	21.4%	17.2%	14.6%	20.1%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	437,652	100.0%	16.8%	17.5%	24.5%	20.7%	20.5%
Brooklyn	844,933	100.0%	30.3%	31.8%	13.8%	13.7%	10.4%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	748,128	100.0%	0.7%	15.0%	27.2%	16.5%	40.6%
Queens	770,029	100.0%	43.2%	20.7%	9.7%	12.6%	13.9%
Staten Island	149,081	100.0%	81.3%	9.2%	3.9%	2.1%	3.5%

Table 4.17	
Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Building Size within Borou	ıgh
New York City 1999	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

fewer were located in smaller buildings with fewer than 20 units, compared to the overall distribution for the City as a whole. In the borough, close to half of all units were either in buildings with 20-49 units (24.5 percent) or in buildings with 50-99 units (20.7 percent) (Table 4.17). A substantially larger number of units in Brooklyn were in smaller buildings. More than six in ten were either in buildings with one or two units (30.3 percent) or in buildings with 3-19 units (31.8 percent), while the remainder were fairly evenly distributed among buildings of the following three sizes: those with 20-49 units (13.8 percent), those with 50-99 units (13.7 percent), and those with 100 or more units (10.4 percent) (Figure 4.3).

Unlike other boroughs, in Manhattan a disproportionately large number of units were in very large buildings. In the borough, four in ten of all occupied and vacant-available units were in the largest buildings with 100 or more units (40.6 percent), while another more than four in ten were either in buildings with 20-49 units (27.2 percent) or in buildings with 50-99 units (16.5 percent) (Table 4.17). Consequently, the proportion of units in the borough that were located in small buildings (those with fewer than 20 units) was very small. The proportion in buildings with one or two units, particularly, was less than 1.0 percent. Conversely, in Queens, close to two-thirds of all units were located in small buildings: either buildings with one or two units (43.2 percent) or buildings with 3-19 units (20.7 percent). Another little more than a fifth were in buildings with either 20-49 units (9.7 percent) or 50-99 units (12.6 percent). Most of the units in Staten Island were in small buildings: eight in ten units in the borough were in buildings with one or two units, while almost one in ten were in buildings with 3-19 units.

The presentation of all occupied and vacant-available units within each size of building by borough can help in understanding the locational concentration of buildings of different sizes in the City. Three-quarters of units in buildings with one or two units were located in either Queens (42.2 percent) or Brooklyn (32.5 percent), while another close to one in six was located in Staten Island (15.4 percent) (Table 4.18). At the same time, close to seven in ten of units in small buildings with 3-19 units

#### - · · · · · ·

INEW TOLK City 1999							
Borough	All	1-2	3-19	20-49	50-99	100 or More	
All (Number)	2,949,824	788,215	630,478	508,398	429,741	592,991	
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	14.8%	9.3%	12.2%	21.1%	21.1%	15.1%	
Brooklyn	28.6%	32.5%	42.7%	22.9%	27.0%	14.8%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	25.4%	0.6%	17.8%	40.1%	28.7%	51.3%	
Queens	26.1%	42.2%	25.2%	14.7%	22.5%	18.0%	
Staten Island	5.1%	15.4%	2.2%	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%	

Table 4.18 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Borough within Building Size New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

were located in either Brooklyn (42.7 percent) or Queens (25.2 percent), while another close to three in ten were located in either Manhattan (17.8 percent) or the Bronx (12.2 percent). Four in ten units in buildings with 20-49 units were located in Manhattan, while another little more than four in ten were located in either Brooklyn (22.9 percent) or the Bronx (21.1 percent). Units in buildings with 50-99 units were somewhat evenly scattered among the following four boroughs: Manhattan (28.7 percent), Brooklyn (27.0 percent), Queens (22.5 percent), and the Bronx (21.1 percent). On the other hand, half of the units in the largest buildings with 100 or more units were located in Manhattan (51.3 percent), while most of the remainder were located in either Queens (18.0 percent), the Bronx (15.1 percent), or Brooklyn (14.8 percent).

#### Housing Inventory Composition by Size of Units

The composition of housing units by size was different from borough to borough. Two-thirds of all 2,950,000 occupied and vacant-available units in the City were either units with one bedroom (33.9 percent) or units with two bedrooms (33.8 percent). Another quarter had three or more bedrooms (25.3 percent). The remaining 7.0 percent of units were studios with no bedrooms (Table 4.19). The distribution of housing units by size in the Bronx resembled that in the City as a whole, except that more units in the borough were one-bedroom units (38.7 percent), while fewer were studios (3.8 percent). The distribution in Brooklyn was also somewhat similar to that in the City overall, except that more units in the borough were two-bedroom units (38.5 percent) and fewer were studios (4.3 percent) or one-bedroom units (30.9 percent). However, the composition of housing units by size in Manhattan was distinctly different from the city-wide composition. In the borough, almost six in ten of all units were small units, either studios (16.0 percent) or one-bedroom units (42.8 percent), while the proportion of large units with three or more bedrooms was 12.1 percent, only about half of the equivalent proportion

			5					
Borough		Number of Bedrooms						
	Number	All	0	1	2	3 or More		
All	2,949,824	100.0%	7.0%	33.9%	33.8%	25.3%		
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	437,652	100.0%	3.8%	38.7%	34.8%	22.7%		
Brooklyn	844,933	100.0%	4.3%	30.9%	38.5%	26.3%		
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	748,128	100.0%	16.0%	42.8%	29.1%	12.1%		
Queens	770,029	100.0%	3.8%	29.3%	34.5%	32.4%		
Staten Island	149,081	100.0%	1.9%	16.4%	24.3%	57.4%		

 
 Table 4.19

 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Number of Bedrooms within Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

of all such units in the City. Conversely, most housing units in Queens and Staten Island were larger units. Two-thirds of the units in Queens were either two-bedroom units (34.5 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (32.4 percent). Eight in ten of the units in Staten Island were larger units: close to six in ten were three-or-more-bedroom units (57.4 percent), while almost a quarter were two-bedroom units (24.3 percent).

Reviewing the distribution of occupied and vacant-available units in each size category by borough shows the locational concentration of different sizes of housing units in the City. Almost six in ten of the smallest units, studio units with no bedroom, were clustered in Manhattan (Table 4.20). A third of the one-bedroom units were located in Manhattan (32.0 percent), while half were located in either Brooklyn (26.1 percent) or Queens (22.6 percent). On the other hand, a third of the two-bedroom units in the City were located in Brooklyn (32.6 percent), while close to half were located in either Queens (26.6 percent) or Manhattan (21.9 percent). At the same time, close to two-thirds of the largest units, those with three or more bedrooms, were clustered in either Queens (33.4 percent) or Brooklyn (29.8 percent), while the remainder were more or less evenly distributed among the other three boroughs.

## Rental Housing Inventory (Occupied and Vacant)

The total number of rental units in the City, occupied and vacant together, numbered at 2,018,000 units, or 66.4 percent of the total housing stock in the City, in 1999 (Tables 4.15 and 4.21). Almost six in ten rental units in the City were located in either Brooklyn (30.1 percent) or Manhattan (28.6 percent). Most of the remainder were in either Queens (21.4 percent) or the Bronx (17.1 percent). [In this and the following sub-sections of the "Rental Housing Inventory (Occupied and Vacant)"

			-				
	Number of Bedrooms						
Borough	All	0	1	2	3 or More		
All (Number)	2,949,824	205,170	1,000,920	997,132	746,601		
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	14.8%	8.1%	16.9%	15.3%	13.3%		
Brooklyn	28.6%	17.7%	26.1%	32.6%	29.8%		
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	25.4%	58.5%	32.0%	21.9%	12.1%		
Queens	26.1%	14.3%	22.6%	26.6%	33.4%		
Staten Island	5.1%	1.4%	2.4%	3.6%	11.5%		

Table 4.20 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Borough within Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

		Borough							
Regulatory Status/ Form of Ownership	Total	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island			
Total Units (Number)	3,038,796	449,271	868,708	782,052	786,072	152,694			
Percent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Total Rental Units	66.4%	76.8%	69.9%	73.7%	55.0%	36.9%			
<b>Renter Occupied</b>	64.3%	72.9%	67.7%	71.8%	53.9%	34.8%			
Controlled	1.7%	1.0%	1.7%	3.1%	1.2%	**			
Stabilized	33.6%	41.6%	31.1%	45.3%	25.2%	6.9%			
Pre-1947	24.6%	34.8%	25.0%	37.3%	10.3%	1.7%			
Post-1947	8.9%	6.8%	6.1%	8.0%	14.9%	5.2%			
Other Regulated	1.8%	2.8%	1.9%	2.6%	0.6%	**			
M-L Rental	2.2%	4.3%	2.0%	2.9%	1.1%	**			
Unregulated	18.9%	14.3%	24.0%	10.0%	23.6%	23.5%			
In Rental Buildings	16.7%	13.0%	23.0%	7.0%	20.4%	22.0%			
In Coops/Condos	2.2%	1.3%	1.0%	3.1%	3.1%	1.5%			
Public Housing	5.6%	8.0%	6.6%	6.8%	2.2%	3.5%			
In Rem	0.5%	0.8%	0.4%	1.1%	**	**			
Vacant for Rent	2.1%	3.9%	2.3%	1.9%	1.2%	2.2%			
Total Owner Units	30.7%	20.7%	27.3%	22.0%	42.9%	60.7%			
<b>Owner Occupied</b>	30.1%	20.4%	26.9%	21.2%	42.3%	60.1%			
Conventional	18.9%	12.5%	20.8%	0.9%	30.9%	57.0%			
Coop/Condo	9.4%	3.4%	4.6%	18.6%	10.2%	3.1%			
Private Coop	1.8%	4.6%	1.5%	1.6%	1.1%	**			
Vacant for Sale	0.6%	0.3%*	0.4%	0.8%	0.7%	**			
Total Vacant Units Not Available for Sale or Rent	2.9%	2.6%	2.7%	4.3%	2.0%	2.4%			

#### Table 4.21 Composition of the Housing Inventory in Each Borough by Rent Regulatory Status or Form of Ownership and Type of Vacancy New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

Notes:

section, the words "occupied and vacant-available" will not be repeated but will, instead, be understood when such units are referred to, unless otherwise specified.]

Seven or more than seven in ten of all housing units in the Bronx (76.8 percent), Manhattan (73.7 percent), and Brooklyn (69.9 percent) were rental units (Table 4.21). On the other hand, the proportions of rental units were much lower in the other two boroughs: 55.0 percent in Queens and 36.9 percent in Staten Island. In other words, in these two boroughs, ownership was more frequent.

#### Changes in the Number of Units by Rent Regulation Status

In 1999, the number of rent-controlled units was 53,000, or 2.6 percent of the total number of rental units in the City (Table 4.22). These units housed 87,000 people (Table 4.23). During the five-year period between 1991 and 1996, the number of rent-controlled units in the City declined by 54,000, or by 43.3 percent, from 124,000 to 71,000 (Table 4.24).<sup>7</sup> In the next three years, this downward trend in the number of rent-controlled units continued, with an additional decline of 18,000 units, or 25.5 percent. On the other hand, the number of rent-stabilized units increased by 42,000, or 4.1 percent, from 1,011,000 to 1,052,000, during the five-year period between 1991 and 1996 but declined slightly by 6,000, or by 0.6 percent, to 1,046,000 in 1999 (Table 4.24). This was the largest single rent-regulation category, covering 51.9 percent of all rental units in the City. These units housed 2,430,000 individuals, or one in every three people in the City (Table 4.23). The decline of 6,000 in the number of rent-stabilized units was the result of a decrease of 11,000 such units in buildings built in 1947 or later that outweighed the increase of 5,000 such units in buildings built before 1947 (Figure 4.4).

The change in the number of Mitchell-Lama rental units and "other"<sup>8</sup> regulated units in the three years between 1996 and 1999 was too small to be interpreted with confidence (Table 4.22).

The number of unregulated rental units increased by 27,000, or by 4.7 percent, to 603,000 between 1996 and 1999 (Table 4.22). This increase was the exclusive consequence of an increase of 27,000 in the number of unregulated rental units in rental buildings, while the number of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings remained practically unchanged. The number of *in rem* units

<sup>8</sup> For the definition of "other" rent-regulated units, see the preceding note.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> "Rent controlled" units have their rents regulated under the provisions of the Local Emergency Rent Control Law of 1962. "Rent stabilized" units have their rents regulated under the provisions of the Rent Stabilization Law of 1969 and the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974. "Other" regulated units are regulated outside the rent control and rent stabilization systems and are primarily units in buildings which have received subsidies through federal, state, or local low-income housing programs, such as HUD's Section 8 New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation and 221(d)3 Programs and the Mitchell-Lama and Article 4 Programs, and whose rents are regulated under the provisions of these programs; this category also includes some unsubsidized, but rent-regulated, loft units. "Unregulated" units have either never been subject to rent regulation or were at one time rent-regulated but subsequently became unregulated. "Public housing" units are owned and operated by the New York City Housing Authority. *"In rem"* units are in buildings that are owned by the City of New York as a result of an *in rem* proceeding against the previous owner for failure to pay real estate taxes or other City charges. More extensive definitions of these six regulatory categories, together with descriptions of the procedures used to categorize sample units, are provided in Appendix C: "Definitions of Rent-Regulation Status."

	1996		199	9	Change 1996-99	
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Renters	2,027,421	100.0%	2,017,701	100.0%	-9,720	-0.5%
Controlled	70,572	3.5%	52,562	2.6%	-18,010	-25.5%
Stabilized	1,052,300	51.9%	1,046,377	51.9%	-5,923	-0.6%
Pre-1947	763,956	37.7%	769,079	38.1%	+5,123	+0.7%
Post-1947	288,344	14.2%	277,298	13.7%	-11,046	-3.8%
Other Regulated	131,577	6.5%	126,661	6.3%	-4,916	-3.7%
Mitchell-Lama	72,759	3.6%	69,975	3.5%	-2,784*	-3.8%
Other Regulated	58,818	2.9%	56,685	2.8%	-2,133*	-3.6%
Unregulated	575,665	28.4%	602,861	29.9%	+27,196	+4.7%
In Rental Buildings	500,156	24.7%	527,364	26.1%	+27,208	+5.4%
In Coops and Condos	75,509	3.7%	75,497	3.7%	**	**
Public Housing	172,096	8.5%	172,661	8.6%	**	**
In Rem	25,211	1.2%	16,579	0.8%	-8,632	-34.2%

#### Table 4.22 Number and Percent Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Regulatory Status New York City 1996 and 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.
Regulatory Status	Population	Percent of Total Population
All	7,245,251	100.0%
Renter Occupied	4,839,008	66.8%
Controlled	87,041	1.2%
Stabilized	2,430,110	33.5%
Pre-1947	1,849,447	25.5%
Post-1947	580,663	8.0%
Mitchell-Lama Rental	152,552	2.1%
Other Regulated	130,708	1.8%
Unregulated	1,520,074	21.0%
In Rental Buildings	1,382,775	19.1%
In Coops and Condos	137,298	1.9%
Public Housing	472,694	6.5%
In Rem	45,830	0.6%
Owner Occupied	2,406,242	33.2%
Conventional	1,735,421	24.0%
Coop/Condo	549,772	7.6%
Mitchell-Lama Coop	121,050	1.7%

# Table 4.23Distribution of Population by Rent Regulation Status or Form of Ownership<br/>New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey

			New York C	ity, Selected	Years 1987-19	990			
						Change 1	991-1996	Change 1	996-1999
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	1987	1991	1993	1996	1999	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Renter Units	1,931,696	2,028,303	2,040,470	2,027,421	2,017,701	*	*	-9,720	-0.5%
Controlled	155,361	124,411	101,339	70,572	52,562	-53,839	-43.3%	-18,010	-25.5%
Stabilized	960,742	1,010,584	1,009,281	1,052,300	1,046,377	+41,716	+4.1%	-5,923	-0.6%
Pre-1947	680,944	740,214	732,435	763,956	769,079	+23,742	+3.2%	+5,123	+0.7%
Post-1947	279,798	270,370	276,846	288,344	277,298	+17,974	+6.6%	-11,046	-3.8%
All Other	815,593	893,307	929,850	904,549	918,762	+11,242	+1.3%	+14,213	+1.6%
Sources: U.S. Bureau of Note: * Too few unit	the Census, 1987, s to report	1991, 1993, 1996	and 1999 New Y	ork City Housing	and Vacancy Surv	eys.			

New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999	Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Selected Regulatory Status	Table 4.24
---	--	------------

fell substantially by 9,000, or by 34.2 percent, from 25,000 units in 1996 to 17,000 units in 1999. This was a back-to-back major reduction in such units. Between 1993 and 1996, the number of *in rem* units dropped by 11,000, or by 30.4 percent, from 36,247.<sup>9</sup> Thus, during the six-year period from 1993 to 1999, the number of *in rem* units decreased by 20,000, or by 54.3 percent. This drop in the number of *in rem* units was the result of HPD's effective implementation of comprehensive policies and programs designed to halt and reverse the deterioration and abandonment of the existing housing stock, while returning properties acquired by the City through tax-foreclosures to responsible private owners and building public-private partnerships and programs that help revitalize neighborhoods by promoting investment and involving neighborhood resources.



#### Rental Units (Occupied and Vacant) by Rent Regulation Status by Location

In 1999, close to one in every two rent-controlled units in the City was concentrated in Manhattan (46.0 percent) (Table 4.25), while a little more than a quarter were in Brooklyn (27.5 percent). The remainder were distributed between Queens (17.6 percent) and the Bronx (8.2 percent). Rent-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Moon Wha Lee, Housing New York City, 1996, page 213.

stabilized units were also concentrated in Manhattan and Brooklyn: about a third of the rent-stabilized units in the City were located in Manhattan (34.4 percent), while another about a quarter were in Brooklyn (26.5 percent). The remainder were located in Queens (19.3 percent) and the Bronx (18.7 percent). The locational distribution of rent-stabilized units in buildings built in 1947 or before was somewhat similar to that of all rent-stabilized units. However, the distribution of such units in buildings built after 1947 was considerably different. A little more than four in ten of post-1947 rent-stabilized units were concentrated in Queens (43.3 percent), while another little more than four in ten were in either Manhattan (22.8 percent) or Brooklyn (19.3 percent) (Figure 4.5) (Map 4.1).

Almost nine in ten Mitchell-Lama rental units were concentrated in the three boroughs of Manhattan (33.2 percent), the Bronx (29.3 percent), and Brooklyn (24.9 percent), while the remainder were located in Queens (12.6 percent) (Table 4.25).

More than two-thirds of the unregulated rental units in the City were located in Brooklyn (36.4 percent) and Queens (31.5 percent) (Table 4.25). The remainder were mostly located in either Manhattan

		1101		.y 1777			
Regulatory Status	Number	Total	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All	2,017,701	100.0%	17.1%	30.1%	28.6%	21.4%	2.8%
Controlled	52,562	100.0%	8.2%	27.5%	46.0%	17.6%	**
Stabilized	1,046,377	100.0%	18.7%	26.5%	34.4%	19.3%	1.1%
Pre-1947	769,079	100.0%	21.3%	29.1%	38.6%	10.6%	0.4%
Post-1947	277,298	100.0%	11.8%	19.3%	22.8%	43.3%	3.1%
Other Regulated	56,685	100.0%	22.5%	30.1%	36.3%	8.6%	2.4%*
M-L Rental	69,975	100.0%	29.3%	24.9%	33.2%	12.6%	**
Unregulated	602,861	100.0%	11.5%	36.4%	14.2%	31.5%	6.2%
In Rental Buildings	527,364	100.0%	11.7%	39.6%	10.9%	31.1%	6.7%
In Coops/Condos	75,497	100.0%	10.8%	14.3%	37.4%	34.3%	3.2%
Public Housing	172,661	100.0%	21.8%	33.8%	31.2%	10.2%	3.1%
In Rem	16,579	100.0%	25.3%	21.1%	53.2%	**	**

# Table 4.25 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Borough within Rent Regulatory Status New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

Figure 4.5 Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Rent Regulation Status within Borough New York City 1999



(14.2 percent) or the Bronx (11.5 percent). The locational distribution of unregulated rental units in rental buildings very much resembled that of all unregulated rental units, while the distribution of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings was markedly different. More than seven in ten unregulated rental units in cooperative or condominium buildings were concentrated in Manhattan (37.4 percent) and Queens (34.3 percent). Most of the remainder were located in either Brooklyn (14.3 percent) or the Bronx (10.8 percent) (Map 4.2).

Almost nine in ten of public housing units in the City were scattered throughout the following three boroughs: Brooklyn (33.8 percent), Manhattan (31.2 percent), and the Bronx (21.8 percent); most of the remainder were in Queens (10.2 percent) (Table 4.25). On the other hand, more than half of *in rem* units were concentrated in Manhattan (53.2 percent), while the remainder were located in either the Bronx (25.1 percent) or Brooklyn (21.1 percent).

A review of the locational distribution of occupied and vacant-available rental units by rentregulation status within each borough shows that the proportion of housing units by rent-regulation status was not uniform from borough to borough. In the City, seven in ten of all rental units were rentcontrolled or -regulated by government agencies at the federal, state, and/or city level. Consequently, the remaining only three in ten units were rent-unregulated (Table 4.26). Of all rental units, occupied and

Map 4.1 Rent Stabilized Units as a Percentage of Total Rental Units New York City 1999



vacant-available together, 51.9 percent were rent-stabilized, 2.6 percent were rent-controlled, 3.5 percent were Mitchell-Lama units, and 2.8 percent were "other" rent-regulated units. The remaining rental units that were also rent-regulated were either public housing units (8.6 percent) or *in rem* units (0.8 percent). In the Bronx and Manhattan, the overwhelming majority of rental units were either rent-controlled or - regulated. In the Bronx, eight in ten of the 345,000 rental units were either rent-controlled or -regulated units, with almost six in ten being either rent-stabilized (56.8 percent) or rent-controlled (1.2 percent). In Manhattan, of the 576,000 rental units, 85.1 percent were either rent-controlled or regulated units, with 66.6 percent being either rent-stabilized units (62.4 percent) or rent-controlled units (4.2 percent).

Map 4.2 Unregulated Rental Units as a Percentage of Total Rental Units New York City 1999



On the other hand, compared to the city-wide distribution, somewhat fewer rental units in Brooklyn were rent-controlled or -regulated. Of the 608,000 rental units in the borough, 63.8 percent were rent-controlled or -regulated units, with almost half of these being either rent-stabilized (45.6 percent) or rent-controlled (2.4 percent) (Table 4.26).

Conversely to the distribution in Manhattan and the Bronx, in Queens unregulated rental units were almost as frequent as rent-regulated units. Of the rental units in the borough, 43.9 percent were rent-unregulated, only less than half were either rent-stabilized (46.7 percent) or rent-controlled (2.1

percent), and fewer than one in twenty was public housing (Table 4.26). In Staten Island, the vast majority of rental units, two-thirds, were rent-unregulated. Only one in five rental units in the borough was rent-controlled or rent-stabilized (20.6 percent).

			•			
Regulatory Status	Total	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All (Number)	2,017,701	344,829	607,599	576,349	432,514	56,409
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Controlled	2.6%	1.2%	2.4%	4.2%	2.1%	**
Stabilized	51.9%	56.8%	45.6%	62.4%	46.7%	20.6%
Pre-1947	38.1%	47.6%	36.8%	51.5%	18.9%	5.2%
Post-1947	13.7%	9.2%	8.8%	11.0%	27.8%	15.4%
Other Regulated	2.8%	3.7%	2.8%	3.6%	1.1%	2.4%*
M-L Rental	3.5%	5.9%	2.9%	4.0%	2.0%	**
Unregulated	29.9%	20.2%	36.2%	14.9%	43.9%	66.8%
In Rental Buildings	26.1%	17.8%	34.4%	10.0%	38.0%	62.5%
In Coops/Condos	3.7%	2.4%	1.8%	4.9%	6.0%	4.3%
Public Housing	8.6%	10.9%	9.6%	9.3%	4.1%	9.5%
In Rem	0.8%	1.2%	0.6%	1.5%	**	**

#### Table 4.26 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Rent Regulatory Status within Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Rental and Owner Housing Units in Cooperatives and Condominiums

The tenure of owner units and non-regulated rental units can change as the situation of individual owners or the market changes. For example, owners of units in cooperatives and condominiums can rent out their units if the owner housing market is weak, and they can sell units they have rented out if the owner housing market is strong. Because the submarket of units in cooperatives and condominiums is structured and functions in this dynamic way, the change in the number of rental or owner units in cooperatives and condominiums is the net result not only of the gross addition of such

types of units, but also of changes in the tenure of these units from owner to rental and vice versa. Moreover, changes in the number of rental and owner units in New York City also depend considerably on changes in these units' tenure, reflecting a rental or owner market situation, in addition to actual additions to or deductions from the inventory of such units.

Between 1996 and 1999, the number of occupied and vacant-available units in cooperatives (excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives) and condominium buildings in the City grew by 37,000, or by 9.1 percent, to 447,000 in 1999 (Table 4.27). This was 15.2 percent of the total number of occupied and vacant-available housing units in the City (Table 4.1). Of these units in cooperative and condominium buildings, two-thirds, or 296,000 units, were owner units (66.3 percent), while the remaining 151,000 were rental units, which were evenly divided into rent-regulated units (rent-controlled and rent-stabilized) and unregulated rental units.

Table 4.27 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units in Coop/Condominium Buildings (Excluding Mitchell-Lama Coops) by Tenure/Regulatory Status New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999

	199	3	19	96	19	99
Tenure/						
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	420,000	100.0%	409,957	100.0%	447,313	100.0%
Owner	237,889	56.6%	249,686	60.9%	296,374	66.3%
Regulated Rental	87,054	20.7%	84,762	20.7%	75,442	16.9%
Unregulated Rental	95,058	22.6%	75,509	18.4%	75,497	16.9%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

More than three-quarters of all occupied and vacant-available units in cooperative and condominium buildings in the City were concentrated in two boroughs: 207,000 units in Manhattan (46.2 percent) and 135,000 units in Queens (30.2 percent) (Table 4.28). The remaining such units were scattered throughout the other three boroughs: 66,000 in Brooklyn (14.8 percent); 31,000 in the Bronx (7.0 percent); and 8,000 in Staten Island (1.8 percent). Of all 296,000 owner units in cooperative and condominium buildings, eight in ten were concentrated in Manhattan (152,000 units or 51.1 percent) and Queens (84,000 or 28.2 percent). The remaining such units were located mostly in Brooklyn (41,000 units or 13.8 percent) and the Bronx (16,000 units or 5.3 percent). Of the 75,000 rent-regulated units and another 75,000 unregulated rental units in such buildings, seven in ten were concentrated in Manhattan (36.6 percent) and Queens (34.0 percent), while the remaining such units were located mostly in Brooklyn (16.9 percent) and the Bronx (10.5 percent) (Figure 4.6).

Borough	Tenure/Regulatory Status	Number	Percent
All	All	447,313	100.0%
	Owner	296,374	66.3%
	Regulated Rental	75,442	16.9%
	Unregulated Rental	75,497	16.9%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	All	31,472	100.0%
	Owner	15,577	49.5%
	Regulated Rental	7,769	24.7%
	Unregulated Rental	8,125	25.8%
Brooklyn	All	66,244	100.0%
	Owner	40,791	61.6%
	Regulated Rental	14,648	22.1%
	Unregulated Rental	10,806	16.3%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	All	206,780	100.0%
	Owner	151,527	73.3%
	Regulated Rental	26,987	13.1%
	Unregulated Rental	28,266	13.7%
Queens	All	134,938	100.0%
	Owner	83,551	61.9%
	Regulated Rental	25,511	18.9%
	Unregulated Rental	25,876	19.2%
Staten Island	All	7,879	100.0%
	Owner	4,928	62.5%
	Regulated Rental	**	**
	Unregulated Rental	2,425*	30.8%

# Table 4.28 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units in Coop/Condominium Buildings (Excluding Mitchell-Lama Coops) by Borough and Tenure/Regulatory Status New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Figure 4.6





#### Size of Rental Units

According to the 1999 HVS, of the 2,018,000 occupied and vacant-available rental units in the City, half were smaller units, either studio units with no bedroom (8.8 percent) or one-bedroom units (41.0 percent), and half were larger units, either units with two bedrooms (35.9 percent) or units with three or more bedrooms (14.3 percent) (Table 4.29). The distribution in the Bronx resembled the overall distribution in the City as a whole. On the other hand, in Brooklyn, more units were larger units. In the borough, close to six in ten of all rental units were either two-bedroom units (40.9 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (16.1 percent). The distribution in Queens and Staten Island was largely consistent with that in Brooklyn. However, in Manhattan, more units were smaller units: six in ten of all rental units in the borough were either studios (17.6 percent) or one-bedroom units (43.7 percent), while close to three of the remaining four in ten were two-bedroom units (28.1 percent) (Figure 4.7).

The distribution of different sizes of rental units by borough provides useful information on the locational concentration of each size of unit. Close to six in ten rental studios in the City were concentrated in Manhattan (57.0 percent), while another third were located in either Brooklyn (18.4 percent) or Queens (14.7 percent) (Table 4.30). One-bedroom rental units were scattered throughout the

# Table 4.29 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Renter Units by Number of Bedrooms within Borough New York City 1999

			N	umber of Bedr	ooms	
Borough	Number	All	0	1	2	3 or More
All	2,017,701	100.0%	8.8%	41.0%	35.9%	14.3%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	344,829	100.0%	4.5%	44.1%	35.2%	16.3%
Brooklyn	607,599	100.0%	5.4%	37.6%	40.9%	16.1%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	576,349	100.0%	17.6%	43.7%	28.1%	10.6%
Queens	432,514	100.0%	6.0%	40.0%	39.1%	14.9%
Staten Island	56,409	100.0%	4.0%	39.5%	40.0%	16.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

Figure 4.7 Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Number of Bedrooms within Borough New York City 1999



		Ν	umber of Bedroon	ns	
Borough	All	0	1	2	3 or More
All (Number)	2,017,701	177,829	827,280	723,655	288,937
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	17.1%	8.7%	18.4%	16.8%	19.4%
Brooklyn	30.1%	18.4%	27.6%	34.4%	33.9%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	28.6%	57.0%	30.4%	22.4%	21.2%
Queens	21.4%	14.7%	20.9%	23.4%	22.2%
Staten Island	2.8%	1.3%	2.7%	3.1%	3.2%

# Table 4.30 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Borough within Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

four most populous boroughs: Manhattan (30.4 percent), Brooklyn (27.6 percent), Queens (20.9 percent), and the Bronx (18.4 percent). Two-bedroom rental units were scattered throughout the same four boroughs: a little more than a third were located in Brooklyn (34.4 percent), while close to two-thirds were in either Queens (23.4 percent), Manhattan (22.4 percent), or the Bronx (16.8 percent). The distribution of rental units with three or more bedrooms mirrored that of two-bedroom units.

A review of different sizes of rental units within each rent-regulation category reveals that a much larger proportion of the public housing, *in rem*, and rent-unregulated categories provided larger units than either all rental categories as a whole or other rent-regulation categories. Of public housing units, 72.7 percent were either two-bedroom units (47.6 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (25.1 percent) (Table 4.31). Of *in rem* units, 67.8 percent were either two-bedroom units (39.1 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (28.7 percent). Of unregulated rental units, 63.5 percent were either two-bedroom units (41.0 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom units (22.5 percent). On the other hand, a greater proportion of units in the rent-stabilized category were smaller units. Of all rent-stabilized units, six in ten were either studios (12.3 percent) or one-bedroom units (48.7 percent).

Looking at the distribution of rental units by rent-regulation status within different sizes of units shows what proportion of different sizes of rental units each rent-regulation category provides. Because of the dominance of rent-stabilized units, such units comprised a major proportion of each size of unit. Close to three quarters of studio rental units in the City were rent-stabilized units (72.6 percent), while another one in six were unregulated rental units (16.7 percent) (Table 4.32). At the same time, six in ten one-bedroom rental units were rent-stabilized units (61.6 percent), while more than one in five were unregulated rental units (23.1 percent). On the other hand, almost eight in ten two-bedroom rental units

# Table 4.31 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Number of Bedrooms within Regulatory Status New York City 1999

		I	Number of Bedroo	ms	
Regulatory Status	All	0	1	2	3 or More
All Rental Units	100.0%	8.8%	41.0%	35.9%	14.3%
Controlled	100.0%	4.1%	50.8%	33.0%	12.1%
Stabilized	100.0%	12.3%	48.7%	31.2%	7.7%
Pre-1947	100.0%	11.9%	48.1%	31.5%	8.5%
Post-1947	100.0%	13.5%	50.2%	30.6%	5.8%
Other Regulated	100.0%	9.9%	41.3%	34.7%	14.1%
Unregulated	100.0%	4.9%	31.6%	41.0%	22.5%
Public Housing	100.0%	2.1%	25.2%	47.6%	25.1%
In Rem	100.0%	*	27.9%	39.1%	28.7%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: \* Too few units to report.

### Table 4.32

#### Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Regulatory Status within Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

		ľ	Number of Bedroo	ms	
Regulatory Status	All	0	1	2	3 or More
All (Number)	2,017,701	177,829	827,280	723,655	288,937
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Controlled	2.6%	1.2%	3.2%	2.4%	2.2%
Stabilized	51.9%	72.6%	61.6%	45.2%	28.1%
Pre-1947	38.1%	51.6%	44.7%	33.5%	22.5%
Post-1947	13.7%	21.0%	16.8%	11.7%	5.5%
Other Regulated	6.3%	7.0%	6.3%	6.1%	6.2%
Unregulated	29.9%	16.7%	23.1%	34.1%	46.9%
Public Housing	8.6%	2.0%	5.3%	11.4%	15.0%
In Rem	0.8%	*	0.6%	0.9%	1.6

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

Too few units to report.

were either rent-stabilized (45.2 percent) or rent-unregulated (34.1 percent) units, while another one in ten were public housing units (11.4 percent). A disproportionately large number of three-or-more-bedroom rental units were unregulated rental units (46.9 percent); the remainder were either rent-stabilized units (28.1 percent) or public housing units (15.0 percent).

### Rental Units by Building Size

Of all the 2,018,000 occupied and vacant-available rental units in the City, two-fifths were located in buildings with 20-99 units, while another fifth were in the largest buildings with a hundred or more units (Table 4.33). The remaining two-fifths were in small buildings, either those with one or two units (13.0 percent) or those with 3-19 units (26.3 percent).

The rent-regulation categories differed in their distribution of units by size of building. More than half of rent-controlled units were located in buildings with 20-99 units (52.7 percent), while four in ten were in small buildings with fewer than 20 units (38.6 percent), with close to a fifth of these being in buildings with fewer than 6 units (17.8 percent) (Table 4.33). Of rent-stabilized units, close to six in ten were in buildings with 20-99 units (57.5 percent), while almost a quarter were in small buildings with fewer than 20 units (57.5 percent), while almost a quarter were in small buildings with fewer than 20 units (24.2 percent) and close to a fifth were in the largest buildings with 100 or more units (18.3 percent). Conversely, eight in ten of unregulated rental units were in small buildings, either those with one or two units (42.5 percent) or those with 3-19 units (38.3 percent). Public housing units were mainly in large buildings: almost two-thirds of such units were in buildings with either 100 or more units (45.5 percent) or 50-99 units (19.8 percent). Another little more than a quarter of such units were in buildings with 20-49 units (26.7 percent). On the other hand, more than nine in ten *in rem* units were in buildings with fewer than 50 units: 45.2 percent were in buildings with 20-49 units, while another 45.9 percent were in buildings with 3-19 units.

Rental units in different sizes of buildings were not scattered throughout the boroughs. Instead, they tended to be concentrated in certain boroughs. Close to eight in ten rental units in one- or two-unit buildings in the City were located in either Brooklyn (40.2 percent) or Queens (36.9 percent) (Table 4.34). Almost equal proportions of the remainder were in either Staten Island (12.1 percent) or the Bronx (10.1 percent). More than four in ten rental units in small buildings with 3-19 units were located in Brooklyn (42.9 percent), while another four in ten were located in either Queens (24.2 percent) or Manhattan (18.6 percent). More than eight in ten rental units in buildings with 20-99 units were located in either Manhattan (33.3 percent), Brooklyn (25.7 percent), or the Bronx (23.3 percent). The remaining units in such buildings were located mostly in Queens. On the other hand, of all rental units in the largest buildings, those with a hundred or more units, half were located in Manhattan, and the remainder were almost evenly distributed among the following three boroughs: Queens (17.4 percent), Brooklyn (16.1 percent), and the Bronx (15.7 percent).

The distribution of rental units in different sizes of buildings in each borough varied. The majority of rental units in the Bronx were in buildings with 20-99 units (54.8 percent) (Table 4.35). Combined with rental units in buildings with a hundred or more units, almost three-quarters of the rental units in the borough were in buildings with twenty or more units. On the other hand, the majority of

					Z	umber of U	nits in Buildi	Bl		
Regulatory Status	Number	All	1-2	3-5	6-19	3-19	20-49	50-99	20-99	100 or More
All Rental Units	2,017,701	100.0%	13.0%	12.0%	14.2%	26.3%	22.9%	17.3%	40.1%	20.6%
Controlled	52,562	100.0%	2.0%*	15.8%	20.8%	36.6%	30.2%	22.5%	52.7%	8.7%
Stabilized	1,046,377	100.0%	0.4%	1.6%	22.2%	23.8%	33.2%	24.3%	57.5%	18.3%
Pre-1947	769,079	100.0%	0.2%*	0.7%	27.3%	28.0%	40.2%	21.9%	62.1%	9.8%
Post-1947	722,298	100.0%	0.9%	4.0%	8.2%	12.2%	14.0%	31.0%	44.9%	42.0%
Other Regulated	126,661	100.0%	* *	2.0%	6.8%	8.7%	15.1%	15.9%	31.0%	60.1%
Unregulated	602,861	100.0%	42.5%	35.5%	2.8%	38.3%	4.2%	4.5%	8.6%	10.6%
In Rental Buildings	527,364	100.0%	47.6%	39.9%	2.6%	42.5%	2.5%	1.8%	4.3%	5.6%
In Coops/Condos	75,497	100.0%	7.1%	4.7%	4.2%	8.9%	15.8%	23.2%	39.0%	45.1%
Public Housing	172,661	100.0%	* *	* *	7.1%	7.4%	26.7%	19.8%	46.5%	45.5%
In Rem	16,579	100.0%	* *	7.7%*	38.2%	45.9%	45.2%	* *	51.1%	* *
Source: IIS Bureau of th	he Census 1000 N	Jaw Vork City H	oneing and Vac	SUPPORT SUPPORT						

# Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Building Size within Regulatory Status New York City 1999 Table 4.33

Source: Notes: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution. Too few units to report.

\* \*

HOUSING NEW YORK CITY 1999

	ر	New	York City	1999	-		
			Ν	umber of Ur	nits in Buildi	ng	
Borough	All	1-2	3-19	20-49	50-99	20-99	100 or More
All (Number)	2,017,701	262,601	530,435	461,556	348,407	809,964	414,701
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	17.1%	10.1%	12.1%	22.7%	24.2%	23.3%	15.7%
Brooklyn	30.1%	40.2%	42.9%	23.4%	28.6%	25.7%	16.1%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	28.6%	0.7%*	18.6%	38.8%	25.9%	33.3%	49.7%
Queens	21.4%	36.9%	24.2%	13.8%	20.4%	16.7%	17.4%
Staten Island	2.8%	12.1%	2.1%	1.2%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%

## Table 4.34 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Borough within Building Size New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

# Table 4.35 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Building Size within Borough New York City 1999

				Num	ber of Units in	Building	
Borough	Number	All	1-2	3-19	20-49	50-99	100 or More
All	2,017,701	100.0%	13.0%	26.3%	22.9%	17.3%	20.6%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	344,829	100.0%	7.7%	18.7%	30.4%	24.4%	18.9%
Brooklyn	607,599	100.0%	17.4%	37.4%	17.8%	16.4%	11.0%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	576,349	100.0%	0.3%*	17.2%	31.1%	15.7%	35.8%
Queens	432,514	100.0%	22.4%	29.7%	14.7%	16.5%	16.7%
Staten Island	56,409	100.0%	56.3%	20.0%	10.1%	5.4%	8.2%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

rental units in Brooklyn were in small buildings with fewer than twenty units (54.8 percent), while the remainder were distributed between buildings with 20-99 units (34.2 percent) and the largest buildings with a hundred or more units (11.0 percent). In Manhattan, fewer than one in five rental units were located in small buildings, mostly those with 3-19 units (17.2 percent), while more than a third were in the largest buildings with a hundred or more units (35.8 percent). Combined with rental units in buildings with 50-99 units (15.7 percent), more than half of all rental units in the borough were in buildings with fifty or more units. The remaining rental units were located in small buildings, either those with 3-19 units (29.7 percent). The remaining rental units (31.1 percent). In Queens, more than half of all rental units were located in small buildings, either those with one or two units (22.4 percent) or those with 3-19 units (29.7 percent). The remaining rental units in the borough were fairly evenly divided among other sizes of buildings: those with 20-49 units (14.7 percent), those with 50-99 units (16.5 percent), and those with a hundred or more units (56.3 percent). In Staten Island, more than half of the rental units were one- or two-unit buildings (56.3 percent), while another fifth were in buildings with 3-19 units (20.0 percent). The remainder were divided among buildings with 20-49 units (10.1 percent), 50-99 units (5.4 percent), and 100 or more units (8.2 percent).

The distribution of rental units by rent-regulation category within each size of building provides another dimension of rental units by building size. Almost all rental units in one- or two-unit buildings were unregulated rental units (97.6 percent), as were nine in ten of those in buildings with 3-5 units (88.0 percent) (Table 4.36). On the other hand, eight in ten rental units in buildings with 6-19 units (80.8

	Number of Units within Building									
Regulatory Status	All	1-2	3-5	6-19	3-19	20-49	50-99	20-99	100 or More	
All (Number)	2,017,701	262,601	243,019	287,417	530,435	461,556	348,407	809,964	414,701	
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Controlled	2.6%	0.4%*	3.4%	3.8%	3.6%	3.4%	3.4%	3.4%	1.1%	
Stabilized	51.9%	1.4%	6.8%	80.8%	46.9%	75.4%	73.0%	74.3%	46.2%	
Pre-1947	38.1%	0.5%*	2.2%	72.9%	40.5%	67.0%	48.3%	59.0%	18.1%	
Post-1947	13.7%	0.9%	4.6%	7.9%	6.4%	8.4%	24.7%	15.4%	28.1%	
Other Regulated <sup>a</sup>	6.3%	**	1.0%	3.0%	2.1%	4.1%	5.8%	4.8%	18.4%	
Unregulated	29.9%	97.6%	88.0%	5.9%	43.5%	5.4%	7.7%	6.4%	15.4%	
Public Housing	8.6%	**	**	4.3%	2.4%	10.0%	9.8%	9.9%	19.0%	
In Rem	0.8%	**	0.5%*	2.2%	1.4%	1.6%	**	1.0%	**	

#### Table 4.36 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Regulatory Status within Building Size New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a Other Regulated includes Mitchell-Lama, HUD-regulated, Loft Board and Article 4 rental units.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report

Notes:

percent) and about three-quarters of those in buildings with 20-99 units (74.3 percent) were rentstabilized units. At the same time, close to half of the units in the largest buildings, those with one hundred or more units, were rent-stabilized units (46.2 percent), while most of the remainder were either public housing units (19.0 percent), "other" rent-regulated units (18.4 percent), or unregulated rental units (15.4 percent).

### Structure Class of Rental Units

Of all 2,018,000 occupied and vacant-available rental units in the City, 86.3 percent were located in multi-family buildings, while 13.7 percent were in one- or two-family houses (Table 4.37). Of all rental units, four in ten were in either Old-Law tenement buildings (9.4 percent), which were built before 1901, or New-Law tenement buildings (31.0 percent), which were built between 1901 and 1929. As for all housing units, buildings built after 1929 covered the largest proportion of rental units in the City: 38.0 percent.

The distribution of rental units by structure class varied from borough to borough. More than nine in ten of all rental units in the Bronx were in multi-family buildings, and about half of these were in New-Law tenements (48.8 percent) (Table 4.37). In Brooklyn, eight in ten of all rental units were in multi-family buildings, and more than four in ten were in either Old-Law tenement buildings (10.7 percent) or New-Law tenement buildings (32.3 percent). At the same time, all of the rental units in Manhattan were in multi-family buildings, and half were in either Old-Law (19.6 percent) or New-Law (29.9 percent) tenements. On the other hand, of the rental units in Queens, three-quarters were in multi-family buildings, while a quarter were in one- or two-family buildings. Of all the rental units in Staten Island, 63.0 percent, were in one- or two-unit buildings.

Almost all Old-Law tenements in the City were located in either Manhattan (62.3 percent) or Brooklyn (34.5 percent) (Table 4.37). At the same time, close to nine in ten of New-Law tenements were located in three boroughs: Brooklyn (31.5 percent), Manhattan (28.7 percent), and the Bronx (27.0 percent). On the other hand, close to eight in ten of rental units in one- or two-unit buildings were located in either Brooklyn (40.2 percent) or Queens (36.9 percent).

By looking at rental units by rent-regulation category within each building structure class, we see that seven in ten of the 180,000 Old-Law tenements were rent-stabilized units, while the remainder were mostly either unregulated rental units (18.1 percent) or rent-controlled units (5.4 percent) (Table 4.38). At the same time, eight in ten of the 593,000 New-Law tenements were rent-stabilized units, while the remainder were either unregulated rental units (11.7 percent), rent-controlled units (4.6 percent), or "other" rent-regulated units (3.3 percent). About half of the 728,000 rental units in multiple-dwelling buildings built after 1929 were rent-stabilized units (48.8 percent), while another almost a quarter were public housing units (23.6 percent). The remainder were either unregulated rental units (10.0 percent). At the same time, more than half of the 95,000 rental units in one- or two-family houses converted to apartments were unregulated rental units (53.9 percent), while another four in ten were rent-stabilized units (39.5 percent). On the other hand, of the 263,000 rental units in one- or two-family houses, almost all were unregulated rental units (97.6 percent).

Structure Classification	A 11	Dronyc	Ducoldar	Manhatta= <sup>c</sup>	Queenc	Staten
Structure Classification	All	Bronx	Brooklyn	Mannattan	Queens	Island
All"	2,017,701	344,829	607,599	576,349	432,514	56,409
Multifamily Buildings <sup>a</sup>	1,755,100	318,370	501,992	574,604	335,495	24,639
Old-Law Tenement	179,593	2,955*	61,931	111,837	2,871*	**
New-Law Tenement	592,596	159,767	186,446	170,055	74,851	**
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	727,608	128,890	173,096	205,777	203,076	16,769
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	94,675	8,339	41,695	32,504	11,739	**
Other <sup>d</sup>	57,013	**	7,712	47,638	**	**
1-2 Family Houses	262,601	26,460	105,607	**	97,019	31,770
Distribution Within Borough						
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Multifamily Buildings <sup>b</sup>	86.3%	91.9%	81.7%	99.7%	75.2%	37.0%
Old-Law Tenement	9.4%	0.9%	10.7%	19.6%	0.7%	**
New-Law Tenement	31.0%	48.8%	32.3%	29.9%	19.2%	2.9%*
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	38.0%	39.4%	30.0%	36.1%	52.0%	33.3%
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	4.9%	2.5%	7.2%	5.7%	3.0%	**
Other <sup>d</sup>	3.0%	**	1.3%	8.4%	**	**
1-2 Family Houses	13.7%	8.1%	18.3%	0.3%*	24.8%	63.0%
Distribution Within Structure (	Classification					
All	100.0%	17.1%	30.1%	28.6%	21.4%	2.8%
Multifamily Buildings <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	18.1%	28.6%	32.7%	19.1%	1.4%
Old-Law Tenement	100.0%	1.6%	34.5%	62.3%	1.6%	**
New-Law Tenement	100.0%	27.0%	31.5%	28.7%	12.6%	0.2%*
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	100.0%	17.7%	23.8%	28.3%	27.9%	2.3%
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	100.0%	8.8%	44.0%	34.3%	12.4%	**
Other <sup>d</sup>	100.0%	**	13.5%	83.6%	**	**
1-2 Family Houses	100.0%	10.1%	40.2%	0.7%*	36.9%	12.1%

#### Table 4.37 Number and Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units by Structure Classification and by Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

a Includes units whose structure class within multifamily buildings was not reported.

b Excludes units whose structure class within multifamily buildings was not reported.

c Marble Hill in the Bronx.

d Multi-family structures including apartment hotels built before 1929, commercial buildings altered to apartments,

and other units in miscellaneous Class B structures.

\* Since the number or percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

Notes:

					Stabilized						
Structure Classification	ΠA		Public	Both	Pre-47	Post-47	M-L Rental	Controlled	In Rem	Other Regulated	Un- Regulated
All <sup>a</sup>	2,017,701	100.0%	8.6%	51.9%	38.1%	13.7%	3.5%	2.6%	0.8%	2.8%	29.9%
MultifamilyBuildings <sup>a</sup>	1,755,100	100.0%	9.8%	59.4%	43.7%	15.7%	4.0%	2.9%	0.9%	3.2%	19.7%
Old-Law Tenement	179,593	100.0%	* *	71.9%	70.2%	$1.7\%^{b}$	* *	5.4%	1.9%	2.7%	18.1%
New-Law Tenement	592,596	100.0%	* *	79.3%	78.1%	$1.2\%^{\mathrm{b}}$	* *	4.6%	1.2%	3.3%	11.7%
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	727,608	100.0%	23.6%	48.8%	14.3%	34.5%	10.0%	0.9%	* *	3.7%	13.5%
1-2 Family House Converted to Apartment	94,675	100.0%	* *	39.5%	30.7%	8.7%	* *	5.3%	* *	* *	53.9%
Other	57,013	100.0%	* *	69.1%	67.1%	2.1%*	* *	2.3%*	* *	7.4%	20.2%
1-2 Family Houses	262,601	100.0%	* *	1.4%	$0.5\%^{*}$	0.9%	* *	0.4%*	* *	*	97.6%
Source: U.S. Bureau of the C Notes:	Census, 1999 N	ew York City	/ Housing an	d Vacancy S	Survey.						
a Includes units whose b Data on structure cl	structure class	within multifa	amily buildin Citv's Maste	gs was not re r Building	eported. File and data	t on vear built	t are obtained	1 from the Citv'	s RPAD Fil	e. An	

5 5 Data on structure class are obtained from the City's Master Building File and data on inconsistency between the two files may have led to an irregular classification of these units. Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution. Too few units to report.

\* \*

# The Owner Housing Inventory

#### Changes in the Ownership Rate

The 1999 HVS reports that the homeownership rate in New York City increased by 1.9 percentage points in the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, from 30.0 percent to 31.9 (Table 4.39). The homeownership rates in Staten Island and Queens were substantially higher than the overall city-wide rate, while the rates in the other three boroughs were lower than the city-wide rate. In Staten Island, the rate was 63.3 percent, the highest of any borough and almost double the city-wide rate, while the rate in Queens was 44.0 percent, the second highest in the City and 1.4 times the city-wide rate. On the other hand, the rates in the Bronx and Manhattan were 21.9 percent and 22.8 percent respectively, markedly lower than the city-wide rate. At the same time, the rate in Brooklyn was 28.4 percent, higher than the rates in Manhattan and the Bronx, but still considerably lower than the city-wide rate (Figure 4.8) (Map 4.3).

Table 4.39
Homeownership Rate by Borough
New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999

Borough	1991	1993	1996	1999
All	29.8%	29.0%	30.0%	31.9%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	19.2%	20.5%	20.4%	21.9%
Brooklyn	26.6%	26.9%	27.3%	28.4%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	19.3%	17.9%	20.3%	22.8%
Queens	43.8%	40.8%	42.2%	44.0%
Staten Island	62.6%	62.8%	61.6%	63.3%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.



Figure 4.8 Homeownership Rates by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

The homeownership rate for white households was 42.0 percent, the highest of any racial and ethnic group and 1.3 times the city-wide rate of 31.9 percent (Table 4.40). The rate for Asian households was 35.2 percent, the second highest of all racial and ethnic groups and considerably higher than the city-wide rate. The rates for the other racial and ethnic groups were lower than the city-wide rate. For black households, the rate was 28.5 percent. For Puerto Rican households, it was a mere 14.6 percent, only 45.8 percent of the city-wide rate. The rate for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was disproportionately low, only 12.7 percent, the lowest of any racial and ethnic group and just 39.8 percent of the city-wide rate (Figure 4.9).

Changes in the homeownership rate over the years have varied from one racial and ethnic group to another. For white households, the rate fluctuated slightly from 40.5 percent in 1991 to 39.0 percent in 1993 and 40.1 percent in 1996 (Table 4.40). Then, in the following three years, it increased to 42.0 percent in 1999. The rate for black households was 22.5 percent in 1991 and remained at that level in the following three years. Then, it made back-to-back improvements in the next two three-year periods, increasing from 22.5 percent in 1993 to 25.1 percent in 1996 and 28.5 percent in 1999. For Puerto Rican households, the rate remained practically constant between 1991 and 1993: 11.9 percent in 1991 and 12.0 percent in 1993. Since then it has also had back-to-back improvements, rising to 13.2 percent in 1996 and 14.6 percent in 1999, although it was still extremely low. Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households

# Map 4.3 Homeownership Rate New York City 1999



have not made any appreciable improvement in their homeownership rate, which was 12.7 percent in 1991 and remained the same eight years later in 1999. The rate for Asian households in 1991 was 32.1 percent, and it remained practically constant, without any noticeable change, until 1996. However, it improved substantially in the following three years, going from 31.7 percent to 35.2 percent. The rate for Asian households was higher than the city-wide rate in each of the four survey years.

#### Changes in the Owner Unit Inventory

The number of occupied and vacant-available owner units in the City increased back-to-back, from 825,000 in 1993 to 858,000 in 1996 and to 932,000 in 1999 (Table 4.41). Particularly during the

Table 4.40
Number of Owner Occupied Units and Ownership Rate by Race/Ethnicity of Householder
New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999

	1991	1993	1996	1999				
Race/Ethnicity		Number 1	Distribution					
All	829,135	804,870	834,183	915,126				
White	556,384	533,817	525,488	556,940				
Black/African American	136,838	150,500	167,957	190,632				
Puerto Rican	33,179	33,541	37,710	40,914				
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	33,627	34,218	38,471	46,047				
Asian	47,147	51,939	62,189	77,004				
Other <sup>a</sup>	9,227	**	2,367*	3,588				
Race/Ethnicity Not Reported	12,732							
	Ownership Rate							
All	29.8%	29.0%	30.0%	31.9%				
White	40.5%	39.0%	40.1%	42.0%				
Black/African American	22.5%	22.5%	25.1%	28.5%				
Puerto Rican	11.9%	12.0%	13.2%	14.6%				
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	12.7%	12.0%	12.5%	12.7%				
Asian	32.1%	31.1%	31.7%	35.2%				
Other <sup>a</sup>	22.6%	**	18.1%	28.0%				

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

\* Since this is a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

a In 1991 "Other" included American Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and all others identified as "Other race." For 1993, 1996 and 1999 "Other" includes only American Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos; individuals the respondent identified as "Other race" and those for whom race was not reported were allocated among the race categories.



Figure 4.9 Homeownership Rates by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999

 Table 4.41

 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Legal Form of Ownership

 New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999

Legal Form of					Change 1	991-1996	Change 1	996-1999
Ownership	1991	1993	1996	1999	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	858,108	825,329	857,765	932,123	**	**	+74,358	+8.7%
Conventional	564,461	543,623	555,318	580,175	-9,143	-1.6%	+24,857	+4.5%
Cooperative	248,170	235,679	256,542	299,725	+8,372	+3.4%	+43,183	+16.8%
Mitchell-Lama <sup>a</sup>	41,094	43,817	52,761	55,573	+11,667	+28.4%	+2,812*	+5.3%
Private Coop	207,076	191,862	203,781	244,152	-3,295	-1.6%	+40,371	+19.8%
Condominium	45,477	46,027	45,904	52,222	**	**	+6,318	+13.8%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a The Census Bureau made improvements in classifying more correctly renter occupied and owner occupied Mitchell Lama units, which might have reduced somewhat the number of Mitchell-Lama rental units and increased somewhat the number of Mitchell-Lama owner units in 1996 and thereafter, compared to the numbers in 1993 and before.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

three years between 1996 and 1999, the number of owner units soared by 74,000, or by 8.7 percent. In the six years between the 1993 HVS and the 1999 HVS--that is, from June 1993 to May 1999--the number of owner units jumped by 107,000, or by 12.9 percent. During the similar six-year period between July 1993 and June 1999, 10,644 families became owners through HPD's various programs to offer more affordable owner-housing units in the City.<sup>10</sup>

The number has increased in each legal form of ownership in the City since 1993, although the rate of increase has varied from one form of ownership to another. Between 1996 and 1999, the number of private cooperative units increased considerably by 40,000 units, or 19.8 percent, to 244,000 units. The number of condominium units increased by 6,000 units, or by 13.8 percent, to 52,000. At the same time, the number of conventional owner units increased by 25,000, or by 4.5 percent, to 580,000 units.

#### **Owner Units by Location**

Owner units, occupied and vacant-available together, in the City consisted of the following four types of ownership (legal forms of ownership): conventional (62.2 percent), private cooperatives (26.2 percent), Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (6.0 percent), and condominiums (5.6 percent) (Table 4.42). The composition of owner units varied from borough to borough. In the Bronx, the composition was somewhat consistent with that in the City as a whole, except that preponderately more owner units in the Bronx were Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, and fewer were private cooperatives and condominiums. In 1999, of the 93,000 owner units in the borough, 22.5 percent were Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, while only 15.0 percent and 1.8 percent respectively were private cooperatives and condominiums (Table 4.42). Mitchell-Lama cooperatives were highly concentrated in the Bronx: 37.6 percent of all such owner units in the City were located in the borough. In Brooklyn, 77.4 percent of the 237,000 owner units were conventional units, while only 15.4 percent and 1.8 percent respectively were private cooperatively were private cooperatives and condominiums (Figure 4.10) (Map 4.4) (Map 4.5).

Conversely, a disproportionately large proportion, 72.3 percent, of the 172,000 owner units in Manhattan were private cooperatives, while another 15.9 percent were condominiums. A mere 4.3 percent of owner units in this borough were conventionally owned. The composition of owner units by type of ownership in Queens resembled that in Brooklyn, except that somewhat more units in Queens were private cooperatives (20.5 percent) and condominiums (4.2 percent). In Staten Island, almost all, or 94.7 percent, of the 93,000 owner units were conventional units.

The number of owner units in each of the five boroughs increased, contributing to an increase of 74,000, or 8.7 percent, in the total number of owner units in the City, over the three years between 1996 and 1999 (Tables 4.41 and 4.43). The number of owner units in Queens increased by 29,000 units, or by 9.4 percent. Almost all of this increase was the result of increases of 15,000 in the number of conventional owner units and 12,000 in the number of private cooperative and condominium units. In

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Division of Policy and Program Analysis. "Homeownership" is generally a record of the number of owners, not building units. For example, in the case of the Partnership program, homeowners may purchase one-, two-, or three-family buildings. Thus, the actual unit counts are much higher than the homeownership counts.

# Table 4.42 Number and Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Legal Form of Ownership and Borough New York City 1999

Logal Form of						Staten
Ownership	Total	<b>Bron</b> x <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Island
All	932,123	92,823	237,334	171,779	337,515	92,672
Conventional	580,175	56,346	183,649	7,459	244,977	87,744
Cooperative	299,725	34,783	49,380	137,052	78,324	**
Mitchell-Lama	55,573	20,900	12,893	12,793	8,987	**
Private Cooperative	244,152	13,884	36,487	124,259	69,338	**
Condominium	52,222	**	4,304	27,268	14,214	4,743
Distribution within Bor	ough					
Legal Form of Ownership	Total	Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Conventional	62.2%	60.7%	77.4%	4.3%	72.6%	94.7%
Cooperative	32.2%	37.5%	20.8%	79.8%	23.2%	**
Mitchell-Lama	6.0%	22.5%	5.4%	7.4%	2.7%	**
Private Cooperative	26.2%	15.0%	15.4%	72.3%	20.5%	**
Condominium	5.6%	1.8%*	1.8%	15.9%	4.2%	5.1%
Distribution within For	m of Ownership					
Legal Form of Ownership	Total	Bronx	Brooklyn	Manhattan	Queens	Staten Island
All	100.0%	10.0%	25.5%	18.4%	36.2%	9.9%
Conventional	100.0%	9.7%	31.7%	1.3%	42.2%	15.1%
Cooperative	100.0%	11.6%	16.5%	45.7%	26.1%	**
Mitchell-Lama	100.0%	37.6%	23.2%	23.0%	16.2%	**
Private Cooperative	100.0%	5.7%	14.9%	50.9%	28.4%	**
Condominium	100.0%	3.2%*	8.2%	52.2%	27.2%	9.1%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

Manhattan, the number of owner units increased by 22,000 units, or by 15.0 percent. Almost all of this increase was the result of an increase of 21,000 in the number of cooperative and condominium units. The number of owner units in Brooklyn also rose considerably by 11,000 units, or by 5.0 percent. Almost all of this increase resulted from an increase of 9,000 in the number of private cooperatives.<sup>11</sup> The numbers of owner units in Staten Island and the Bronx increased as well, by 6,000 and 5,000 respectively.



Figure 4.10 Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Type of Ownership within Borough New York City 1999

#### Size of Owner Units

The sizes of owner units remained constant between 1996 and 1999.<sup>12</sup> In 1999, almost half of all owner units were units with three or more bedrooms (49.1 percent), while the remainder were units with either two bedrooms (29.3 percent) or one bedroom (18.6 percent) (Table 4.44). However, almost all of the conventional units in the City were larger units with two or more bedrooms: seven in ten had three or more bedrooms, while another quarter had two bedrooms. On the other hand, eight in ten

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Map 4.4 Occupied and Vacant Conventional Owner Units as a Percentage of Private\* Owner Units New York City 1999



Mitchell-Lama cooperatives were either one-bedroom units (42.2 percent) or two-bedroom units (37.4 percent), while another close to a fifth had three or more bedrooms (18.3 percent). Like Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, almost eight in ten of the private cooperatives were also either one-bedroom units (42.5 percent) or two-bedroom units (35.6 percent), while the remainder were either units with three or more bedrooms (12.8 percent) or studios with no bedrooms (9.1 percent). Of condominium units, more than seven in ten were either one-bedroom units (34.3 percent) or two-bedroom units (38.6 percent), while another more than a fifth had three or more bedrooms (21.7 percent).

Almost all of the smallest owner units, studios, were either private cooperative units (81.6

Map 4.5 Occupied and Vacant Cooperative and Condominium Owner Units as a Percentage of Private\* Owner Units New York City 1999



percent) or condominium units (10.2 percent) (Table 4.45). At the same time, six in ten of the onebedroom owner units were private cooperative units, while the remainder were scattered among conventional units (16.4 percent), Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (13.5 percent), and condominium units (10.3 percent). Conversely, more than half of the two-bedroom owner units were conventional units (53.3 percent), while more than three in ten were private cooperative units (31.7 percent); the remainder were either Mitchell-Lama cooperatives (7.6 percent) or condominium units (7.4 percent). Almost nine in ten of the owner units with three or more bedrooms were conventional units (88.5 percent), while most of the remainder were private cooperatives (6.8 percent).

	1991	1993	1996	1999			
		Number Dis	tribution				
All	858,108	825,329	857,765	932,123			
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	83,196	87,854	87,430	92,823			
Brooklyn	227,087	224,959	226,058	237,334			
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	140,853	131,493	149,311	171,779			
Queens	320,812	294,959	308,374	337,515			
Staten Island	86,161	86,064	86,592	92,672			
	Percent Distribution						
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	9.7%	10.6%	10.2%	10.2%			
Brooklyn	26.5%	27.3%	26.4%	25.5%			
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	16.4%	15.9%	17.4%	18.4%			
Queens	37.4%	35.7%	36.0%	36.2%			
Staten Island	10.0%	10.4%	10.1%	9.9%			

# Table 4.43 Number and Distribution of Owner Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1991 - 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

# Table 4.44 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Number of Bedrooms Within Form of Ownership New York City 1999

	Number of Bedrooms					
Form of Ownership	All	0	1	2	3 or More	
All	100.0%	2.9%	18.6%	29.3%	49.1%	
Conventional	100.0%	0.2%*	4.9%	25.1%	69.8%	
Private Cooperative	100.0%	9.1%	42.5%	35.6%	12.8%	
Mitchell-Lama Cooperative	100.0%	2.1%*	42.2%	37.4%	18.3%	
Condominium	100.0%	5.3%	34.3%	38.6%	21.7%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note:

Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*

# Table 4.45 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Type of Ownership Within Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

	Number of Bedrooms					
Form of Ownership	All	0	1	2	3 or More	
All (Number)	932,123	27,342	173,640	273,478	457,664	
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Conventional	62.2%	3.9%*	16.4%	53.3%	88.5%	
Private Cooperative	26.2%	81.6%	59.7%	31.7%	6.8%	
Mitchell-Lama Cooperative	6.0%	4.3%*	13.5%	7.6%	2.2%	
Condominium	5.6%	10.2%	10.3%	7.4%	2.5%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution

# Table 4.46 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Borough within Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

	Number of Bedrooms					
Borough	All	0	1	2	3 or More	
All (Number)	932,123	27,342	173,640	273,478	457,664	
All (Percent)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	10.0%	4.3%*	10.1%	11.3%	9.4%	
Brooklyn	25.5%	13.1%	19.1%	27.9%	27.2%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	18.4%	68.3%	39.2%	20.5%	6.3%	
Queens	36.2%	12.2%	30.4%	35.3%	40.4%	
Staten Island	9.9%	**	1.2%	5.0%	16.7%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes: a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

Almost seven in ten of the studios in the City were concentrated in one borough, Manhattan (68.3 percent), while most of the remainder were located in either Brooklyn (13.1 percent) or Queens (12.2 percent) (Table 4.46). At the same time, seven in ten of the one-bedroom units in the City were

Note: \*

located in two boroughs, Manhattan (39.2 percent) and Queens (30.4 percent), while the remainder were located in Brooklyn (19.1 percent) or the Bronx (10.1 percent). On the other hand, more than eight in ten of the two-bedroom units in the City were scattered among three boroughs: Queens (35.3 percent), Brooklyn (27.9 percent), and Manhattan (20.5 percent). Four in ten of the units with three or more bedrooms in the City were concentrated in Queens (40.4 percent), while another more than a quarter were located in Brooklyn (27.2 percent). The remainder were scattered among the three other boroughs: Staten Island (16.7 percent), the Bronx (9.4 percent), and Manhattan (6.3 percent).

The distribution of owner units by size in the Bronx resembled the city-wide distribution: eight in ten of all owner units in the borough were larger units, either two-bedroom units (33.4 percent) or units with three or more bedrooms (46.5 percent) (Table 4.47). The remainder were mostly onebedroom units (18.9 percent). The distribution in Brooklyn was also similar to that of the City as a whole and the Bronx, except that more owner units in Brooklyn were larger units and fewer were one-bedroom units. Of the owner units in the borough, more than eight in ten were either two-bedroom units (32.2 percent) or units with three or more bedrooms (52.4 percent), while the remainder were mostly onebedroom units (13.9 percent). On the other hand, half of the owner units in Manhattan were smaller units, either studios (10.9 percent) or one-bedroom units (39.6 percent). The remainder were larger units, either two-bedroom units (32.6 percent) or units with three or more bedrooms (16.9 percent). In Queens, more than half of the owner units were larger units with three or more bedrooms (54.8 percent), while another close to three in ten were two-bedroom units (28.6 percent). Almost all of the owner units in Staten Island were larger units: more than eight in ten had three or more bedrooms (82.3 percent), while most of the remainder were two-bedroom units (14.7 percent).

Borough		Number of Bedrooms					
	Number	All	0	1	2	3 or More	
All	932,123	100.0%	2.9%	18.6%	29.3%	49.1%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	92,823	100.0%	1.3%*	18.9%	33.4%	46.5%	
Brooklyn	237,334	100.0%	1.5%	13.9%	32.2%	52.4%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	171,779	100.0%	10.9%	39.6%	32.6%	16.9%	
Queens	337,515	100.0%	1.0%	15.6%	28.6%	54.8%	
Staten Island	92,672	100.0%	**	2.3%	14.7%	82.3%	

### Table 4.47 Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Owner Units by Number of Bedrooms within Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Owner Units by Year of Home Purchase

According to the 1999 HVS, at the time of the survey, 87,000 owners, or 9.5 percent of all owners in the City, had bought the units they were occupying within the previous eighteen months between January 1998 and June 1999, when the Census Bureau completed interviewing the sample-unit households for the 1999 HVS (Table 4.48). This was an increase of 29,000, or 50.7 percent, over the 58,000 units owners bought during the equivalent eighteen-month period between January 1995 and June 1996, when the 1996 HVS interviews were completed. In addition, the 1999 HVS reports that 189,000 owners, or 20.7 percent of all owners in the City, purchased their units during the previous three-year period between January 1995 and December 1997. This is an increase of 18,300 owner units over the 171,000 units that owners bought during the equivalent three-year period between January 1992 and December 1994. In sum, a total of 276,000 owners, or 30.2 percent of all owners in the City, had bought their units during the four-and-a-half years between January 1995 and June 1999. This increase in home purchases in the City was likely the result of growth in the owner housing market in recent years, as

Years	1991	1993	1996	1999			
Number Distribution							
All	829,135	804,870	834,183	915,126			
18 months or less	46,674	40,282	57,823	87,168			
19 months – 5 years	162,379	146,941	170,981	189,321			
6-10	129,859	140,577	154,790	153,911			
11-20	220,357	219,186	183,292	195,123			
21-30	146,364	143,261	145,750	144,641			
31 or more	123,502	114,623	121,548	144,962			
Percent Distribution							
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			
18 months or less	5.6%	5.0%	6.9%	9.5%			
19 months – 5 years	19.6%	18.3%	20.5%	20.7%			
6-10	15.7%	17.5%	18.6%	16.8%			
11-20	26.6%	27.2%	22.0%	21.3%			
21-30	17.7%	17.8%	17.5%	15.8%			
31 or more	14.9%	14.2%	14.6%	15.8%			

Table 4.48Number and Distribution of Owner Occupied Units by Length of Tenure<br/>New York City, Selected Years 1991 - 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

households' incomes, even after inflation, increased considerably. HPD's expanded programs to create affordable owner housing and educate the public on homeownership opportunities in the City undoubtedly contributed greatly to the increase in home purchases. As the owner housing market improved, many owner units which were previously rented out could also have been sold, as discussed earlier.

#### **Owner Units by Estimated Current Value**

The 1999 HVS reports that the proportion of owner units with higher estimated market value increased, while the proportion with lower market value decreased. In 1999, 20.6 percent of the owner units in the City, excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, had an estimated market value of \$300,000 or more, a 5.9 percentage-point-increase over 1996, when the figure was 14.7 percent (Table 4.49). On the other hand, the proportion of owner units with a market value of less than \$150,000 was 25.4 percent in 1999, an almost equivalent 5.2 percentage-point-decrease from 1996, when the figure was 30.6 percent.

In 1999, 128,000 owner units, or one in seven of the owner units in the City (excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives) were valued at less than \$100,000. Almost eight in ten of these units were private cooperatives; 48.6 percent were located in Queens and another 38.4 percent were distributed in the two boroughs of Brooklyn and Manhattan. Although they were the least expensive and smallest of owner units, they were not in much poorer condition, compared to owner units in the City overall.<sup>13</sup> Of all owner units in the City, 292,000, or a third, had an estimated value between \$100,000 and \$199,000. Another 263,000, or three in ten of the owner units in the City, had an estimated value between \$200,000 and \$299,000. In addition, another 177,000 owner units, or two in ten of all owner units, had an estimated value of \$300,000 or more. Of these owner units with the highest market value, 121,000, or 14.0 percent of all owner units, had an estimated value of \$350,000 or more. The number of owner units with this highest estimated value increased by 50,000, or by 71.8 percent, in the three years following 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.
Table 4.49
Number and Distribution of the Estimated Current Value of Owner Occupied Units
(Excluding Mitchell-Lama Coops) in 1999 Dollars
New York City 1996 and 1999

	1996	1999
	Number Distribution	
All	783,549	860,281
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 75,000	100,383	98,321
<sup>\$</sup> 75,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 99,999	35,411	29,781
<sup>\$</sup> 100,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 149,999	104,261	90,525
<sup>\$</sup> 150,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 199,999	191,492	201,489
<sup>\$</sup> 200,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 249,999	148,689	154,367
<sup>\$</sup> 250,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 299,999	88,325	108,783
<sup>\$</sup> 300,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 349,999	44,771	56,393
<sup>\$</sup> 350,000 or more	70,217	120,622
	Percent Distribution	
All	100.0%	100.0%
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 75,000	12.8%	11.4%
<sup>\$</sup> 75,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 99,999	4.5%	3.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 100,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 149,999	13.3%	10.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 150,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 199,999	24.4%	23.4%
<sup>\$</sup> 200,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 249,999	19.0%	17.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 250,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 299,999	11.3%	12.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 300,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 349,999	5.7%	6.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 350,000 or more	9.0%	14.0%

Sources:U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.Note:The 1996 value was adjusted for inflation by multiplying the value by the CPI of April 1999 (176.0) and dividing by the<br/>CPI of April 1996 (166.0). The CPI was for all Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for New York-Northern N.J- Long Island.

#### Housing Units Accessible to Physically Disabled Persons

For the first time, in the 1996 HVS the Census Bureau collected data on five selected structural characteristics of residential buildings and units that help in estimating the number and characteristics of units accessible to physically disabled persons who might have to use wheelchairs in moving in and out of residential buildings and units in New York City. The 1999 HVS again collected data on these same five structural characteristics, which include: (1) street/inner lobby entry at least 32 inches wide (to allow a wheelchair to move in and out); (2) residential unit entrance of the same width; (3) elevator door at least 36 inches wide and cab at least 51 inches deep (in buildings with elevators); (4) no stairs between the sidewalk and a passenger elevator (in buildings with an elevator); and (5) no stairs between the sidewalk and the residential unit. These components of accessibility in New York City's multiple dwellings could be examined individually; but, since any one of the components could render a unit inaccessible to a person in a wheelchair, all five must be examined together in order to determine the number of units in multiple dwellings that are actually accessible to persons with disabilities requiring wheelchairs.

In 1999, only 469,000 units, or 42.4 percent of all units in multiple dwellings with elevators in the City, were determined to be accessible to people with physical disabilities requiring the use of a wheelchair, when all five accessibility criteria covered in the 1999 HVS are applied at once (Table 4.50). This is an increase of 54,000, or 13.0 percent, over the number of such units in 1996.

Of units in multiple dwellings without elevators, the number of accessible units was very small. In 1999, of the 827,000 units in such buildings, for which there was full information about each of the accessibility criteria, only 19,000 units altogether, or 2.3 percent, met all three HVS accessibility criteria for buildings without elevators (Table 4.51). This was a slight increase over the 14,000 such units in 1996.

#### Accessible Housing by Location and Structure Class

In Manhattan, 231,000 units, or 50.2 percent of all units in multiple dwellings with elevators in the borough, were accessible (Table 4.50). This was the largest number of accessible units, in terms of both absolute number and proportion, in the City. In Brooklyn, 71,000 units, or three in ten of all units in such buildings, were accessible, the lowest proportion of accessible units in all of the boroughs. In the Bronx, 77,000 units, or four in ten of all units in multiple dwellings with elevators, met all five accessibility criteria. In Queens, 86,000 units, or four in ten of all units in such buildings in the borough, were accessible. Only a small number of units were in multiple dwellings with elevators in Staten Island. Of these, about 5,000, or a little more than four in ten, were accessible.

The number of accessible units in multiple dwellings without elevators in each borough was very small: about 6,000 each in Brooklyn and Queens and fewer than 5,000 in the Bronx. The numbers in Manhattan and Staten Island were too small to report (Table 4.51).

Looking at the accessibility of units by structure class reveals that eight in ten of the 469,000 accessible units in New York City in multiple dwellings with elevators were in buildings built after 1929 (Table 4.52). Of the 764,000 units in multiple dwellings built after 1929 with elevators, 373,000 units, or

						Accessibili	ty Criteria <sup>a</sup>					
			Door	Width				No	Stairs			
	Entranc	:e/Lobby	Elev	ator	Resident	tial Unit	to Ele	vator	to L	Jnit	All Cr	iteria
Borough	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>c</sup>
All	822,238	64.4%	976,730	79.4%	959,379	79.7%	715,551	58.1%	655,775	52.2%	468,837	42.4%
Bronx <sup>d</sup>	161,183	75.9%	178,489	85.9%	181,566	87.8%	110,698	52.8%	93,165	44.3%	77,167	39.3%
Brooklyn	124,471	47.1%	178,871	70.9%	183,400	72.4%	126,210	50.2%	115,351	44.1%	70,620	31.1%
Manhattan <sup>d</sup>	392,123	71.6%	435,365	83.2%	411,132	82.9%	337,149	63.5%	316,318	58.5%	230,777	50.2%
Queens	137,038	57.3%	174,730	74.3%	173,618	73.7%	133,963	58.8%	124,568	53.6%	85,610	40.6%
Staten Island	7,422	59.5%	9,276	78.9%	9,663	77.5%	7,532	62.5%	6,373	52.5%	4,662	42.3%
Source: U.S.	Bureau of the C	ensus, 1999 N	ew York City	Housing and '	Vacancy Surve	ey.						
a For th chara City.	ae 1999 HVS th cteristics of unit: The five structu me width; (3) e	he Census Bur s accessible to rral characterist slevator door a	eau collected physically har tics include: (1 t least 36 inch	data on five s ndicapped pers ) street/inner l es wide and c	selected structu ons who migh obby entry at 1 ab at least 51	rral characteris t have to use v least 32 inches inches deep (i	stics of resider wheelchairs in 1 wide (to allow n buildings wi	ntial buildings moving in and a wheelchair ith elevators);	and units that I out of residen to move in and 4) no stairs be	t help in estin ttial buildings ( d out); (2) resid stween the sid	lating the num and units in Ne dential unit ent evalk and a p	ber and w York rance of tssenger
b Perce c Perce d Marbl	for (in buildings int of units for wi int of total units f e Hill in the Bro	with an elevate hich complete for which infor mx.	or); and (c) no information we mation was ref	stairs between as reported for ported on each	the criterion in and every crite	na the residen 1 question. erion.	ual unit.					

Table 4.50

HOUSING NEW YORK CITY 1999

287

			New Yo	rk City 1999				
			Α	ccessibility Crit	teria <sup>a</sup>			
	Entrance/Lobby	Door Width	Residential Uni	t Door Width	No Stair	s to Unit	All Ci	iteria
Borough	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>e</sup>
All	193,146	21.1%	328,030	38.7%	39,126	4.3%	18,722	2.3%
Bronx <sup>d</sup>	70,998	45.9%	87,972	59.4%	7,233	4.8%	4,846	3.4%
Brooklyn	53,499	16.2%	117,862	38.9%	12,351	3.8%	5,914	2.0%
Manhattan <sup>d</sup>	36,191	16.6%	66,225	34.0%	5,667	2.7%	2,004*	1.1%
Queens	31,077	15.6%	52,843	28.2%	12,968	6.6%	5,570	3.0%
Staten Island	* *	8.9%*	3,127	20.0%	* *	* *	* *	* *
Source: U.S. Bu	reau of the Census, 1	999 New York Ci	ty Housing and Vaca	ncy Survey.				

Table 4.51

Number and Percent of All Units in Multiple Family Dwellings with Wheelchair Accessibility by Accessibility Criteria and Number and Percent Meeting All Criteria by Borough Units in Buildings without Elevators

ρ Notes: inches deep (in buildings with elevators); (4) no stairs between the sidewalk and a passenger elevator (in buildings with an elevator); and (5) no stairs allow a wheelchair to move in and out); (2) residential unit entrance of the same width; (3) elevator door at least 36 inches wide and cab at least 51 the number and characteristics of units accessible to physically handicapped persons who might have to use wheelchairs in moving in and out of residential buildings and units in New York City. The five structural characteristics include: (1) street/inner lobby entry at least 32 inches wide (to For the 1999 HVS the Census Bureau collected data on five selected structural characteristics of residential buildings and units that help in estimating between the sidewalk and the residential unit.

Percent of units for which complete information was reported for the criterion in question.

Percent of total units for which information was reported on each and every criterion.

Marble Hill in the Bronx

\* d c d

Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution.

Too few units to report.

\*

					ts in Build New Y	ork City 1 Accessibili	1999 ty Criteria <sup>a</sup>					
			Door W	idth				No Staiı	SJ			
	Entranc	e/Lobby	Elevs	ator	Resident	iial Unit	to Ele	vator	to U	'nit	All Cr	iteria
Structure Class	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>c</sup>
All	822,238	64.4%	976,730	79.4%	959,379	79.7%	715,551	58.1%	655,775	52.2%	468,837	42.4%
Old Law	13,306	39.0%	18,276	59.1%	18,524	59.9%	10,307	31.2%	9,107	27.9%	6,455	22.9%
New Law	134,939	46.7%	197,107	71.3%	199,071	72.6%	102,638	37.3%	94,411	33.4%	59,876	24.3%
Post-1929	620,749	71.0%	701,631	82.6%	682,900	82.8%	559,766	66.0%	511,044	59.2%	372,684	48.8%
Converted House	11,914	60.1%	13,768	81.3%	13,979	79.3%	9,133	50.2%	9,148	48.4%	5,905	40.1%
Other	36,888	70.9%	40,489	80.2%	39,120	79.0%	30,777	62.3%	29,136	56.9%	21,284	46.5%
Source: U.S. Bı Notes:	areau of the Cens	sus, 1999 New	/ York City Hc	ousing and V	acancy Survey							

HOUSING NEW YORK CITY 1999

of the same width; (3) elevator door at least 36 inches wide and cab at least 51 inches deep (in buildings with elevators); (4) no stairs between the sidewalk and a passenger elevator (in buildings with an elevator); and (5) no stairs between the sidewalk and the residential unit. City. The five structural characteristics include: (1) street/inner lobby entry at least 32 inches wide (to allow a wheelchair to move in and out); (2) residential unit entrance

Percent of units for which complete information was reported for the criterion in question. Percent of total units for which information was reported on each and every criterion.

с р

48.8 percent, were accessible. On the other hand, relatively fewer units in the other types of multiple dwellings with elevators were accessible. Only a little more than a fifth of units in Old-Law tenement buildings and about a quarter of units in New-Law tenement buildings were accessible.

Of the 19,000 accessible units in multiple dwellings without elevators, 28.0 percent were in structures built after 1929, while 26.5 percent were in New-Law tenement buildings (Table 4.53). The numbers of accessible units in other multiple dwellings without elevators, including Old-Law tenement structures, were negligible.

#### Table 4.53 Number and Percent of All Units in Multiple Family Dwellings with Wheelchair Accessibility by Accessibility Criteria and Number and Percent Meeting All Criteria by Structure Class Units in Buildings without Elevators New York City 1999

				Accessibility C	riteriaª			
	Entrance/Lobb	y Door Width	Residential Ur	nit Door Width	No Stai	rs to Unit	All	Criteria
Structure Class	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>b</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>c</sup>
All	193,146	21.1%	328,030	38.7%	39,126	4.3%	18,722	2.3%
Old Law	27,975	16.5%	55,562	36.8%	3,475	2.1%	**	**
New Law	81,863	21.5%	145,237	40.3%	8,804	2.3%	4,952	1.4%
Post-1929	36,988	32.6%	50,728	47.0%	10,712	9.4%	5,235	4.9%
Converted House	16,569	16.4%	29,522	32.6%	3,786	3.8%	**	2.0%*
Other	3,193	14.8%	7,324	40.6%	**	**	**	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

For the 1999 HVS the Census Bureau collected data on five selected structural characteristics of residential buildings and units that help in estimating the number а and characteristics of units accessible to physically handicapped persons who might have to use wheelchairs in moving in and out of residential buildings and units in New York City. The five structural characteristics include: (1) street/inner lobby entry at least 32 inches wide (to allow a wheelchair to move in and out); (2) residential unit entrance of the same width; (3) elevator door at least 36 inches wide and cab at least 51 inches deep (in buildings with elevators); (4) no stairs between the sidewalk and a passenger elevator (in buildings with an elevator); and (5) no stairs between the sidewalk and the residential unit.

Percent of units for which complete information was reported for the criterion in question. b

Percent of total units for which information was reported on each and every criterion

Since the percent is based on a small number of units, interpret with caution. \*\*

Too few units to report.

Notes:

## **5** Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates

#### Introduction

In this chapter, first, overall rental vacancies and vacancy rates for the City as a whole are presented and discussed. In general, the number of housing vacancies that are available for rent or sale is the result of the interaction of both supply and demand in the housing market. In other words, housing vacancies rise as the housing supply expands and/or demand is reduced; they fall as the supply contracts and/or demand grows. Thus, the vacancy rate is the most commonly used indicator summarizing how a housing market is currently performing in terms of providing an adequate level of vacant, available housing units. For this reason, the following State and City rent regulation laws require the City to determine the existence of a housing emergency, based on the rental vacancy rate, as a condition for the continuation of rent regulations. If the rental vacancy rate is below 5.00 percent, according to a comprehensive housing market survey, the laws permit the City to declare the existence of a housing emergency, and rent control and rent stabilization can be continued. Local Law No. 20, 1962, of the New York City Rent Rehabilitation Law,<sup>1</sup> mandates that New York City conduct studies and investigations designed to determine if the rental vacancy rate is lower than five percent as proof of the need for continuing rent regulation and control. The Local Rent Stabilization Law of 1969<sup>2</sup> also permits the local determination of the existence of a housing emergency as a condition of the need for continuing rent stabilization. The Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974<sup>3</sup> not only again permits the local determination of the existence of a housing emergency but also specifically states that an emergency exists if the rental vacancy rate is 5 percent or less. Thus, the number of vacant units and rental vacancy rates are primary determinants of rent-regulation policies and programs in the City.

However, the vacancy rate alone indicates only the aggregate proportion of units that are vacant and available for rent or sale, not the reasonable choices of vacant units available for a particular group of households looking for units into which to move, in terms of tenure, types of rental or owner categories, location, price or rent, condition, and size. Therefore, in order to understand what suitable housing options vacant available units provide, in the second part of the chapter, data on the following characteristics of vacant available units that the HVS provides are analyzed separately for renter and owner units: location, asking price or rent levels, affordability, building and unit characteristics, housing and neighborhood conditions, and length of vacancies and turnovers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Section 1(3) of the Local Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, Section 8603 of the Unconsolidated Laws.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Section 26-501 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Section 3 of the Emergency Tenant Protection Act, Section 8623 of the Unconsolidated Laws.

In addition to the vacancy rate, two other indicators of the status of the housing market will be discussed, not to supplement the vacancy rate as the single best indicator, but to add depth to our understanding of how the forces of supply and demand operate and to underscore the degree of stringency in the market.

In the final part of the chapter, the number and characteristics of vacant units unavailable for rent or sale, including reasons for unavailability and the previous status of these units, are presented and discussed. Since the HVS has provided data on the number of vacant unavailable units in the City, the number of vacant unavailable units has always been substantially higher than the number of vacant rental units, while the rental vacancy rate has never been at or above 5.00 percent. Thus, examination of the reasons vacant units are unavailable could contribute to an additional understanding of changes in the formation of tenure and occupancy in the housing stock in the City, in general, and of the dynamics of changes in vacancies and the vacancy rate, in particular, between the survey years.

#### Definition of Vacant Rental Units and Estimating the Rental Vacancy Rate

Since the first HVS in 1965, the Census Bureau has applied the same definition and equation, without exception, in estimating the rental vacancy rate in New York City, using data from the HVS as specified in the following:

Number of	Vacar	it, Non-Dilapidated
Units	Availa	ible for Rent
Number of Vacant, Non-		Number of Renter-Occupied
Dilapidated Units	+	Units, Dilapidated
Available for Rent		and Non-Dilapidated

The Census Bureau has used the same definition of vacant rental units and the same equation for estimating the rental vacancy rate in its other surveys, such as the decennial census, the American Housing Survey, and the national Current Population Survey/Housing Vacancy Survey (CPS/HVS), with two minor differences. The first difference is that, in the HVS, as shown above, dilapidated vacant rental units are treated as unavailable for rent and are excluded in counting vacant units available for rent, while, in counting the number of occupied rental units, all occupied rental units, whether or not they are dilapidated, are counted.

The Census Bureau did not cover dilapidated vacant units in counting vacant available units--and, thus, in estimating the rental vacancy rate--in its 1950 and 1960 decennial censuses (although it collected data on dilapidation), on the grounds that such units should not be classified as vacant available units. But for the 1970 and following decennial censuses, the Census Bureau did not collect data on dilapidation because these censuses were done primarily by mail. For this reason, beginning with the 1970 census, whether or not a housing unit is dilapidated has not been considered in counting vacant available units for the decennial census. On the other hand, starting with the first HVS in 1965, the Census Bureau has

conducted the HVS through personal visit interviews; and data on dilapidation have always been collected and considered in classifying vacant available units.<sup>4</sup> Since dilapidated vacant units are not considered as available in estimating the rental vacancy rate, the rental vacancy rate calculated by applying the above HVS definition and equation can, in fact, be termed the "**net** rental vacancy rate." This classification of dilapidated vacant units as vacant unavailable units has been used by the Census Bureau in estimating the rental vacancy rate for every HVS without exception.

The second difference is that, in the HVS, the Census Bureau counts vacant units that are rented but not yet occupied as vacant unavailable units, not as renter occupied units. The Census Bureau uses a similar approach for the decennial census but different approaches for its other surveys. In these other surveys, the Census Bureau classifies rented but not yet occupied units as occupied units. In this regard, the Census Bureau's underlying assumption for the HVS, the primary purpose of which is to estimate the number of vacant rental units and the rental vacancy rate, is that it is logical to treat rented units that are not yet occupied as vacant unavailable units, since such units are committed for rental to identified tenants about to move in and are, for practical purposes, no longer available; thus, they cannot be counted as vacant available units.<sup>5</sup> For this reason, in estimating the rental vacancy rate for the HVS, the Census Bureau has classified vacant units that are rented but not yet occupied as vacant unavailable units since 1965, when the first survey was conducted.

The rental vacancy rate of 3.19 percent in 1999 was estimated using data from the 1999 HVS on each item in the above equation, as follows:

Since the HVS is a sample survey, the rental vacancy rate is subject, as are other statistics derived from the HVS, to sampling error. For this reason, this rental vacancy rate is different from the true vacancy rate that would be calculated from a one-hundred-percent-count survey. The HVS, like all censuses and surveys, is also subject to non-sampling errors.

The first kind of error mentioned above, sampling error, results from the fact that the actual sample used for the 1999 HVS was one of a large number of different samples of similar size that could have been selected from the same sample frame. Different samples would have yielded different rental vacancy rates. The sampling error, the extent to which any particular sampling result differs from the average of all possible results, is unknown; but the standard error of estimate is a statistical measure most commonly used to approximate it.

The City's determination of the need for continuing rent regulation is based on the rental vacancy rate estimated from the survey; therefore, a high standard of accuracy is required for the HVS. The Census Bureau is required to design the HVS sample in such a way that, if the rental vacancy rate

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For further discussion of the classification of dilapidated vacant units as vacant unavailable units, see Peter Marcuse, Rental Housing in the City of New York: Supply and Condition, 1975-1978, page 103.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> For further discussion of this issue, see Lawrence N. Bloomberg, *The Rental Housing Situation in New York City, 1975*, pages 215-216.

for the City were to be estimated at three percent, the standard error of the estimate of the rental vacancy rate would be no more than one-quarter of one percent. The results of the 1999 HVS show that the standard error of the rental vacancy rate of 3.19 percent is 0.19 percent. This means that if a census of every housing unit in the City had been taken using exactly the same procedure as in the HVS, the chances are 95 times out of 100 that the net rental vacancy rate from the census would vary from the rental vacancy rate of 3.19 percent by no more than 2 standard errors, or by 0.37 percent. That is, given the 1999 rental vacancy rate of 3.19 percent, the chances are 95 out of 100 that the actual vacancy rate is between 2.82 percent and 3.56 percent ( $3.19\% \pm 1.96 \ge 0.19$ ).

The second kind of error in estimating the rental vacancy rate is non-sampling error. Nonsampling errors can come from many sources, including if one or more units were erroneously classified as occupied or vacant. However, the incidence of non-sampling errors made in estimating the rental vacancy rate is likely to be lower for the HVS than for other surveys, since the specific purpose of the HVS is to estimate the rate accurately. All of the HVS's procedures are designed for this purpose, as is the HVS questionnaire, and the survey's enumerators are trained with particular regard to questions designed to determine whether a unit is vacant or not. As an additional check, for the HVS, the Census Bureau dispatches a second enumerator to all vacant units to verify the correct determination of their

		•		
Year	Number of Occupied Rental Units	Number of Vacant Available Rental Units	Total	Vacancy Rate
1999	1,953,289	64,412	2,017,701	3.19%
1996	1,946,165	81,256	2,027,421	4.01%
1993	1,970,355	70,115	2,040,470	3.44%
1991	1,951,576	76,727	2,028,303	3.78%
1987	1,884,210	47,486	1,931,696	2.46%
1984	1,900,768	39,594	1,940,362	2.04%
1981	1,933,887	42,157	1,976,044	2.13%
1978	1,930,030	58,682	1,988,712	2.95%
1975	1,999,037	56,968	2,056,005	2.77%
1970	2,167,100	33,000	2,200,100	1.50%
1968	2,096,058	26,035	2,122,093	1.23%
1965	2,077,031	68,423	2,145,454	3.19%
1960	2,078,000	38,300	2,116,300	1.81%

Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units and Net Rental Vacancy Rates New York City, Selected Years 1960 - 1999

Table 5.1

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 and 1970 Decennial Censuses and 1965, 1968, 1975, 1978, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

status. Most of this cannot generally be said to be true of other surveys that have much broader or different purposes. Finally, during the Census Bureau's review of the data for reasonableness and consistency, most of the operational errors in the HVS are detected and corrected.

#### The Overall Rental Vacancy Rate in New York City

Compared to the 1996 HVS, the 1999 HVS reports 17,000 fewer vacant-for-rent units city-wide, or a decrease of 20.7 percent, bringing the number of vacant rental units down to 64,000 in 1999 and lowering the vacancy rate for units available for rent in the City to 3.19 percent during the period between February and May 1999. This is down from 4.01 percent during a similar period (between March and June) in 1996<sup>6</sup> (Table 5.1). The 1999 rental vacancy rate is the lowest reported by the HVS since 1991 and indicates the substantially tightened stringency of the rental housing market, leaving tenants with fewer choices. The rate is significantly lower than 5.0 percent and, thus, meets the legal definition of a housing emergency in the City, as defined by New York State and City rent-regulation laws, requiring a continuation of both rent-control and rent stabilization in the City (Figure 5.1).





<sup>6</sup>In previous survey years, survey interviews were usually conducted between January or February and May. However, in 1996, due to two government-wide federal furloughs, the Census Bureau had to delay the interviews by more than four weeks.

#### Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Location

Vacant-available rental units are not evenly dispersed throughout the City. Instead, they are concentrated in some boroughs more than others and, even within boroughs, they are clustered in particular areas. Since households looking for suitable rental units consider not only the characteristics of vacant-available units--such as rent-regulation category, rent, size of unit, building and/or neighborhood conditions--but also residential location, it is useful to look at vacant-available rental units by vacancy rates by boroughs (Figure 5.2).

As the citywide rental vacancy rate dropped from 4.01 percent in 1996 to 3.19 percent in 1999, the rate also declined in all boroughs, except Staten Island. The rental vacancy rate in the Bronx was 5.04 percent in 1999, while it was 5.43 percent in 1996 (Table 5.2). Thus, in two consecutive survey years, the vacancy rate in the borough remained at or above 5.00 percent, the rental vacancy rate standard used to determine whether or not a housing emergency exists for the City as a whole. The number of vacant rental units in the Bronx in 1999 was 17,000, and these were highly concentrated in the southern part of the borough. Specifically, of all vacant rental units in the borough areas: 1 (Mott Haven/Hunts Point); 2 (Morrisania/East Tremont); 3 (Highbridge/South Concourse); 4 (University





Heights/Fordham); 5 (Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu); and 7 (Soundview/Parkchester). This is approximately the same area where most vacant-available rental units were located in both 1978 and 1996, when the rental vacancy rate in the borough was over 5.00 percent.

The rental vacancy rate in the south Bronx as a whole was 5.92 percent in 1999, down from 6.29 percent in 1996. The monthly median asking-rent for vacant-available units in the area in 1999 was \$600, 7.7 percent and 14.3 percent lower respectively than the \$650 for the Bronx overall and \$700 for the City as a whole.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, the conditions of buildings and neighborhoods in the area were worse than they were for the Bronx and the City. In the area, 76.1 percent and 83.3 percent respectively for the borough and the City. Of the vacant rental units in the area, 17.2 percent were located on streets with broken or boarded-up windows; the comparable figures for the borough and the City were 14.7 percent and 15.2 percent.

The rental vacancy rate in Staten Island was 5.82 percent in 1999, but the number of rental units was very small: only 56,000 occupied and vacant-available rental units in the borough (Table 5.2). Thus, a detailed analysis of the 1999 rental vacancy rate in the borough would not appear to provide any significant analytic value, although the rate was over the rental vacancy rate standard of 5.0 percent.

The rental vacancy rate in Brooklyn was 3.26 percent in 1999, down from 4.20 percent three years earlier, as the number of vacant rental units declined from 26,000 to 20,000 (Table 5.2). In Manhattan, the rate fell from 3.47 percent to 2.57 percent, as the number of vacant rental units was reduced from 20,000 to 15,000. In Queens, the rate also declined, from 3.28 percent to 2.11 percent, the lowest rate of all the boroughs, as the number of vacant rental units decreased from 14,000 to 9,000.

		1996			1999	
Borough	Number	Percent	Vacancy Rate	Number	Percent	Vacancy Rate
Total	81,256	100.0%	4.01%	64,412	100.0%	3.19%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	18,825	23.2%	5.43%	17,385	27.0%	5.04%
Brooklyn	25,937	31.9%	4.20%	19,819	30.8%	3.26%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	20,185	24.8%	3.47%	14,816	23.0%	2.57%
Queens	14,020	17.3%	3.28%	9,109	14.1%	2.11%
Staten Island	2,289*	2.8%	4.17%	3,283	5.1%	5.82%

Table 5.2Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Rent-Regulation Categories

The vacancy rate for rent-stabilized units declined considerably, from 3.57 percent to 2.46 percent, as the number of vacant rent-stabilized units dropped from 38,000 in 1996 to 26,000 in 1999 (Table 5.3). On the other hand, as the number of vacant unregulated rental units, 30,000 in 1999, remained virtually unchanged in the three years, the vacancy rate for units in this rental category declined only slightly from 5.29 percent to 4.98 percent, since the number of occupied units in the category increased considerably by 28,000 units during the three-year period. As in 1996, the vacancy rate for unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings was disproportionately higher than for the other sector of the category in 1999--13.25 percent, as opposed to 3.79 percent. As in 1996, vacant rent-stabilized units and vacant unregulated rental units together accounted for close to nine in ten of all vacant rental units in the City in 1999.

	Number of Rental	<sup>°</sup> Occupied Units	Number o Available Uni	f Vacant Rental ts	Percen Vacant A Rental	t of All vailable Units	Net Va Ra	acancy ate
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	1,946,165	1,953,289	81,256	64,412	100.0%	100.0%	4.01%	3.19%
Controlled	70,572	52,562						
Stabilized	1,014,751	1,020,588	37,549	25,790	46.2%	40.0%	3.57%	2.46%
Pre-1947	734,575	749,010	29,381	20,069	36.2%	31.2%	3.85%	2.61%
Post-1977	280,176	271,578	8,168	5,720	10.1%	8.9%	2.83%	2.06%
Other Regulated <sup>a</sup>	127,001	122,685	4,575	3,975	5.6%	6.2%	3.48%	3.14%
Unregulated	545,198	572,862	30,468	29,999	37.5%	46.6%	5.29%	4.98%
In Rental Buildings	478,828	507,371	21,328	19,993	26.2%	31.0%	4.26%	3.79%
In Coops/Condos	66,370	65,492	9,140	10,006	11.2%	15.5%	12.10%	13.25%
Public Housing	165,647	169,339	6,450	3,323	7.9%	5.2%	3.75%	1.92%
In Rem	22,997	15,253	2,214*	**	2.7%	2.1%*	8.78%	8.00%*

Table 5.3
Number of Occupied Rental Units, Vacant Available Rental Units
and Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Regulatory Status of Unit
New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a "Other regulated" includes Mitchell-Lama rentals, HUD subsidized units, Loft Board regulated units, and Article 4 rentals.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

The rental vacancy rate for public housing units decreased substantially, from 3.75 percent in 1996 to 1.92 percent in 1999, as the number of vacant public housing units was cut in half, from 6,000 to 3,000. At the same time, the number of vacant *in rem* units further declined from 1996, becoming negligibly small in 1999.

#### Vacancy Rates and Rent Levels

As the affordability of vacant-available housing becomes increasingly one of the most urgent housing issues in the City, it is critically important to consider vacant rental units by rent levels, among other housing and household characteristics, since, if the asking rents of vacant units are too high for a household to afford, these units do not provide any additional housing choices, even if the units are physically decent and located in neighborhoods suitable for the households.

Table 5.4
Number of Occupied and Vacant Available Rental Units
and Vacancy Rates by Monthly Rent Level in 1999 Dollars
New York City 1996 and 1999

	Number of Renter Occupied Units			N Av	Number of Vacant Available Rental Units			Vacancy Rate	
Monthly Rent Level <sup>a</sup>	1996	1999	Change 1996-1999	1996	1999	Change 1996-1999	1996	1999	
<sup>\$</sup> 1- <sup>\$</sup> 399	347,558	305,269	-12.2%	11,528	3,884	-66.3%	3.21%	1.26%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1- <sup>\$</sup> 299	221,479	202,380	-8.6%	6,050	2,090*	-65.5%	2.66%	1.02%	
<sup>\$</sup> 300 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	126,079	102,889	-18.4%	5,479	**	-67.3%	4.16%	1.71%*	
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	859,837	803,936	-6.5%	35,863	24,889	-30.6%	4.00%	3.00%	
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 499	220,302	200,770	-8.9%	7,536	5,203	-31.0%	3.31%	2.53%	
<sup>\$</sup> 500 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	315,400	289,199	-8.3%	12,771	8,510	-33.4%	3.89%	2.86%	
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	324,135	313,967	-3.1%	15,556	11,176	-28.2%	4.58%	3.44%	
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 999	465,182	523,356	+12.5%	25,589	23,453	-8.3%	5.21%	4.29%	
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 799	229,985	242,162	+5.3%	13,673	13,685	0	5.61%	5.35%	
<sup>\$</sup> 800 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	121,763	170,906	+40.4%	7,116	6,661	-6.4%	5.52%	3.75%	
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 999	113,433	110,288	-2.8%	4,801	3,107	-35.3%	4.06%	2.74%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000 or more	240,267	296,280	+23.3%	8,276	12,187	+47.3%	3.33%	3.95%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	111,984	133,677	+19.4%	3,980	4,600	+15.6%	3.43%	3.33%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 or more	128,283	162,603	+26.8%	4,296	7,587	+76.6%	3.24%	4.46%	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Contract rent for occupied units; asking rent for vacant units. In order to convert 1996 rents into rents measured in 1999 dollars, the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers, or CPI-U for New York, Northern New Jersey-Long Island was used (i.e., nominal rent multiplied by the ratio of CPI-U April 1999/CPI-U April 1996 or 176.0/166.0).

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

In the three years between 1996 and 1999, the number of vacant rental units declined and, consequently, the rental vacancy rate declined markedly, as discussed earlier. However, the impact of this shrinkage on the availability of rental units was not evenly distributed among the different rent levels. Instead, it was much more seriously felt by low-rent units and gradually receded as rent levels moved up. Between 1996 and 1999, the number of occupied and vacant rental units with rents of less than \$400 declined by 50,000, or by 13.9 percent, while the number of vacant rental units in the same rent level declined by 8,000, or by 66.3 percent (Table 5.4). Commensurately, the rental vacancy rate for units in this asking-rent level dropped sharply from 3.21 percent to 1.26 percent (Figure 5.3).



Figure 5.3 Net Rental Vacancy Rate by Monthly Rent Level

At the same time, the number of occupied and vacant rental units with an asking rent level of \$400 to \$699 declined by 67,000, or by 7.5 percent, from 896,000 to 829,000, while the number of vacant rental units in the same rent level declined by 11,000 units, or by 30.6 percent. As a result, the rental vacancy rate for units in this rent level declined considerably, from 4.00 percent to 3.00 percent.

On the other hand, during the same three years the number of occupied and vacant units with rents of \$700 to \$999 increased by 56,000, or by 11.4 percent, while the number of vacant rental units in this rent level decreased by 2,000, or by 8.3 percent. Consequently, the rental vacancy rate dropped from 5.21 percent to 4.29 percent.

Also, from 1996 to 1999, the number of occupied and vacant rental units with rents of \$1,000 or more increased by 60,000, or by 24.1 percent, while the number of vacant rental units in this rent level increased by 4,000, or by 47.3 percent. As a result, the rental vacancy rate for this level increased from 3.33 percent to 3.95 percent.

As the rental vacancy rate for the City declined markedly from 4.01 percent to 3.19 percent between 1996 and 1999, vacancy rates in every rent quintile declined. But the rates dropped the most substantially for units with very low rents (Figure 5.4). Specifically, the vacancy rate for units with rents in the lowest 20 percent was cut by more than half, from 3.06 percent to 1.47 percent, as the number of vacant units in the quintile declined by about half (Table 5.5 and Figure 5.5).



Figure 5.4 Vacancy Rates by Rent Quintile of Occupied and Vacant Available Units New York City 1996 and 1999

### Table 5.5Median Rent, Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and Vacancy Rate by Rent Quintile<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

	1996			1999		
Rent Quintile <sup>a</sup>	Median <sup>b</sup> Rent	Number <sup>a</sup> of Vacant Available Rental Units	Rental Vacancy Rate	Median <sup>b</sup> Rent	Number <sup>a</sup> of Vacant Available Rental Units	Rental Vacancy Rate
All	<sup>\$</sup> 636	81,256	4.01%	<sup>\$</sup> 650	64,412	3.19%
Lowest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 265	11,752	3.06%	<sup>\$</sup> 294	5,837	1.47%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Lowest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 504	14,685	3.56%	<sup>\$</sup> 508	11,760	2.96%
Middle 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 636	17,221	4.44%	<sup>\$</sup> 635	11,176	3.26%
2nd Highest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 742	18,865	5.30%	<sup>\$</sup> 760	20,346	4.69%
Highest 20%	<sup>\$</sup> 1,023	18,734	4.14%	<sup>\$</sup> 1,122	15,294	3.63%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a The rent quintile ranges for all occupied and vacant units, in 1999 dollars, for the two years were: 1996: \$1-\$423; \$424-\$565; \$566-\$688; \$689-\$847; \$848-\$3,293. 1999: \$1-\$443; \$444-\$589; \$590-\$699; \$700-\$899, \$900-\$3,820.

b Median rent for all occupied (contract rent) and vacant (asking rent) units in 1999 dollars.





Also, the 1999 HVS data on vacant rental units and rental vacancy rates by cumulative askingrent intervals provide a pattern that is generally consistent with findings of the above analyses of rental vacancies and rental vacancy rates by asking-rent levels and quintiles: as the rental vacancy rate for the City declined, the rate for each cumulative rent interval also declined. And the level of the decline was most serious for the very low rent levels, gradually receding in seriousness as rent levels move up. For units with asking rents of less than \$300, the rental vacancy rate was 1.02 percent in 1999, dropping from 2.66 percent in 1996 (Table 5.6). It plummeted from 3.21 percent to 1.26 percent for units renting for less than \$400 and from 3.25 percent to 1.76 percent for units renting for less than \$500. The rental vacancy rates for all of the very low rent levels--less than \$300, less than \$400, and less than \$500--were less than 2.00 percent in 1999.

As mentioned above, close to nine in ten vacant rental units in 1999 were either rent-stabilized units (40.0 percent) or unregulated rental units (46.6 percent) (Table 5.3). Thus, it is useful to review rental vacancy rates by asking-rent levels separately for rent-stabilized units and unregulated rental units. The rental vacancy rate for all rent-stabilized units was 2.46 percent in 1999. Close to nine in ten vacant rent-stabilized units had asking rents of either \$400-\$599 (29.0 percent), \$600-\$699 (23.2 percent), or

	Number o Available R	f Vacant ental Units	Vacancy Rate		
Monthly Rent Level	1996	1999	1996	1999	
All Rental Units <sup>a</sup>	81,256	64,412	4.01%	3.19%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 300	6,050	2,090*	2.66%	1.02%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 400	11,528	3,884	3.21%	1.26%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 500	19,064	9,087	3.25%	1.76%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 600	31,835	17,597	3.48%	2.16%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 700	47,391	28,772	3.78%	2.53%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 800	61,064	42,457	4.08%	3.05%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 900	68,180	49,118	4.19%	3.13%	
Less than \$1,000	72,980	52,225	4.18%	3.10%	
Less than \$1,250	76,960	56,825	4.13%	3.12%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 1,500	79,423	58,327	4.15%	3.11%	

#### Table 5.6 Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and Vacancy Rate by Cumulative Monthly Rent Intervals in 1999 Dollars New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

a Total includes units for which no rent is paid. These units are <u>not</u> included in the Monthly Rent Level figures.

\* Since the number of vacant units is small, interpret with caution.

\$700-\$899 (34.4 percent) (Table 5.7). The rental vacancy rate for such units in the lowest of these three rent levels, \$400-\$599, was the lowest at 2.35 percent, rising as the rent-level rose: 3.10 percent for units renting for \$600 to \$699 and 3.97 percent for units renting for the highest level, \$700-\$899.

Seven in ten vacant unregulated rental units had middle or high levels of rent: \$700-\$899 (32.9 percent), \$900-\$1,249 (17.8 percent), and \$1,250 and over (19.7 percent). The rental vacancy rate for all unregulated rental units was 4.98 percent in 1999. However, the rates for such units with higher rent levels were higher than 5.00 percent: 5.45 percent for units with rents of \$700-\$899, 5.04 percent for units with rents of \$900-\$1,249, and 7.47 percent for units with rents of \$1,250 and over.

Table 5.7

Net Rental Vacancies and Vacancy Rates in Stabilized and Unregulated Housing by Monthly Rent Level New York City 1999								
Monthly Rent Level	Va	Stabiliz cant Availa	ed ble Units	Unregulated Vacant Available Units				
	Number	Percent	Vacancy Rate	Number	Percent	Vacancy Rate		
All <sup>a</sup>	25,790	100.0%	2.46%	29,999	100.0%	4.98%		
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 400	**	**	**	**	**	* *		
<sup>\$</sup> 400- <sup>\$</sup> 599	7,484	29.0%	2.35%	3,779	12.6%	3.92%		
<sup>\$</sup> 600- <sup>\$</sup> 699	5,984	23.2%	3.10%	4,198	14.0%	4.05%		
<sup>\$</sup> 700- <sup>\$</sup> 899	8,869	34.4%	3.97%	9,861	32.9%	5.45%		
<sup>\$</sup> 900- <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	**	7.1%*	1.41%	5,353	17.8%	5.04%		
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and over	**	5.7%*	1.73%	5,923	19.7%	7.47%		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Totals include units for which no rent is paid. These units are not included in the Monthly Rent Level figures.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Number of Vacant Rental Units Renting at or below Public Shelter Maximum Allowances

As the citywide rental vacancy rate decreased from 4.01 percent in 1996 to 3.19 percent in 1999, housing choices in New York City dwindled significantly. As discussed above, the vacancy rate for units with rents under \$400 plummeted from 3.21 percent to 1.26 percent in the three years. For this reason, an analysis of the number of vacant and occupied units sheltering households receiving public assistance sheds additional light on the critically pervasive shortage of housing that very-low-income households in the City can afford.

In the following analysis, public assistance shelter allowances <sup>8</sup> are used to measure the availability of very-low-rent units for households that would use public assistance shelter allowances to pay their rent. At the time of the 1999 HVS, the maximum monthly public assistance shelter allowances in New York City ranged from a low of \$215 for a single person, to \$250 for a mother and a single child, to \$421 for a family of eight or more. To estimate the share of the housing stock that had rents within these limits, different family sizes were allocated to apartments with an appropriate number of bedrooms, using the following conversion rates:

- 1 person: Number of zero-bedroom apartments (studios) with an asking rent (for vacant units) or contract rent (for occupied units) at or below \$215.
- 2-3 persons: Number of one-bedroom apartments with an asking or contract rent at or below\$268, the average maximum shelter allowance for 2 and 3 persons (\$250+\$286/2).
- 4-5 persons: Number of two-bedroom apartments with an asking or contract rent at or below \$325, the average maximum shelter allowance for 4 and 5 persons (\$312+\$337/2).
- 6 or more persons: Number of three-bedroom apartments with an asking or contract rent at or below \$391, the average maximum shelter allowance for 6, 7, and 8 or more persons [(\$349+\$403+\$421)/3].

In regard to shelter allowances, there have been serious concerns about the quality as well as quantity of housing available to public assistance recipients. For this reason, only physically decent housing units should be counted in estimating the number of such housing units. Thus, for purposes of this analysis, housing units in the following quality categories were considered to be physically inadequate and were excluded in estimating the number of physically decent housing units: units with incomplete kitchen and/or bathroom facilities, units in dilapidated buildings, units in buildings with three or more building defect types, and units with four or more maintenance deficiencies.

In 1999, the number of rental units within the Public Assistance Maximum Shelter Allowance that met the above definitions of quality of housing was estimated to be 187,000--that is, 19,000 units fewer, or 9.3 percent less, than the number of such units three years earlier (Table 5.8). For these 187,000 physically decent low-rent units, the vacancy rate was only 1.35 percent, less than half the rate of 2.85 percent in 1996, as the 6,000 such vacant units in 1996 were cut in half three years later. Moreover, more than half of this very small number of vacant, physically decent, low-rent units were public housing units. This compelling finding indicates that the pervasive shortage of physically decent housing units that very-low-income households can afford was further accentuated over the three-year period. Thus, very poor households seeking affordable, decent housing had even more difficulty finding it in 1999 than in 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> These shelter allowances, which include heat, were implemented in January 1988 (New York City Human Resources Administration, *Public Assistance Rents and Shelter Allowance Procedures*, 8/28/91).

#### Table 5.8 Estimate of the Number of Physically Decent Rental Units within the Public Assistance Maximum Shelter Allowance New York City 1996 and 1999

	Total Physically Decent Units <sup>a</sup>						
	Nu	mber <sup>b</sup>		Percent			
	1996	1999	1996	1999			
Total	206,198	186,980	100.0%	100.0%			
Occupied	200,330	184,458	97.2%	98.7%			
Vacant	5,868	2,523*	2.85%	1.35%			

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a Housing units in the following quality categories are excluded in defining physically decent housing units: units with incomplete kitchen and/or bathroom facilities, units in dilapidated buildings, units in buildings with three or more building defect types, and units with four or more maintenance deficiencies.

b Maximum shelter allowance for family sizes was converted to number of bedrooms in rental unit for comparison

to rent level as follows: 1 person: number of zero-bedroom apartments (studios) with asking rent (for vacant units) or contract rent (for occupied units) at or below \$215; 2-3 persons: number of one-bedroom apartments with asking or contract rent at or below \$268, the average maximum shelter allowance for 2 and 3 persons (\$250+\$286/2); 4-5 persons: number of two bedroom apartments with asking or contract rent at or below \$325, the average maximum shelter allowance for 4 and 5 persons (\$312+\$337/2); 6 or more persons: number of three bedroom apartments with asking or contract rent at or below \$391, the average maximum shelter allowance for 6, 7, and 8 or more persons [(\$349+\$403+\$421)/3].

These shelter allowances, which include heat, were implemented in January 1988 (New York City Human Resources Administration, *Public Assistance Rents and Shelter Allowance Procedures*, 8/28/91).

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

#### Number of Vacant Rental Units Affordable to Median-Income Renter Households

In measuring the affordability of rental housing units, it has been most commonly assumed that the average renter household should not pay more than 30 percent of its income for housing. Applying this assumption, it is estimated that the number of privately owned vacant rental units (rent-controlled, rent-stabilized, and rent-unregulated) affordable by households with incomes at least equal to the median renter household income was 21,000 in 1999, 16.3 percent less than the 25,000 such units available in 1996 (Table 5.9). This decrease is a consequence of the following overlapping situations: there were 17,000 fewer vacant rental units overall in 1999 than in 1996 (Table 5.1), some of which could well have been units that median-income households could have afforded; rent increases were higher than income increases, as the median asking-rent for vacant units increased by 6.7 percent between 1996 and 1999 (median gross rent for occupied units increased by 3.1 percent), while the median renter household income increase relative to occupancies for units with lower-than-middle levels of rent during the same period (Table 5.9). However, the number of such vacant and occupied units together stood at

Notes:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Table 5.9 Number of Privately Owned<sup>a</sup> Vacant Available Units and Vacant Available Plus Renter Occupied Units at Affordable Rent Levels<sup>b</sup> New York City 1996 and 1999

Occupancy Status	1996	1999	Percent Change 1996-1999
Vacant Available	24,716	20,695	-16.3%
Renter Occupied	698,822	772,209	+10.5%
Vacant Available Plus Renter Occupied	723,538	792,904	+9.6%
Vacancy Rate	3.42%	2.61%	-23.7%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Controlled, stabilized and unregulated units.

b The affordable rent level is defined as rent at or below 30 percent of the citywide median income for renters, of \$23,892 in 1996 and \$26,000 in 1999.

793,000 in 1999. This was 9.6 percent more than in 1996. In the meantime, the rental vacancy rate for units that households with incomes at least equal to the median renter household income could afford was 2.61 percent in 1999, a considerable decline over the rate of 3.42 percent in 1996. In short, during the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, the shortage of rental units that even median-income households in the City could afford grew more severe.

#### Number of Vacant Rental Units at Fair Market Rents

Applying HUD's Fair Market Rents, the number of vacant rental units that households receiving federal Section 8 certificates and vouchers can afford can be estimated. The Fair Market Rent is an estimate of the shelter rent and cost of utilities, which is set at the fortieth percentile of the distribution of standard quality rental housing units, excluding newly built units, occupied by renter households who moved into the units within the past fifteen months, with adjustments to correct for the below-market rents of public housing units. The Fair Market Rent schedule varies with apartment size. The schedule used is as follows: 0 bedroom - \$704; 1 bedroom - \$785; 2 bedrooms - \$891; 3 bedrooms - \$1,114; 4 bedrooms - \$1,249; and 5 bedrooms - \$1,436 (Fair Market Rents, Existing Section 8, effective October 1998). Although the schedule of rents for various sizes of units used here is consistent with Section 8 Fair Markets Rents, this analysis is not designed to estimate the number of Section 8-eligible units in New York City. Assuming that a household should not pay more than 30 percent of its income for housing, the minimum income required to afford these housing units in New York City ranged from \$28,160 for units with no bedrooms (studios) to \$49,960 for four-bedroom units. The definition of condition used for estimating physically decent units whose rents were within the Public Assistance Maximum Shelter Allowance can be applied to the analysis of Fair Market Rent units. However, it should be noted that the definition of physically decent units used here does not correspond to the housing quality standards used by Section 8 certificate and voucher programs, since the HVS does not provide data on the very detailed building and unit conditions, including engineering aspects, that the Section 8 certificate and voucher programs require.

Applying Fair Market Rents for Existing Section 8, effective October 1998, it is estimated that 1,377,000 physically decent units met the Fair Market Rent limits in 1999; this was 46,000, or 3.5 percent, more than the 1,331,000 such units in 1996 (Table 5.10). Of the number in 1999, 46,000 units were vacant and available for rent; the corresponding vacancy rate was 3.35 percent, considerably lower than three years earlier, when it was 4.39 percent. A little more than half of these vacant units were either studios (7.6 percent) or one-bedroom units (46.8 percent), while the remainder were two-bedroom (33.3 percent) or three-or-more-bedroom (12.3 percent) units (Table 5.11).

Table 5.10

Estimate of the Number of Physically Decent Units that Meet Market-Based Rent Schedule <sup>a</sup> New York City 1996 and 1999							
Total Physically Decent Units at or below Fair Market Rent Levels <sup>b</sup>							
	19	96	19	99			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent			
Total	1,330,893	100.0%	1,377,185	100.0%			
Occupied Units	1,272,467	95.6%	1,331,076	96.7%			
Vacant Units	58,426	4.39%	46,109	3.35%			

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a The market-based rent schedule used is consistent with the corresponding HUD Existing Section 8 Fair Market Rents: For 1996: 0 bedroom-\$645; 1 bedroom-\$719; 2 bedrooms-\$817; 3 bedrooms-\$1,022; 4 bedrooms-\$1,144; and 5 bedrooms-\$1,316, effective October 1995; and, for 1999: 0 bedroom-\$704; 1 bedroom-\$785; 2 bedrooms-\$891; 3 bedrooms-\$1,114; 4 bedrooms-\$1,249; and 5 bedrooms-\$1,436, effective October 1998.

b Housing units in the following quality categories are excluded in defining physically decent housing units: units with incomplete kitchen and/or bathroom facilities, units in dilapidated buildings, units in buildings with three or more building defect types, and units with four or more maintenance deficiencies.

In summary, as the overall housing inventory in the City improved significantly, the number of units, occupied and vacant together, at Fair Market Rents expanded. But the availability of vacant units at such rents contracted considerably.

#### Median Asking Rents for Vacant-Available Units by Rent-Regulation Categories

As the city-wide vacancy rate declined to 3.19 percent, the vacancy rates for most rent levels also declined significantly, except for the very high rent levels, as discussed earlier. Thus, as a result of fewer

choices among vacant-available units for most rent levels, one would expect that inflation-adjusted median asking rents for vacant available units overall and for units in most rental categories would increase during the 1996-1999 period, if other market conditions remained the same. In fact, that is what happened. The real median asking rent for a vacant unit overall rose by 6.7 percent, from \$656 to \$700 over the period (Table 5.12), and the median asking rents were highest in 1999 in the two boroughs with the lowest vacancy rates, Manhattan and Queens (Table 5.13).

Table 5.11	
Size Distribution of Physically Decent Units Renting At or Below	
Fair Market Rent Level by Occupancy Status	
New York City 1999	
Total Physically Decent Units <sup>b</sup>	

			_			
Number of Bedrooms	Market Based Rent Schedule <sup>a</sup>	Vacant Units	Percent	Occupied Units	Percent	Minimum Annual Income <sup>c</sup>
Total		46,109	100.0%	1,331,076	100.0%	
0	<sup>\$</sup> 704	3,506	7.6%	83,178	6.2%	\$28,160
1	<sup>\$</sup> 785	21,589	46.8%	540,245	40.6%	<sup>\$</sup> 31,400
2	<sup>\$</sup> 891	15,344	33.3%	493,444	37.1%	<sup>\$</sup> 35,640
3+	<sup>\$</sup> 1,114- <sup>\$</sup> 1,436	5,671	12.3%	214,209	16.1%	<sup>\$</sup> 44,560

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a The market-based rent schedule used here is consistent with the following HUD Section 8 Fair Market Rents: 0 bedroom-\$704; 1 bedroom-\$785; 2 bedrooms-\$891; 3 bedrooms-\$1,114; 4 bedrooms-\$1,249; and 5 bedrooms-\$1,436 (Fair Market Rents, Existing Section 8, effective October 1998).

b Housing units in the following quality categories are excluded in defining physically decent housing units: units with incomplete kitchen and/or bathroom facilities, in dilapidated buildings, in buildings with three or more building defect types, and units with four or more maintenance deficiencies.

c To be able to afford the market-based rent at 30 percent of income.

Except for public housing units, real median asking rents for units in all other rental categories increased, although the level of increase varied for different categories. The sharpest asking-rent increase between 1996 and 1999 was the 25.8-percent increase for "other" rent-regulated units, a category which covers publicly-assisted units whose rents are regulated by the federal, state, and/or city governments (Table 5.12). The median asking rent for vacant rent-stabilized units as a whole increased by 4.4 percent, while the rent increases for such units in pre-1947 buildings and post-1947 buildings separately were visibly different: 2.2 percent and 8.9 percent respectively (Figure 5.6). At the same time, the asking rents for vacant unregulated rental units as a whole and for such units in rental buildings remained practically unchanged, while the asking rent for such units in cooperatives and condominiums increased by 6.9 percent (Figure 5.6).

On the other hand, the median asking rent for vacant public housing units declined by 18.8 percent between 1996 and 1999, while the change in the median asking rent for *in rem* units was unappreciably small (Table 5.12).

	Median Asking Rent			Number o	Number of Vacant Available Units		
- Regulatory Status	1996	1999	Percent Change	1996	1999	Percent Change	
All Vacant for Rent Units	<sup>\$</sup> 656	<sup>\$</sup> 700	6.7%	81,256	64,412	-20.7%	
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 664	4.4%	37,549	25,790	-31.3%	
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 650	2.2%	29,381	20,069	-31.7%	
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 750	8.9%	8,168	5,720	-30.0%	
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 800	25.8%	4,575	3,975	**	
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 742	<sup>\$</sup> 750	1.1%	30,468	29,999	**	
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 742	<sup>\$</sup> 750	1.1%	21,328	19,993	-6.3%*	
In Coops and Condos	<sup>\$</sup> 795	<sup>\$</sup> 850	6.9%	9,140	10,006	**	
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 389	<sup>\$</sup> 316	-18.8%	6,450	3,323	-48.5%	
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 300	<sup>\$</sup> 312*	4.0%	2,214*	**	**	

Table 5.12 Median Asking Rents of Vacant Available Units by Selected Regulatory Status in 1999 Dollars New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note: \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.







	110	w IOIK City 19							
		1996							
	Vacant Units Median Asking								
Borough	Number	Rate	Rent						
All	81,256	4.01%	\$656						
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	18,825	5.43%	\$628						
Brooklyn	25,937	4.20%	\$636						
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	20,185	3.47%	\$689						
Queens	14,020	3.28%	\$742						
Staten Island	2,289*	4.17%	\$583						
		1999							
_	Vacant	Units	Median Asking						
Borough	Number	Rate	Rent						
All	64,412	3.19%	\$700						
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	17,385	5.04%	\$650						
Brooklyn	19,819	3.26%	\$660						
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	14,816	2.57%	\$1,050						
Queens	9,109	2.11%	\$750						
Staten Island	3,283	5.82%	\$650						

#### Table 5.13 Number of Vacant Available Rental Units, Vacancy Rate, and Median Asking Rent in 1999 Dollars by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

#### Vacancy Rates and Building and Unit Characteristics

#### Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size

As the rental vacancy rate for the City as a whole declined considerably between 1996 and 1999, the vacancy rates for units in the various sizes of buildings also declined, except for units in buildings with 50 or more units. The rate declined the most sharply for units in small buildings with 6-19 units. For units in such buildings, the rate plummeted to 2.12 percent in 1999, a drop of 3.35 percentage points from the rate of 5.47 percent in 1996, as the number of vacant units in such buildings declined by 10,000, or by 61.6 percent (Table 5.14) (Figure 5.7).

#### Rental Vacancy Rates by Structure Class

The rental vacancy rates for units in all structure classes declined between 1996 and 1999, except for units in one- or two-family buildings converted to apartments, the number of which remained unchanged during the three years. The level of rate decline varied for the different structure classes;

however, it was most visible for units in New-Law tenement buildings, where the rate dropped by 1.23 percentage points to 2.95 percent in 1999, as the number of rental units in such buildings declined by 7,000, or by 30.0 percent (Table 5.15).

Number of Units in Building	Number of Vac	cant Available Units	Vacancy Rate		
	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>	
All	81,256	64,412	4.01%	3.19%	
1 - 5	21,933	19,386	4.30%	3.83%	
6 - 19	15,866	6,092	5.47%	2.12%	
20 - 49	16,744	12,927	3.68%	2.80%	
50 or More	26,713	26,007	3.46%	3.41%	

#### Table 5.14 Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.



Figure 5.7 Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Building Size New York City 1999

#### Rental Vacancy Rates by Unit Size

The citywide rental vacancy rate for units without a bedroom (studios) was 4.45 percent in 1999, 1.26 percentage points higher than the overall rate of 3.19 percent. However, the rate declines as the size of the unit increases: 3.60 percent for one-bedroom units, 2.83 percent for two-bedroom units, and 2.16 percent for three-or-more-bedroom units (Table 5.16). This pattern of the relationship between the level of the vacancy rate and the size of the rental units holds true for unregulated rental units as well. The rate for rent-unregulated studios was 12.23 percent, 7.25 percentage points higher than the rate of 4.98 percent for two-bedroom units, and 2.58 percent for three-or-more-bedroom units, 4.24 percent for two-bedroom units, and 2.58 percent for three-or-more-bedroom-units. In other words, in the City, vacant-available larger rental units were very scarce.

Table 5.15
Number of Vacant Available Rental Units and Net Rental Vacancy Rates by Structure Class
New York City 1996 and 1999

Structure Class	Number Availa U	r of Vacant ble Rental Jnits	Percen Vacant A Renta	t of All Available I Units	Vacanc	y Rate
	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>
All Structure Classes	81,256	64,412	100.0%	100.0%	4.01%	3.19%
Old-Law Tenement	7,907	5,055	10.3%	8.3%	4.37%	2.81%
New-Law Tenement	24,965	17,477	32.5%	28.6%	4.18%	2.95%
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	25,319	22,350	32.9%	36.6%	3.48%	3.07%
1-2 Family Converted to Apartments	4,109	4,109	5.3%	6.7%	4.12%	4.34%
Other <sup>a</sup>	3,850	3,171	5.0%	5.2%	6.60%	5.56%
1-2 Family	10,701	8,979	13.9%	14.7%	4.07%	3.42%
Unreported	4,405	3,270				

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note: a

"Other" includes apartment hotels built pre-1929, commercial buildings converted to apartments, tenement SROs, 1- and 2-family houses converted to rooming houses, and units in the miscellaneous class.

					•					
						Number of I	Bedrooms			
	AI		Noi	ne	On	e	Tw	0	Three c	r More
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
All	64,412	3.19%	7,912	4.45%	29,804	3.60%	20,466	2.83%	6,230	2.16%
Stabilized	25,790	2.46%	2,937*	2.27%	14,252	2.80%	6,721	2.06%	* *	2.32%*
Pre-1947	20,069	2.61%	2,331*	2.54%	11,096	3.00%	5,390	2.23%	* *	1.92%*
Post-1947	5,720	2.06%	* *	* *	3,155	2.27%	* *	1.57%*	* *	* *
Other Regulated	3,975	3.14%	* *	8.09%*	* *	3.29%*	* *	* *	* *	* *
Unregulated	29,999	4.98%	3,627	12.23%	12,404	6.50%	10,471	4.24%	3,497	2.58%
In Rental Buildings	19,993	3.79%	* *	7.09%*	7,358	4.82%	8,296	3.69%	3,062	2.32%
In Coops/Condos	10,006	13.25%	2,351*	20.17%	5,045	13.30%	2,174*	9.85%	* *	* *
Public Housing	3,323	1.92%	* *	* *	*	* *	*	2.43%*	* *	* *
In Rem	*	8.00%*	*	*	*	* *	*	* *	* *	* *
Median Asking Rent	\$70	0	\$55	50	\$67	5	\$73	5	8\$	25
Source: U.S. Bureau of the (	Census, 1999 Nev	v York City H	ousing and Vaca	ancy Survey.						

by Regulatory Status and Median Asking Rent by Number of Bedrooms Number of Available Vacant Rental Units and Vacancy Rates New York City 1999 Table 5.16

Notes: \*

\* \*

Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution. Too few units to report.

#### **Turnover of Rental Units**

#### Length of Vacancies

In general, the levels and types of supply of and demand for renter units in any housing market determine the duration of rental vacancies, the period of time during which landlords who have available rental vacancies and households looking for suitable rental housing units seek each other out and contract for the rental of a unit. In New York City's rental housing market, where housing choices are extremely scarce, an absorption period of one to three months can be considered sufficient for an owner to advertise the availability of the rental unit and for a prospective renter to seek out a suitable unit. In the City's rental housing market, an increase in vacancies lasting three or more months could mean that these units are probably being rejected by the market as unsuitable for either one or a combination of the following reasons: they are not in a preferred location in terms of accessibility, public and private services available, and/or other neighborhood characteristics; their rents are too high; they are not of the size wanted; or their housing and/or neighborhood physical and other conditions are not acceptable.

Table 5.17
Number and Percent Distribution of the Length of Vacancies in Rental Units by Borough
New York City 1999

		Length of Vacancy		
Borough	All	Less than 3 Months	3 Months or More	
Number	64,412	38,231	22,882	
Percent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	27.0%	25.4%	31.2%	
Brooklyn	30.8%	28.6%	36.1%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	23.0%	24.4%	20.0%	
Queens	14.1%	16.3%	9.7%	
Staten Island	5.1%	5.3%	*	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx

\* Too few units to report.

In 1999, 38,000, or six in ten of the 64,000 vacant rental units in the City, were available on the market only for a short term (less than three months), while the remaining 23,000 vacant rental units were available for a long term (three months or more) (Table 5.17). The housing and neighborhood conditions of vacant rental units available for a long term were substantially inferior to those of occupied rental units. Specifically, in 1999, the proportion of long-term vacant rental units in buildings with no building defects was 79.1 percent, compared to 89.1 percent for occupied rental units in the City. At the same time, 21.5 percent of long-term vacant rental units were on streets with boarded-up buildings, while only 8.8 percent of occupied rental units were on streets with such buildings.<sup>10</sup>

Close to eight in ten of the vacant rental units that were available for a short term were distributed approximately equally in three boroughs: the Bronx (25.4 percent), Brooklyn (28.6 percent), and Manhattan (24.4 percent). The remaining two in ten were in either Queens (16.3 percent) or Staten Island (5.3 percent) (Table 5.17). On the other hand, 23,000 vacant rental units were available for a long term, and close to seven in ten of them were located in either the Bronx (31.2 percent) or Brooklyn (36.1 percent). Of the remaining three in ten, two were in Queens.

Of the 38,000 vacant rental units which were available for a short term, almost nine in ten were either rent-stabilized (44.9 percent) or rent-unregulated (43.3 percent). Of the 23,000 vacant rental units that were available for a long term, half were rent-unregulated, while about a third were rent-stabilized (34.0 percent) (Table 5.18).

Of vacant rent-stabilized units, almost seven in ten were available on the market for a short term (Table 5.18). Of such units in post-1947 buildings, close to eight in ten were available for a short term. At the same time, of vacant unregulated rental units, almost six in ten were available on the market for a short term, while, of such units in rental buildings, only one in two was available for a short term. But, of such units in cooperatives and condominiums, seven in ten were available for a short term. Overall, the patterns of vacancy duration by rental categories in 1999 were similar to those in 1996 (Tables 5.18 and 5.19).

#### Turnover

Another measure that sheds additional light on how the housing market performs in producing vacant available units is turnover. The term "turnover" embraces the concept that there are constant moves, in and out of housing, within the existing inventory. In this report, "turnover" is understood as constituting a completed transaction in the existing inventory during the period of time between the two HVS years--that is, a "move-out" and a "move-in" during the three years between 1996 and 1999. To meet the conditions of this relationship, a "move-out" must be from a unit that remained in the inventory for the three-year period and a "move-in" must be to a unit that was in the inventory in 1996. Adopting this conceptual approach, for this report, if the household occupying the unit in 1999 was not the same as the household that occupied the unit in 1996 according to the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, the unit is assumed to have turned over at least once during the three years.

Applying the above conceptual method, it is estimated that 35.8 percent of rental units that were occupied in both 1996 and 1999 turned over at least once during the three-year period. Among rental categories, the proportion was highest for unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings: 46.9 percent of such units turned over at least once between 1996 and 1999 (Table 5.20). The proportion of turned-over unregulated rental units in rental buildings was 44.5 percent. For rent-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

		Length of	Time Vacant
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	Total <sup>a</sup>	Less than 3 Months	Three or More Months
Total	64,412	38,231	22,882
Stabilized	25,790	17,180	7,780
Pre-1947	20,069	12,953	6,499
Post-1947	5,720	4,227	**
Other Regulated	3,975	2,991*	**
Unregulated	29,999	16,549	11,525
In Rental Buildings	19,993	9,523	8,722
In Coops and Condos	10,006	7,026	2,803*
Public Housing	3,323	**	**
In Rem	**	**	**
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Stabilized	40.0%	44.9%	34.0%
Pre-1947	31.2%	33.9%	28.4%
Post-1947	8.9%	11.1%	5.6%*
Other Regulated	6.2%	7.8%	**
Unregulated	46.6%	43.3%	50.4%
In Rental Buildings	31.0%	24.9%	38.1%
In Coops and Condos	15.5%	18.4%	12.3%
Public Housing	5.2%	3.5%*	8.6%*
In Rem	2.1%*	**	4.8%*
Total	100.0%	62.6%	37.4%
Stabilized	100.0%	68.8%	31.2%
Pre-1947	100.0%	66.6%	33.4%
Post-1947	100.0%	76.7%	23.3%
Other Regulated	100.0%	85.6%	**
Unregulated	100.0%	58.9%	41.1%
In Rental Buildings	100.0%	52.2%	47.8%
In Coops and Condos	100.0%	71.5%	28.5%
Public Housing	100.0%	40.8%*	59.2%*
In Rem	100.0%	**	87.6%*

#### Table 5.18 Number and Distribution of Vacant Available Rental Units by Regulatory Status by Length of Time Vacant New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes: a Includes units whose length of vacancy was not reported.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Table 5.19 Number and Distribution of Vacant Available Rental Units by Regulatory Status by Length of Time Vacant New York City 1996

		Length of	Time Vacant
Regulatory Status	Total <sup>a</sup>	Less than 3 Months	Three or More Months
Total	81,256	47,900	30,249
Stabilized	37,549	24,408	12,799
Pre-1947	29,381	18,704	10,509
Post-1947	8,168	5,704	2,290*
Other Regulated	4,575	2,721*	**
Unregulated	30,468	16,226	12,062
In Rental Buildings	21,328	11,900	8,305
In Coops and Condos	9,140	4,326	3,757
Public Housing	6,450	4,096	**
In Rem	2,214*	**	**
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Stabilized	46.2%	51.0%	42.3%
Pre-1947	36.2%	39.0%	34.7%
Post-1947	10.1%	11.9%	7.6%
Other Regulated	5.6%	5.7%	5.5%*
Unregulated	37.5%	33.9%	39.9%
In Rental Buildings	26.2%	24.8%	27.5%
In Coops and Condos	11.2%	9.0%	12.4%
Public Housing	7.9%	8.6%	6.5%*
In Rem	2.7%	**	5.8%*
Total	100.00/	61.20/	29.70/
Stabilized	100.0%	65.6%	34.4%
Pre-1947	100.0%	64.0%	36.0%
Post-1947	100.0%	71.4%	28.6%
Other Regulated	100.0%	62.2%	37.8%*
Unregulated	100.0%	57.4%	42.6%
In Rental Buildings	100.0%	58.9%	41.1%
In Coops and Condos	100.0%	53.5%	46.5%
Public Housing	100.0%	67.5%	32.5%*
In Rem	100.0%	**	79.7%*

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes: a Includes units whose length of vacancy was not reported.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

stabilized units, it was 36.2 percent. The lowest proportion of turned-over units was in the *in rem* category, 20.5 percent; but the proportion for public housing units was also very low, 21.5 percent. Judging from this, it is apparent that only a very small proportion of households in the two categories of rental units for very-low-income households moved out.

The proportion of rental units that turned over at least once between 1996 and 1999 was lowest for units in the lowest rent level (less than \$400): 25.3 percent (Table 5.21). The proportion moved up steadily to 47.7 percent for the highest rent level (\$1,250 or more) as the level of rent increased: 32.2 percent for the \$400-\$599 level, 38.0 percent for the \$600-\$699 level, 40.1 percent for the \$700-\$899 level, and 46.0 percent for the \$900-\$1,249 level (Figure 5.8).

Table 5.20
Percentage of Units that were Renter Occupied in both 1996 and 1999 and
Turned Over at Least Once Between 1996 and 1999 by 1996 Regulatory Status
New York City 1999

1996 Regulatory Status	Percentage of Units Turning Over At Least Once Between 1996 and 1999 <sup>a</sup>
All Renters	35.8%
Controlled	24.2% <sup>b</sup>
Stabilized	36.2%
Other Regulated	29.4%
Unregulated	44.8%
In Rental Buildings	44.5%
In Coops and Condos	46.9%
Public Housing	21.5%
In Rem	20.5%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Note:

a These numbers are *not* turnover rates. A turnover rate is the total number of turnovers, including multiple turnovers of the same unit, divided by the total number of units.

b These units had been rent controlled in 1996, but upon turnover became rent stabilized if in a building of 6 or more units or unregulated if in a building of 5 or fewer units.

# Table 5.21Percentage of Units that were Renter Occupied in both 1996 and 1999and Turned Over at Least Once Between 1996 and 1999 by 1996 Rent Level in 1999 Dollars<br/>New York City 1999

	Percentage of Units Turning Over at Least Once <sup>a</sup>	
1996 Rent Level (in 1999 dollars)	1996-99	
All	35.8%	
Less than <sup>\$</sup> 400	25.3%	
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	32.2%	
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	38.0%	
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	40.1%	
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	46.0%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and Over	47.7%	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Note:

a These numbers are *not* turnover rates. A turnover rate is the total number of turnovers, including multiple turnovers of the same unit, divided by the total number of units.

#### Figure 5.8

Percentage of Units that were Renter Occupied in 1996 and 1999 that Turned Over at Least Once between 1996 and 1999 by 1996 Rent Level in 1999 Dollars New York City 1999


#### Vacancies in the Owner Housing Market

Since 1993, the number of owner housing units in New York City has increased. Between 1996 and 1999, the number increased by 74,000 units. As seen in Chapter 4, "New York City's Housing Inventory," the proportion of owner housing units in 1999 was 30.7 percent, a 3.0-percentage-point increase over the proportion in 1993. Thus, the owner housing segment of the City's housing market has continued to make an increasing contribution to the provision of housing for New Yorkers.

However, as the demand for housing units in general--and for owner units in particular--was strong during the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, the number of vacant-available owner units decreased by 7,000, or by 27.9 percent, to 17,000, while the number of occupied owner units increased by 81,000, or by 9.7 percent, to 915,000 units (Table 5.22). Consequently, the owner vacancy rate declined from 2.75 percent in 1996 to 1.82 percent in 1999.

As the citywide owner vacancy rate declined between 1996 and 1999, the rate in each of the five boroughs also declined. The rate in the Bronx fell the most sharply, from 4.09 percent to 1.32 percent, as vacant owner units in the borough declined to a negligibly small number (Table 5.22). In Brooklyn, the rate in 1999 was 1.61 percent, while it was 1.86 percent three years earlier. In Manhattan, the rate declined from 4.33 percent to 3.42 percent, while, in Queens, it fell from 2.33 percent to 1.54 percent. In Staten Island, where six in ten of all housing units were owner units, the owner housing market was very tight, as the number of vacant owner units in 1999 was too small to allow for a meaningful estimation of the vacancy rate.

	Occupi	ed Units	Vacant	for Sale	Percent	of Total	Vacan	cy Rate
Borough	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	834,183	915,126	23,581	16,997	100.0%	100.0%	2.75%	1.82%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	83,853	91,596	3,577	**	15.2%	7.2%*	4.09%	1.32%*
Brooklyn	221,850	233,513	4,208	3,821	17.8%	22.5%	1.86%	1.61%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	142,843	165,904	6,468	5,875	27.4%	34.6%	4.33%	3.42%
Queens	301,189	332,332	7,186	5,184	30.5%	30.5%	2.33%	1.54%
Staten Island	84,449	91,781	2,143*	**	9.1%	**	2.47%	**

#### Table 5.22 Number of Owner Occupied Units, Vacant for Sale Units, Distribution of Vacant Units and Vacancy Rates by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Vacancies and Vacancy Rates by Types of Owner Units

In 1996, when there were 24,000 vacant owner units in the City and the owner vacancy rate was 2.75 percent, half of all vacant owner units were conventional one- or two-family units. In the following three years, the owner housing market in the City expanded, and the utilization of owner units increased also, while the number of vacant owner units decreased and, consequently, the owner vacancy rate declined considerably to 1.82 percent, as discussed earlier. In this expanded but relatively tight owner housing market in 1999, only little more than a third of vacant owner units were conventional units (34.3 percent), with a vacancy rate of 1.00 percent, while more than half were private cooperative units (52.3 percent), up from about a third in 1996 (Table 5.23). The vacancy rate of private cooperative units was 3.64 percent.

		11011 1		/// und 1				
	Number of Owner Occupied Units		Nun of Vaca Available	ıber nt Units e for Sale	Percen Un Available	t of All nits e for Sale	Net fo Vacano	r Sale zy Rate
	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	834,183	915,126	23,581	16,997	100.0%	100.0%	2.75%	1.82%
Conventional	543,304	574,353	12,014	5,823	50.9%	34.3%	2.16%	1.00%
All Cooperatives	246,780	290,102	9,762	9,623	41.4%	56.6%	3.81%	3.21%
Mitchell-Lama	50,634	54,845	2,127*	**	9.0%	**	4.03%	**
Private	196,146	235,257	7,635	8,895	32.4%	52.3%	3.75%	3.64%
Condominium	44,099	50,671	**	**	7.7%*	9.1%*	3.93%*	2.97%*

Table 5.23 Owner Occupied and Vacant Units and Vacancy Rates by Form of Ownership New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

#### Vacancy Duration by Types of Owner Units

Compared to 1996, the length of time that vacant owner units were available for sale in 1999 was slightly shorter. In 1999, 47.0 percent of vacant owner units were available on the market for a short term of less than three months, while 53.0 percent were available for a long term of three months or more (Table 5.24). In 1996, the proportions were equal: half were available for a short term and half were available for a long term. As in 1996, the vacancy duration of conventional units was much longer than it was for units in other forms of ownership in 1999. Six in ten of the vacant conventional owner units were available for a long term, while half of the vacant private cooperative or condominium units were available for a long term.

#### Vacant Units Unavailable for Rent or Sale

As the utilization of housing units, particularly owner units, increased markedly while the consequent availability of vacant units decreased considerably, the number of vacant units unavailable for rent or sale, for a variety of reasons, plummeted by 21,000, or by 19.2 percent, in the three years between 1996 and 1999 (Table 5.25). Of all unavailable vacant units, the proportion unavailable because they were occupied only for occasional, seasonal, or recreational purposes, rather than as a permanent residence, was 19.6 percent in 1999, compared to 30.8 percent in 1996. During the period, the number of unavailable units in this category dropped disproportionately by 16,000, or by 47.7 percent, to 17,000 in 1999. Of units in this category, 63.3 percent were in cooperative or condominium buildings, and about 80 percent of these were located in Manhattan.<sup>11</sup> The decrease in this category accounts for three-quarters of the decrease of 21,000 in the total number of unavailable vacant units in the City (Figure 5.9).

Table 5.24
Distribution of the Length of Time that Vacant Owner Units
Available for Sale Have Been Vacant by Form of Ownership
New York City 1996 and 1999

		1996			1999	
Form of Ownership	All <sup>a</sup>	Less than 3 Months	3 or More Months	All <sup>a</sup>	Less than 3 Months	3 or More Months
All	23,581	11,549	11,287	16,997	7,402	8,353
	100.0%	50.6%	49.4%	100.0%	47.0%	53.0%
Conventional	12,014	4,788	6,481	5,823	2,214*	3,208
	100.0%	42.5%	57.5%	100.0%	40.8%	59.2%
Private Coop/ Condominium	9,441	6,039	3,401	10,446	4,847	4,759
-	100.0%	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%	50.5%	49.5%
Mitchell-Lama Coop	2,127*	**	**	**	**	**
	100.0%	**	66.1%*	100.0%	**	**

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Includes units whose length of vacancy was not reported.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

On the other hand, during the same three-year period, the proportion of vacant units unavailable because they were either undergoing or awaiting renovation increased from 29.1 percent in 1996 to 36.4 percent in 1999, although the number of such units was relatively stable: 32,000 in 1999, compared to 31,000 in 1996 (Table 5.25).

Three-quarters of the vacant units unavailable for various reasons in 1996 returned to the active housing stock in 1999 as either occupied units or vacant units that were available for rent or sale (Table 5.26). The remaining quarter were still vacant and unavailable for rent or sale three years later. Almost nine in ten of the vacant units unavailable because they were rented or sold but not yet occupied in 1996 (86.2 percent) were determined to be occupied or vacant-for-rent-or-sale in 1999, while seven in ten of those that were unavailable because they were being held for occasional, seasonal, or recreational use in 1996 (69.5 percent) became occupied or vacant-for-rent-or-sale three years later.

		5				
	19	93	19	96	19	99
Reason Unavailable	Units	Percent	Units	Percent	Units	Percent
All	111,038	100.0%	110,090	100.0%	88,973	100.0%
Dilapidated	5,120	4.7	6,356	6.0	4,542	5.2
Rented, Not Occupied	9,765	8.9	6,807	6.4	5,049	5.7
Sold, Not Occupied	4,388	4.0	3,850	3.6	5,385	6.1
Undergoing Renovation	11,384	10.4	16,988	15.9	19,121	21.8
Awaiting Renovation	11,132	10.1	14,112	13.2	12,870	14.6
Used/Converted to Nonresidential	**	1.1*	2,151*	2.0	**	2.1*
In Legal Dispute	7,881	7.2	8,180	7.7	5,990	6.8
Awaiting Conversion/Being Converted to Coop/Condo	**	**	**	**	**	**
Held for Occasional, Seasonal, or Recreational Use	39,371	35.9	32,929	30.8	17,229	19.6
Held Pending Sale of Building	2,531*	2.3	**	1.8*	3,160	3.6
Owner Unable to Sell or Rent Due to Personal Problems	4,204	3.8	8,054	7.5	5,276	6.0
Held for Other Reasons	12,191	11.1	5,304 <sup>a</sup>	4.5	7,019	8.0
Reason Not Reported	**		3,342		**	

Table 5.25Number of Vacant Units Unavailable for Rent or Sale by Reason for Unavailability<br/>New York City 1993, 1996, and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Figure is different from previously published number because it includes "Held for planned demolition," too small to report as a separate category.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

Of the 89,000 unavailable vacant units in the City in 1999, close to two-thirds were concentrated in either Manhattan (38.1 percent) or Brooklyn (26.7 percent) (Table 5.27). The remainder were located mostly in either Queens (18.0 percent) or the Bronx (13.1 percent).

The distribution of unavailable vacant units by structure class in 1999 was similar to what it was in 1996. Three in ten of the vacant units unavailable for rent or sale in 1999 were either Old-Law tenements (21.7 percent) or New-Law tenements (9.1 percent), while another three in ten were units in multiple dwellings built after 1929 (29.8 percent) (Table 5.28). Another close to three in ten were one-or two-family housing units (27.2 percent).



Figure 5.9 Composition of the Vacant Unavailable Inventory by Reason for Unavailability New York City, Selected Years 1991 - 1999

# Table 5.26Distribution of Units that Were Vacant Unavailable in 1996by Reason for Unavailability and by 1999 Availability

		1999 Availability	
Reason Unavailable in 1996	Both	Occupied or Vacant Available for Rent or Sale	Vacant Not Available for Rent or Sale
All	100.0%	75.0%	25.0%
Held for Occasional, Seasonal or Recreational Use	100.0%	69.5%	30.5%
Rented or Sold, but not Occupied	100.0%	86.2%	*
Dilapidated	100.0%	72.9%	27.1%*
Undergoing or Awaiting Renovation	100.0%	77.5%	22.5%
Used/Converted to Nonresidential	*	*	*
Other	100.0%	75.5%	24.5%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Notes:

\* Too few units to report.

	1996	1996		
Borough	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	110,090	100.0%	88,973	100.0%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	13,164	12.0%	11,619	13.1%
Brooklyn	31,854	28.9%	23,775	26.7%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	44,378	40.3%	33,923	38.1%
Queens	16,297	14.8%	16,042	18.0%
Staten Island	4,399	4.0%	3,613	4.1%

#### Table 5.27 Vacant Unavailable Units by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

	1996		1999		
Structure Class	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
All Structure Classes <sup>a</sup>	110,090	100.0%	88.973	100.0%	
Old-Law Tenement	12,464	12.1%	7,636	9.1%	
New-Law Tenement	25,329	24.5%	18,134	21.7%	
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	26,428	25.6%	24,905	29.8%	
1-2 Family Converted to Apartments	6,314	6.1%	5,105	6.1%	
Other Multiple Dwelling	5,715	5.5%	5,129	6.1%	
1-2 Family	27,005	26.2%	22,764	27.2%	

#### Table 5.28 Vacant Unavailable Units by Structure Class New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Includes units whose structure class within multiple dwelling was not reported.

Compared to all occupied and vacant housing units, the physical condition of vacant units unavailable for rent or sale was markedly inferior. Specifically, the dilapidation rate (the proportion of units in dilapidated buildings) for unavailable vacant units was 5.2 percent (Table 5.25), compared to 0.8 percent for all occupied and vacant-available units in the City in 1999.<sup>12</sup> Also, 82.1 percent of the unavailable vacant units in 1999 were in buildings with no building defects (Table 5.29), while 91.0 percent of all occupied and vacant units were in buildings with no building defects.<sup>13</sup>

Of the 89,000 unavailable vacant units in 1999, 41,000 (or 45.9 percent) were rental units, 17,000 (or 18.7 percent) were owner units, and 17,000 (or 18.9 percent)<sup>14</sup> were unavailable vacant units in 1996 (Table 5.30). The remaining 15,000 (or 16.5 percent) were units that were not linked to 1996 units, either because they were non-interviews, or they were newly constructed, gut-rehabilitated, or they were units added to the sample between 1996 and 1999.

Of the 41,000 unavailable vacant units that were rental units in 1996, three-quarters were either rent-stabilized units (32.7 percent) or unregulated rental units (42.9 percent). Of the 17,000 unavailable vacant units that were owner units in 1996, half were conventional units and another half were private cooperative or condominium units.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. All vacant units in dilapidated buildings were classified as unavailable vacant units.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Percents calculated using unrounded numbers.

#### Table 5.29 Vacant Unavailable Units by Building Defects New York City 1996 and 1999

		1996		999
Number of Building Defect Types	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total <sup>a</sup>	110.090	100 0%	88.973	100.0%
None	71,201	80.1%	53,998	82.1%
1	6,668	7.5%	5,030	7.6%
2	5,241	5.9%	2,251	3.4%
3 or More	5,768	6.5%	4,510	6.9%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Includes units whose building defect information was not reported.

#### Table 5.30

Number and Percent Distribution of 1999 Vacant Unavailable Units by Tenure and Regulatory Status or Form of Ownership in 1996 New York City 1999

	Units Not Ava	ilable in 1999
Regulatory Status/ Form of Ownership in 1996	Number	Percent
Total Units <sup>a</sup>	88.973	100.0%
Total Rental Units	40,799	45.9%
Controlled	**	1.4%*
Stabilized	13,355	15.0%
Pre-1947	10,413	11.7%
Post-1947	2,942*	3.3%
Other Regulated	**	1.2%*
Unregulated	17,497	19.7%
In Rental Buildings	15,149	17.0%
In Co-ops/ Condos	2,348*	2.6%
Public Housing	4,168	4.7%
In Rem	3,431	3.9%
Total Owner Units	16,664	18.7%
Conventional	8,297	9.3%
Coop/Condo	8,367	9.4%
Total Vacant Units Not Available for Sale or Rent	16,812	18.9%
Not Applicable <sup>b</sup>	14,698	16.5%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys, Longitudinal Database. Notes:

a Includes units which were not in the inventory in 1996.

b Units which were not in the inventory in 1996.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few to report.

### 6 Variations in Rent Expenditure in New York City

#### Introduction

This chapter covers most issues relating to rent expenditures as a housing cost that tenants pay for the housing units they occupy. The housing inventory in New York City was about two-thirds renteroccupied units in 1999. Thus, the level of rents, their temporal changes, and their relation to household incomes are primary concerns for providers and consumers of housing and for housing policy-makers, in general, and for those on all sides of issues pertinent to rent-controlled units, rent-stabilized units, and other rent-regulated units in New York City, in particular.

Rents are determined, in general, by market conditions--that is, by the dynamic relationship between the demand for and the supply of housing units. Rents for different types of housing units in different locations are influenced by, among other things, household characteristics, such as the number and sizes of households and household incomes; by housing characteristics, such as the size and condition of units; and by locational characteristics, such as accessibility to transportation systems and neighborhood conditions, including private and public neighborhood services. In addition to market conditions, rents are also determined by non-market conditions. In the City specifically, where extensive rent-regulation systems are administered, rents and changes in rents for more than seven in ten of all renter-occupied units are largely decided by the rent-regulation category under which the units are placed. Also, in the City, rents for the large number of rental units built, owned, managed, maintained, and/or made available by the government to particular groups of households are regulated by the respective government agencies at the federal, state, and/or city level, according to the pertinent laws and regulations.

This chapter opens with a discussion of the definition and proper use of the HVS rent data and continues with a discussion of the patterns of rent. A discussion of rents and their changes for units in different locations and under different rental categories follows. Next, the difference in rent by unit size is discussed. Then, a discussion of the discernable relationship between rent and housing condition is covered. Since the unregulated rental market has been steadily growing in the City, rents in this market will be analyzed. And because the number of rental housing units in cooperative and condominium buildings changes as the tenure of these units changes, reflecting varying situations in the rental and owner markets in the City, rents in cooperative and condominium buildings will also be discussed. Although housing and neighborhood conditions in the City have improved significantly, the shortage of affordable housing has become increasingly critical in the inflationary housing market in recent years. Therefore, at the end of the chapter, an analysis of the affordability (rent-income ratio) of rental housing will be carried out.

#### The HVS Data on Rent Expenditures

#### Definitions of Contract Rent, Gross Rent, and Asking Rent

The HVS provides data on three major different types of rent: contract rent, gross rent, and asking rent. The first, contract rent, is the amount tenants agree to pay owners for the units they occupy, as contracted between the tenant and the owner in the lease; it includes fuel and utilities if they are provided by the owner without additional, separate charges to the tenant. The second, gross rent, is the contract rent plus any additional charges for fuel and utilities paid separately by the tenant. In this chapter, only data on contract rent and gross rent for occupied units are presented and discussed.

As the definition of each of the types of rent implies, when issues that primarily concern only the rent tenants agree to pay owners, as specified in the lease, are being considered, contract rent is used; while, when overall housing costs tenants pay for the bundle of housing services they receive are being considered, gross rent is used.

The third type of rent, asking rent, is the amount of rent asked for vacant units by owners (or other persons who are knowledgeable about the vacant units and have the information necessary to rent the units) at the time of the survey interview. Asking rent may differ from the contracted rent at the time the unit is actually occupied. Asking rent may or may not include utilities. Since the rental units included in this chapter are occupied units only, asking rent data are covered in Chapter 5, "Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates."

#### Use of Imputed Rent Data

Starting in 1993, key data items covered in the HVS (including income and rent) that were not supplied by the respondent were assigned by the Census Bureau, using an imputation methodology.<sup>1</sup> Thus, as in the presentation and analysis of income data, whenever rent data for 1993, 1996, and/or 1999 only are being considered, data containing **imputed** rents will be used. On the other hand, in showing long-term trends for 1984, 1987, 1991, and later survey years and in comparing rent data from 1993 or later surveys with data from 1991 or previous surveys, only **reported** data will be used. When reported data are used, they will be specifically noted as "reported."

#### Rent Subsidy Data from the 1996 and 1999 HVSs

For the 1999 HVS, the Census Bureau maintained a series of questions, initially covered in the 1996 HVS, designed to collect data on the following: rent, rent subsidy, and out-of-pocket rent. The Census Bureau asked these questions in the following sequence. First, immediately after asking what the monthly rent was, they asked if any part of the monthly rent was paid by any of the following specific

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For further information on the imputation methodology, see Chapter 3, "Household Incomes in New York City," of this report and Moon Wha Lee, *Housing New York City*, 1996, p. 108.

government programs, either to a member of the household or directly to the landlord:

- the federal Section 8 certificate or voucher program,
- the public assistance shelter allowance program,
- the City's Senior Citizen Rent Increase Exemption (SCRIE) program,
- another federal housing subsidy program, or
- another state or city housing subsidy program.

Second, the Census Bureau asked how much of the rent reported by the household was paid out of pocket by the household.<sup>2</sup> With these new rent questions and the sequence in which the questions were asked, the Census Bureau interviewers were more likely to be able to collect the full contract rent, not just the out-of-pocket rent, since respondents had the opportunity to distinguish between the two. For example, in 1996 and 1999 the interviewer asked the total monthly rent question and the rent subsidy question; then, the interviewer asked what amount of the monthly rent was paid out of pocket. Thus, if the interviewer or the tenant realized that the total rent the tenant first reported was incorrect, since it covered only out-of-pocket rent, and the tenant had subsequently reported that he or she also received some kind of subsidy, appropriate corrections could be made.

#### Usefulness and Limitations of Rent Subsidy Data

The 1999 HVS reports that 11.0 percent of renter households in New York City received various rent subsidies from any of four types of government programs: Section 8, other federal programs, SCRIE, and other state and city housing programs (Table 6.1). (In this report, the PA shelter allowance is not treated as a rent subsidy, since the Census Bureau covered it in estimating income in 1999, as in previous survey years.) However, the proportion of subsidized households varied widely for different rental categories in 1999, as in 1996.<sup>3</sup>

In 1999 as in 1996, the median contract rent of units occupied by households reporting that they received a rent subsidy (hereafter referred to as "subsidized" households or "subsidized" units) was overall substantially lower than the rent paid by households reporting that they did not receive a rent subsidy (hereafter referred to as "unsubsidized" households or "unsubsidized" units, despite the fact that some of these households lived in public housing, *in rem*, Mitchell-Lama, or other publicly-aided units, which were, in effect, subsidized because they were subsidized in their construction and/or operation by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Appendix E, "New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Questionnaire, 1999."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For example, of households in the "other" regulated category, which includes primarily units subsidized by HUD programs, in addition to Loft Board units and Article 4 units [units in buildings constructed under Article 4 of the New York State Private Housing Finance Law (PHFL)], 64.2 percent received subsidies from any of the government programs covered in the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, while 30.7 percent of Mitchell-Lama renter households received such subsidies (Table 6.1). (Article 4 of the PHFL program provided for the construction of limited-profit rental buildings for occupancy by households with moderate incomes. For further information, see Appendix C: "Definitions of Rent Regulation Status.") On the other hand, 10.8 percent of households in rent stabilized units, 7.9 percent of households in rent controlled units, and 4.9 percent of rent unregulated households received a rent subsidy.

Z	edian Contr	act Rent a	nd Distributi by S	on of Renter Selected Reg New	Table 6.1 Househo ulatory Sta York City	lds Receiv atus Categ 1996	ing and Not ories	Receiving ]	Rent Subsidi	es
					Rent	Regulatory	Status			
				Re	nt Stabilized					
Rent Subsidy	Total	Public	Rent Controlled	All Stabilized	Pre- 1947	Post- 1947	ML Rental	In Rem	Other Regulated	Unreg- ulated
All	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 250	<sup>\$</sup> 477	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 620	007 <sup>s</sup>	$009_{\$}$	<sup>\$</sup> 280	<sup>\$</sup> 350	<sup>\$</sup> 750
$NR^{a}$	$^{8}650$	<sup>\$</sup> 301	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 700	$^{s}650$	8760	800	$00\xi_{s}$	<sup>\$</sup> 350	007 <sup>8</sup>
Yes	<sup>\$</sup> 570	<sup>\$</sup> 215	<sup>\$</sup> 342	<sup>\$</sup> 587	<sup>\$</sup> 595	<sup>\$</sup> 532	<sup>\$</sup> 639	<sup>\$</sup> 238*	<sup>\$</sup> 332	$008_{\$}$
No	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 247	<sup>\$</sup> 460	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 619	<sup>\$700</sup>	065 <sub>s</sub>	<sup>\$</sup> 275	<sup>\$</sup> 372	<sup>\$</sup> 750
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Yes	11.0%	10.1%	7.9%	10.8%	11.7%	8.1%	30.7%	10.7%*	64.2%	4.9%
No	89.0%	89.9%	92.1%	89.2%	88.3%	91.9%	69.3%	89.3%	35.8%	95.1%
Total	100.0%	8.7%	2.7%	52.2%	38.3%	13.9%	3.4%	0.8%	2.8%	29.3%
$NR^{a}$	100.0%	6.6%	2.6%	55.5%	38.7%	16.8%	5.5%	0.7%	2.8%	26.3%
Yes	100.0%	8.4%	1.9%	50.6%	40.9%	9.7%	8.4%	0.8%*	16.7%	13.2%
No	100.0%	9.4%	2.8%	51.9%	38.2%	13.7%	2.3%	0.8%	1.2%	31.7%
Source: U.S. Notes:	Bureau of the Cer	nsus, 1999 New	Vork City Housin	ig and Vacancy Su	rvey.					
a Hou	useholds reporting	no cash rent ar ving a subsidy.	e excluded from th Subsidy includes	ne calculation of me Section 8, other fe	edian contract deral programs	rent but includ	ed in the category N other state and city J	VR (not reporting nousing program	g subsidy) with res 18.	spect to

, a ą á

Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*

virtue of government programs) (Table 6.1). However, the difference in the median rents of subsidized and unsubsidized households varied for different categories of rental housing units.<sup>4</sup>

The 1999 HVS reports that, of rent-subsidized households in the City, six in ten received HUD Section 8 subsidies (61.8 percent) (Table 6.2). The remaining subsidized households received either another federal housing program subsidy (14.8 percent), SCRIE (11.9 percent), or another state or city housing program subsidy (11.5 percent).

The relative rank of out-of-pocket rent and median contract rent of units receiving different subsidies was different. The amount of Section 8 subsidy was the highest, followed by New York City or State housing programs other than SCRIE, SCRIE, and federal programs other than Section 8 (Table 6.3). Households that received Section 8 subsidies paid the lowest median out-of-pocket rent, and the median contract rent of their units was the highest. On the other hand, households that received another New York State or City rent subsidy other than SCRIE paid the second lowest out-of-pocket rent, and their contract rent was the second highest. Households that received a federal subsidy other than Section 8 paid the second highest out-of-pocket rent, and their contract rent was the lowest. SCRIE-recipient households paid the highest out-of-pocket rent, and their contract rent was the second lowest.

Since, like many other social programs, rent subsidy programs covered in the 1996 and 1999 HVSs are structured and operate in a complicated manner, it is safe to assume that some tenants who received these rent subsidy programs would not be familiar enough with each of the programs to differentiate clearly the programs and identify the one they received. Thus, although, with the rent subsidy data, several new rent analyses can be performed, rent subsidy data should be used as a general aggregate of the overall estimate rather than as a reliable enumeration of individual rent subsidies.

#### Comparison of 1996 and 1999 HVS Rent Data with Rent Data from 1993 and Previous HVS Years

Because the 1996 and 1999 HVS rent and rent subsidy questions are significantly different from the 1993 questions, it is impossible to develop one definition of "rent subsidy" that can be applied to all the years for which the data are compared, although it is necessary to use such a definition if the rent data are to be compared in a reliable manner. Thus, in comparing rent data from the 1996 or 1999 HVSs with rent data from the 1993 or previous HVSs, the limitations that are incurred by applying inconsistent definitions should be taken into consideration.

The 1996 and 1999 rent questions were designed to differentiate out-of-pocket rent from total contract rent, while the 1993 and previous HVS questions were not. Therefore, it is possible that the 1993 contract rent reported for rent-subsidized households may not in all cases have been the full contract rent, since it may have included out-of-pocket rent only and excluded the rent subsidy. Specifically, the median out-of-pocket rent in 1999 was 31.8 percent of the median contract rent for rent-subsidized households, while the out-of-pocket rent in 1993 cannot be determined (Table 6.7).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> For example, the median contract rent paid by unsubsidized households in rent stabilized units and unregulated units in cooperative and condominium buildings was higher than the rent of subsidized households in such units (Table 6.13). On the other hand, the median rent paid by unsubsidized households in some other rental categories was lower than the rent of subsidized households.

#### Table 6.2 Median Contract Rent and Distribution of Renter Households Receiving Rent Subsidies by Type of Subsidy New York City 1999

Rent Subsidy	Total <sup>a</sup>
All Renter Households Receiving Subsidy	<sup>\$</sup> 570
Section 8	<sup>\$</sup> 640
SCRIE	<sup>\$</sup> 430
$NY^b$	<sup>\$</sup> 535
Federal	<sup>\$</sup> 320
Distribution by Type of Subsidy	
All Renter Households Receiving Subsidy	100.0%
Section 8	61.8%
SCRIE	11.9%
$NY^b$	11.5%
Federal	14.8%
Source:       U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housin         Notes:       a         Households reporting no cash rent are excluded from the         Another New York City or state rent subsidy	ng and Vacancy Survey. e calculation of median contract rent.

### Table 6.3

#### Median Contract Rent and Median Out-of-Pocket Rent Paid by Renter Households Receiving Rent Subsidies by Type of Rent Subsidy New York City 1999

Median Contract Rent					
All Renter Households Receiving Subsidy	<sup>\$</sup> 570				
Section 8	<sup>\$</sup> 640				
SCRIE	<sup>\$</sup> 430				
NY <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 535				
Federal	<sup>\$</sup> 320				
Median Out-of-Pocket Rent					
All Renter Households Receiving Subsidy	<sup>\$</sup> 181				
Section 8	<sup>\$</sup> 164				
SCRIE	<sup>\$</sup> 355				
NY <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 171				
Federal	<sup>\$</sup> 185				

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Another New York City or state rent subsidy.

b Paid out of pocket means the amount of rent <u>not</u> paid by a government housing subsidy program.

In addition, there is no evidence that the out-of-pocket rent proportion of the contract rent in 1996 or 1999 was the same as in 1993. In light of all this, it appears clear that some of the differences in rents between 1996 or 1999 and 1993 or any previous survey years may be the result, not of actual changes in rent between the years, but of changes in the rent and rent subsidy questions that were asked. Thus, comparisons between 1996 or 1999 and 1993 or any previous survey years will be undertaken in the following manner: Comparisons of rent data from the 1993 or previous HVSs with data from the 1996 and/or 1999 HVSs will be done only for the City as a whole and for a very few selected segments in which the proportion of households receiving subsidies is relatively very low and for which the impacts of the differences in the rent and rent subsidy questions between the 1993 or any previous HVSs and the 1996 or 1999 HVSs are, thus, expected to be small enough not to cause differences in rent values to be beyond the bounds of reasonableness.

#### Patterns of Rent Expenditures

In New York City, according to the 1999 HVS, the median monthly contract rent, which excludes tenant payments for utilities and fuel, was \$648, while the median monthly gross rent, which includes utility and fuel payments, was \$700 (Table 6.4).

From 1996 to 1999, the median contract rent increased by 2.6 percent annually. This was a 0.6-percent annual increase after adjusting for inflation (Table 6.4). In the same three years, the median gross rent increased by 3.0 percent annually, which is an inflation-adjusted increase of 1.0 percent annually.

Table 0.4	
Median Contract Rent and Median Gross Rent in Constant (1999)	)
and in Current Dollars	
New York City 1996 and 1999	

Table 6 4

			Average Annual Compound Rate of Change
			1996-1999
Contract Rent	1996	1999	
Constant (1999) Dollars <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 648	0.6%
Current Dollars	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 648	2.6%
Gross Rent			
Constant (1999) Dollars <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 679	<sup>\$</sup> 700	1.0%
Current Dollars	<sup>\$</sup> 640	<sup>\$</sup> 700	3.0%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a In order to convert nominal rents into rents measured in 1999 dollars, the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers, or CPI-U, for New York, Northern New Jersey-Long Island was used (i.e., multiplied by the ratio of CPI-U April 1999/CPI-U April 1996 or 176.0/166.0).

Note:

In the nine years between 1987 and 1996, the **reported** real median contract rent (inflationadjusted rent) increased 1.9 percent annually (Table 6.5), while the **reported** real median gross rent increased by 1.2 percent annually (Table 6.6).

Table 6.5
Median Contract Rent in Constant (1999) and in Current Dollars
New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

	Reported Rent <sup>4</sup>			With Imp	outed Rents <sup>b</sup>	Average Annual Compound Rate of Change		
	1987	1991	1993	1996	1996	1999	1987-1996 <sup>a</sup>	1996-1999 <sup>b</sup>
1999 Dollars	<sup>\$</sup> 532	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 572	<sup>\$</sup> 629	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 648	1.9%	0.6%
Current Dollars	<sup>\$</sup> 350	<sup>\$</sup> 475	<sup>\$</sup> 501	<sup>\$</sup> 593	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 648	6.0%	2.6%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a For 1991 and previous survey years, the HVS provided rent data reported by the survey respondent. For 1993 and subsequent surveys, the Census Bureau provided rent data containing imputed data for rent items not reported by the respondent. Thus, for analysis of the long-term trend of rent change and the rent change between 1987 and 1996, reported rent data only are used.

b In comparing changes in rent between 1996 and 1999, data containing imputed rents where not reported by respondent are used.

Table 6.6
Median Gross Rent in Constant (1999) and in Current Dollars
New York City, Selected Years 1987-1999

		Reported Rent <sup>a</sup>			With Imp	uted Rents <sup>b</sup>	Average Compour Cha	e Annual nd Rate of ange
	1987	1991	1993	1996	1996	1999	1987-96 <sup>a</sup>	1996-99 <sup>b</sup>
1999 Dollars	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 625	<sup>\$</sup> 632	<sup>\$</sup> 668	<sup>\$</sup> 679	<sup>\$</sup> 700	1.2%	1.0%
Current Dollars	<sup>\$</sup> 395	<sup>\$</sup> 509	<sup>\$</sup> 553	<sup>\$</sup> 630	<sup>\$</sup> 640	<sup>\$</sup> 700	5.3%	3.0%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a For 1991 and previous survey years, the HVS provided rent data reported by the survey respondent. For 1993 and subsequent surveys, the Census Bureau provided rent data containing imputed data for rent items not reported by the respondent. Thus, for analysis of the long term trend of rent change and the rent change between 1987 and 1996, reported rent data only are used.

b In comparing changes in rent between 1996 and 1999, rent data containing imputed rents where not reported by the respondent are used.

In 1999, the median contract rent of units occupied by rent-subsidized households was \$570. (As used in this chapter, "subsidized" only covers households that received any of the government rent subsidies covered in the 1996 and 1999 HVSs, as described earlier, although all housing units in the Mitchell-Lama, public housing, in rem, and "other" rent-regulated categories are subsidized in their original construction and/or operations by virtue of government programs.) This was \$78, or 12.0 percent, lower than the overall median rent of \$648 for all rental units and \$80, or 12.3 percent, lower than the median rent of \$650 for units occupied by rent-unsubsidized households (Table 6.7). Of the \$570 median rent for units occupied by subsidized households, only a median of \$181, or 31.8 percent, was paid by the households out of pocket. In other words, of the median rent these subsidized households paid, more than two-thirds (68.2 percent) was paid by the government rent subsidy the households received. The difference between their median rent and out-of-pocket rent was \$389 (\$570-\$181), more than double the households' out-of-pocket rent. This means that, other than the portion of the rent paid out of pocket, the remainder was paid entirely by government programs, although some renters might have received more than one government subsidy and/or some portion of the rent that was not subsidized by the government might have been paid by relatives or others, including non-profit agencies. Judging from this analysis, it seems reasonable to say that many rent-subsidized households, particularly very poor households, could not have afforded the units they occupied without the rent subsidies they received.

Table 6.7 Median Contract Rent and Distribution of All Renter Households, Rent Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households New York City 1999

Households by Subsidy Type	Median Contract Rent	Number of Households	Percent <sup>b</sup>
All Renter Households <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 648	1,928,841	100.0%
Subsidized Households	<sup>\$</sup> 570	174,378	11.0%
Out-of-Pocket Rent	<sup>\$</sup> 181		
Unsubsidized Households	<sup>\$</sup> 650	1,404,091	89.0%
Households Not Reporting Subsidy	<sup>\$</sup> 650	350,372	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a "All renter households" includes those for whom there was no response to the subsidy question and excludes those reporting no cash rent.

b The percent distribution is based on those reporting on the subsidy question.

In 1999, the median gross rent for rent-subsidized households was \$624. This was \$76, or 10.9 percent, lower than the median gross rent of \$700 for all rental units in the City (Table 6.8). The median gross rent that unsubsidized households paid was \$700, exactly the same as the median gross rent of all renter units.

In 1999, the median contract rent for the lowest twenty percent of the renter units in the City was \$287 (Table 6.9). In other words, the rent of one in ten renter units in the City was less than \$287 a month; these units were mostly public housing, *in rem*, or "other" rent-regulated units.<sup>5</sup> The rent for rent-subsidized units in the lowest quintile was disproportionately low, only \$170, while the equivalent rent for unsubsidized units was \$300.

Table 6.8
Median Gross Rent and Distribution of All Renter Households, Rent Subsidized Households
and Unsubsidized Households
New York City 1999

		J	
Households by Subsidy Type	Median Gross Rent	Number of Households	Percent <sup>b</sup>
All Renter Households <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 700	1,928,841	100.0%
Subsidized	<sup>\$</sup> 624	174,378	11.0%
Out-of-Pocket Rent			
Unsubsidized	<sup>\$</sup> 700	1,404,091	89.0%
Not Reporting Subsidy	<sup>\$</sup> 708	350,372	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a "All renter households" includes those for whom there was no response to the subsidy question and excludes those reporting no cash rent.

b The percent distribution is based on those reporting on the subsidy question.

#### Table 6.9 Median Contract Rent by Contract Rent Quintile for All, Subsidized and Unsubsidized Households New York City 1999

Contract Rent Quintile <sup>a</sup>	All Renter Households	Subsidized	Unsubsidized	Households Not Reporting Subsidy
All Renter Households	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 570	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Lowest	<sup>\$</sup> 287	<sup>\$</sup> 170	<sup>\$</sup> 300	<sup>\$</sup> 312
2nd Lowest	<sup>\$</sup> 502	<sup>\$</sup> 368	<sup>\$</sup> 514	<sup>\$</sup> 525
Middle	<sup>\$</sup> 631	<sup>\$</sup> 562	<sup>\$</sup> 634	<sup>\$</sup> 650
2nd Highest	<sup>\$</sup> 765	<sup>\$</sup> 703	<sup>\$</sup> 770	<sup>\$</sup> 800
Highest	<sup>\$</sup> 1,120	<sup>\$</sup> 962	<sup>\$</sup> 1,145	<sup>\$</sup> 1,250

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

The rent quintile ranges were: All Households: \$1-\$437; \$438-584; \$585-\$699; \$700-\$899; \$900+. Subsidized: \$1-\$246; \$247-\$481; \$482-\$634; \$635-\$802; \$803+. Unsubsidized: \$1-\$449; \$450-\$589; \$590-\$699; \$700-\$899; \$900+. Not Reporting Subsidy: \$1-\$472; \$473-\$595; \$596-\$718; \$719-\$940; \$941+.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note: a

The median contract rent for all rental units in the second-lowest twenty percent of rental units was \$502 (Table 6.9). The rent for rent-subsidized units in this quintile was \$368, only 73.3 percent of the overall rent and 71.6 percent of the rent for rent-unsubsidized units in the same quintile, which was \$514. For the middle twenty percent of rental units, the overall median rent was \$631, almost the same as the rent for unsubsidized units, which was \$634, while the rent of subsidized units was \$562, or 89.1 percent of the overall rent in the quintile. The overall median rent was \$765 for the second-highest twenty percent of rental units. The rent for unsubsidized units in this quintile was \$770, while the rent for subsidized units was \$703, or 91.9 percent of the overall rent. For the highest twenty percent, the overall median rent of all units was \$1,120. The rent for unsubsidized units in this quintile was \$1,145, but the rent for subsidized units was \$962, or 85.9 percent of the overall rent.

Reviewing contract rent distributions, several unique patterns emerge. In 1999, of all rental units, 15.8 percent rented for a contract rent between \$1 and \$399 a month, while a similar 14.7 percent of unsubsidized units rented for such a rent (Table 6.10). However, of subsidized units, 31.2 percent, about double the proportion of all rental units or unsubsidized rental units, rented for an equivalent rent. In other words, the rent of a disproportionately large number of subsidized rental units, close to a third, was less than \$400. The rents of about a quarter of all rental units (26.1 percent) and unsubsidized rental units (26.1 percent) were between \$400 and \$599. The comparable proportion of subsidized rental units in the same rent level was smaller, 22.2 percent. About three in ten of all rental units (28.9 percent) and unsubsidized rental units (29.3 percent) had a rent level between \$600 and \$799. The comparable proportion for subsidized rental units was again lower, 24.4 percent.

However, the disparate proportions between all rental units and subsidized rental units become less as the rent level moves up. The proportions of all rental units and unsubsidized rental units with contract rents between \$800 and \$999 were practically the same, 14.6 percent and 14.7 percent respectively. At the same time, the comparable proportion of subsidized rental units in the same rent level was 13.4 percent, not much lower. A similar pattern holds for the \$1,000-\$1,499 rent level: the proportions for all rental units and for unsubsidized rental units were 9.6 percent and 9.5 percent respectively, while the proportion for subsidized rental units was 8.1 percent. In the top rent level, \$1,500 and over, the proportions of all rental units and unsubsidized rental units were almost the same, 5.8 percent and 5.7 percent respectively, while the corresponding proportion of subsidized rental units in this rent level was negligibly small.

Comparison of the 1999 rent distribution with the 1996 distribution after inflation reveals that, in the three years, the proportion of low-rent units decreased as the proportion of high-rent units increased by approximately commensurate rates. During the three-year period, the numbers of rental units with contract rents between \$1 and \$399 and between \$400 and \$699 decreased by 42,000 units (or 12.2 percent) and 56,000 units (or 6.5 percent) respectively (Table 6.10). At the same time, the number of rental units with rents between \$700 and \$999 increased by 58,000 units (or 23.3 percent), while the number of rental units with rents of \$1,000 or more increased by 56,000 units (or 23.3 percent). A similar pattern repeated for the rent distributions of both rent-subsidized and rent-unsubsidized units (Figures 6.1 and 6.2).

	All Renter H	ouseholds		
Contract Rent	Number	Percent	Subsidized	Unsubsidized
All Renter Households <sup>a</sup>	1,946,165	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 299	221,479	11.6%	25.6%	10.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 300 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	126,079	6.6%	7.9%	6.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 499	220,302	11.5%	11.0%	12.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 500 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	315,400	16.5%	12.5%	16.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	324,135	16.9%	12.6%	17.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 799	229,985	12.0%	10.4%	12.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 800 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	121,763	6.4%	7.9%	6.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 999	113,433	5.9%	3.5%	6.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,499	160,841	8.4%	7.0%	8.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,500 and Over	79,426	4.2%	1.7%	4.0%
	1	999		
All Renter Households <sup>a</sup>	1,953,289	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 299	202,380	10.5%	23.9%	9.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 300 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	102,889	5.3%	7.3%	5.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 499	200,770	10.4%	10.6%	10.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 500 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	289,199	15.0%	11.6%	15.4%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	313,967	16.3%	13.4%	16.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 799	242,162	12.6%	11.0%	12.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 800 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	170,906	8.9%	8.7%	9.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 999	110,288	5.7%	4.7%	5.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,499	184,722	9.6%	8.1%	9.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,500 and Over	111,557	5.8%	0.7%*	5.7%

#### Table 6.10 Contract Rent Distribution (in 1999 Dollars) by All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households New York City 1996 and 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a "All renter households" includes those for whom there was no response to the subsidy question. Those reporting no cash rent were excluded from the rent distribution.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

Figure 6.1 Percent Rent Subsidized and Unsubsidized Households by Contract Rent New York City 1999



#### **Rents by Location**

In the City between 1996 and 1999, the real median contract rent increased by 1.9 percent to \$648, while the real median renter household income increased by 1.7 percent (Table 6.11). In 1999, the median rent in Manhattan was \$727, the highest of any of the boroughs and 12.2 percent higher than the citywide median of \$648 (Map 6.1). This was a 5.5-percent increase after inflation in the three-year period, during which the real median income in the borough increased by 6.3 percent. The real median rent in Queens increased by 2.0 percent to \$700 in 1999, the second-highest in the City and 8.0 percent higher than the city-wide median. During the same three-year period, the real median income in the borough decreased by 2.2 percent. In Staten Island, the median rent, \$642, did not change much over the three years and remained very close to the citywide median. During the period, the real median increased by 3.8 percent from three years earlier to \$605, which was 6.6 percent lower than the city-wide median in 1999, while the real median income increased by 8.4 percent. The real median rent in the Bronx increased by 2.0 percent to \$550, the lowest of any of the boroughs and 15.1 percent lower than the citywide median. The real median rent in the Bronx increased by 2.0 percent to \$550, the lowest of any of the boroughs and 15.1 percent lower the three years.

Figure 6.2 Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Categories in 1999 Dollars New York City 1996 and 1999



 Table 6.11

 Median Contract Rent and Median Renter Household Income by Borough (in 1999 Dollars)

 New York City 1996 and 1999

	Median Co	ntract Rent <sup>a</sup>	Median House	ehold Income <sup>b</sup>
Borough	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 25,571	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000
Bronx <sup>c</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 539	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 17,395	<sup>\$</sup> 17,472
Brooklyn	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 605	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 23,200
Manhattan <sup>c</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 727	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 34,140
Queens	<sup>\$</sup> 686	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 30,664	<sup>\$</sup> 30,000
Staten Island	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 642	<sup>\$</sup> 29,968	\$32,000

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Monthly rent is reported as of the year of the survey.

b Annual income is reported for the year prior to the survey.

c Marble Hill in the Bronx.

Map 6.1 Median Contract Rents New York City 1999



The boroughs were different in their distributional patterns of contract rent. Compared to the citywide pattern, more rental units in the Bronx were lower-rent units. In the borough, six in ten of the rental units were rented out for a contract rent between \$1 and \$399 (22.7 percent) or between \$400 and \$599 (36.9 percent), compared to 15.8 percent and 25.4 percent respectively of all rental units in the City (Table 6.12). On the other hand, less than 4.0 percent of all units in the borough rented for \$1,000 or more; and less than 1.0 percent rented for \$1,500 or more. In Brooklyn, of rental units, close to two-thirds rented for \$400-\$799 (64.5 percent), while 6.0 percent rented for \$1,000 or more and only 1.0 percent rented for \$1,500 or more (see also Figure 6.3).

Of all rental units in Manhattan, the rents of more than a third (34.8 percent) were \$1,000 or more, while the rents of 17.7 percent were \$1,500 or more (Table 6.12). On the other hand, 37.2 percent of all rental units in the borough were low-rent units with rents between \$1 and \$599, and the rents for 18.5 percent of these were between \$1 and \$399. In other words, rental units in the borough were distributed in a bipolar manner among the rent levels. In Queens, more units had middle-level rents. In the borough, the rents of six in ten of all rental units were \$600 to \$999, while the proportion of rental units with rents between \$1 and \$399 was only 8.5 percent and the proportion of units with rents of \$1,500 or more was only 1.3 percent. In Staten Island, as in Brooklyn, almost two-thirds of the rental units rented for \$400 to \$799 (65.1 percent), while only about one in ten rented for between \$1 and \$399, and another one in ten rented for \$1,000 or more (Map 6.2).

Citvwide Bronx Brooklyn Manhattan Oueens Staten Island 0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100% \$1-\$499 \$500-\$699 \$700-\$999 \$1000+ Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Figure 6.3 Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Categories within Borough New York City 1999

Map 6.2 Renter-Occupied Units with Monthly Contract Rents of Less Than \$500 New York City 1999



Contract Rent	All	<b>Bron</b> x <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
All Renter						
Occupied Units	1,953,289	327,444	587,780	561,534	423,405	53,126
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 <sup>\$</sup> 299	10.5%	16.0%	10.1%	12.0%	4.9%	8.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 300 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	5.3%	6.7%	5.0%	6.5%	3.6%	2.2%*
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 499	10.4%	14.8%	11.9%	8.9%	7.0%	10.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 500 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	15.0%	22.1%	17.2%	9.8%	13.2%	16.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	16.3%	15.9%	20.4%	9.4%	19.1%	22.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 799	12.6%	10.0%	15.0%	6.4%	18.9%	16.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 800 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	8.9%	7.6%	9.0%	5.9%	13.4%	10.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 999	5.7%	3.5%	4.6%	6.1%	8.6%	4.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	6.9%	2.4%	4.9%	10.7%	8.3%	7.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,499	2.6%	0.6%	0.9%	6.4%	1.8%	**
<sup>\$</sup> 1,500 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,999	3.0%	0.3%*	0.8%	8.8%	0.9%	**
<sup>\$</sup> 2,000 and Over	2.7%	**	0.2%*	8.9%	0.4%*	**

Table 6.12 Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent by Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report

#### **Rent by Rent-Regulation Categories**

Public housing and *in rem* units were unquestionably more affordable for the poor than units in other rental categories in the City. The median contract rents of public housing units and *in rem* units were \$250 and \$280 respectively, the lowest of any rental categories and only 38.6 percent and 43.2 percent of the median rent of \$648 for all rental units in the City in 1999 (Table 6.13).

Units in the "other" rent-regulated category--which includes units whose rents are regulated by HUD, the Loft Board, or the provisions of the Article 4 program--were also much more affordable than the average rental units in the City. The median contract rent of units in this category was \$350, or 54.0 percent of the citywide median (Table 6.13). The rent of rent-controlled units was also very low, \$477 and only 73.6 percent of the overall median rent.

On the other hand, the median contract rent of unregulated units was \$750. The rent of such units in private cooperative and condominium buildings was \$860, \$212 or 32.7 percent higher than the city-wide median rent and the highest of all rent-regulation categories, while the rent of such units in rental buildings was \$750, \$102 or 15.7 percent higher than the city-wide median rent (Table 6.13).

#### Table 6.13

	All Renter Households <sup>b</sup>	Subsi House	dized holds	Unsubsidized Households
Regulatory Status	Median Contract Rent	Median Contract Rent	Out-of-Pocket Rent	Median Contract Rent
All	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 570	<sup>\$</sup> 181	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 477	<sup>\$</sup> 342	<sup>\$</sup> 320	<sup>\$</sup> 460
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 587	<sup>\$</sup> 171	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 620	<sup>\$</sup> 595	<sup>\$</sup> 146	<sup>\$</sup> 619
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 532	<sup>\$</sup> 239	<sup>\$</sup> 700
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 536	<sup>\$</sup> 527	<sup>\$</sup> 200	<sup>\$</sup> 545
Mitchell-Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 639	<sup>\$</sup> 269	<sup>\$</sup> 590
Other <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 350	\$332	<sup>\$</sup> 190	\$372
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 750	\$800	<sup>\$</sup> 130	<sup>\$</sup> 750
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 750	\$800	<sup>\$</sup> 127	<sup>\$</sup> 750
Sublet Coops	<sup>\$</sup> 860	<sup>\$</sup> 750*	<sup>\$</sup> 200*	<sup>\$</sup> 865
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 250	<sup>\$</sup> 215	<sup>\$</sup> 176	<sup>\$</sup> 247
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 280	<sup>\$</sup> 238*	<sup>\$</sup> 135*	<sup>\$</sup> 275

#### Median Contract Rent of All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households and Out-of-Pocket Rent of Subsidized Households by Regulatory Status New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Includes primarily units whose rents are regulated by HUD, and also units with rents regulated by the Loft Board or under the provisions of the Article 4 program (which built limited-profit rental buildings for households with moderate incomes under Article 4 of the state PHFL).

b Excludes those reporting no cash rent.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

The median rent of rent-stabilized units was \$650, not meaningfully different from the citywide median rent. However, the rent for rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947 (post-1947 rent-stabilized units) was much higher than that of such units in buildings built in 1947 or before (pre-1947 rent-stabilized units): \$700 compared to \$620.6

In 1999 as in 1996, the median contract rent for rent-subsidized units was considerably lower than both that for all rental units and that for rent-unsubsidized units in the City. However, this citywide pattern did not hold for all rental categories. The median contract rent for subsidized unregulated rental units in rental buildings was higher than that of all rental units and that of unsubsidized units in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> In this report, rent-stabilized units in buildings built in 1947 or before will be referred to as "pre-1947 rent-stabilized units," unless the phrase confuses the meaning of the category. Similarly, rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947 will be referred to as "post-1947 rent stabilized units."

this category, while the rent of subsidized units was lower than that of all rental units and that of unsubsidized rental units in most other rental categories. The primary reason for the higher rent of subsidized rental units in this category was the fact that a large proportion of households in these units received Section 8 subsidies, which were the highest among all rent subsidies covered in the 1999 HVS.<sup>7</sup>

			<i></i>			
	Mee Contra	dian .ct Rent	Percent Change	Mediar Househo	n Renter Id Income	Percent Change
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	1996	1999	1996-99	1995	1998	1995-98
All	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 648	1.9%	<sup>\$</sup> 25,571	<sup>\$</sup> 26,000	1.7%
Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 454	<sup>\$</sup> 477	5.1%	<sup>\$</sup> 14,372	<sup>\$</sup> 17,000	18.3%
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 650	2.2%	<sup>\$</sup> 27,132	<sup>\$</sup> 27,000	-0.5%
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 606	<sup>\$</sup> 620	2.3%	<sup>\$</sup> 25,687	<sup>\$</sup> 25,600	-0.3%
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 700	1.6%	\$32,644	\$30,400	-6.9%
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 562	<sup>\$</sup> 536	-4.6%	<sup>\$</sup> 14,449	<sup>\$</sup> 15,000	3.8%
Mitchell-Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 600	+2.9%	<sup>\$</sup> 21,406	<sup>\$</sup> 21,454	0.2%
Other	<sup>\$</sup> 448	<sup>\$</sup> 350	-21.9%	<sup>\$</sup> 9,847	<sup>\$</sup> 10,200	3.6%
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 732	<sup>\$</sup> 750	2.5%	\$32,109	\$35,350	10.1%
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 750	7.1%	<sup>\$</sup> 32,109	<sup>\$</sup> 35,000	9.0%
Sublet Coops	<sup>\$</sup> 848	<sup>\$</sup> 860	1.4%	<sup>\$</sup> 46,022	<sup>\$</sup> 49,080	6.6%
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 239	<sup>\$</sup> 250	4.6%	<sup>\$</sup> 9,633	<sup>\$</sup> 9,704	0.7%
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 265	<sup>\$</sup> 280	5.7%	<sup>\$</sup> 8,990	<sup>\$</sup> 11,478	27.7%

Table 6.14
Median Contract Rent (in 1999 dollars) and Median Household Income (in 1998 dollars)
and Percent Changes between 1996-99 by Regulatory Status
New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

After adjusting for inflation, in the three years between 1996 and 1999, the median contract rent of all rental units rose by 1.9 percent, from \$636 to \$648, while the median renter household income rose by 1.7 percent, as discussed earlier (Table 6.14). During the same period, the rent of rent-controlled units rose by 5.1 percent, from \$454 to \$477, while household income in these units increased by 18.3 percent. At the same time, the rent of rent-stabilized units rose by 2.2 percent, while household income in those units decreased by 0.5 percent. The rent increase for pre-1947 rent-stabilized units was 2.3 percent, while the income decrease for households in such units was 0.3 percent. At the same time, the rent of post-1947 rent-stabilized units rose by 1.6 percent, while the income of households in those units decreased by 6.9 percent.

<sup>7</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Between 1996 and 1999, the median contract rent of unregulated rental units in rental buildings rose by 7.1 percent, from \$700 to \$750, the highest rate of change of any rental category, while the median income of households in those units increased by 9.0 percent between 1995 and 1998 (Table 6.14). At the same time, the rent of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings increased by 1.4 percent, while the income of those households increased by 6.6 percent.

The median contract rents of public housing units and *in rem* units, which were disproportionately lower than rents of other categories, also rose between 1996 and 1999, by 4.6 percent and 5.7 percent respectively (Table 6.14). The income of households in *in rem* units increased by 27.7 percent, while the income of public housing households remained virtually unchanged during the three-year period.

In 1999, the median contract rent of rent-controlled units in Manhattan and Queens was \$500, higher than the rents of such units in the City as a whole (\$477) and in the other boroughs (Table 6.15). The rent of rent-controlled units in the Bronx was \$400, the lowest for such units in any of the boroughs. The rent of rent-stabilized units in Manhattan was \$800, the highest for such units in any of the boroughs, as was the case with the rent of all rental units in Manhattan. This was \$150, or 23.1 percent, higher than the city-wide rent for such units, which was \$650. The rent for such units in buildings built after 1947 in Manhattan was \$1,052, while it was \$718 for such units in buildings built in 1947 or before. The rent for rent-stabilized units in the Bronx was \$550, the lowest for such units in any of the boroughs (Figure 6.4).

Rents of unregulated units in rental buildings in Manhattan were the most expensive in the City. The 1999 rent for such units in the borough was \$2,040, 2.7 times the rent of all unregulated rental units in rental buildings in the City, which was \$750 (Table 6.15). The rent of unregulated rental units in cooperatives and condominiums in Manhattan was the second most expensive in the City, \$1,470, or 1.7 times the rent for all such units in the City, which was \$860 (Figure 6.4).

The median contract rent of public housing units in the Bronx was \$200, lower than the rent for all such units in the City and the lowest for such units in any of the boroughs (Table 6.15).

The pattern of change in the median contract rent between 1996 and 1999 by rent-regulation category in each borough mirrored the city-wide pattern, with some exceptions, including the following worthy of note. In Manhattan, real median rents for unregulated rental units as a whole and such units in rental buildings jumped extraordinarily by 56.8 percent and 63.7 percent respectively, compared to increases of 2.5 percent and 7.1 percent respectively for the City as a whole (Table 6.15). Also in the borough, the real rent for rent-controlled units declined by 5.7 percent and the real rent for post-1947 rent-stabilized units declined by 9.8 percent, while real rents for such units city-wide increased by 5.1 percent and 1.6 percent respectively.

Of all renter units in the City, 15.8 percent rented for between \$1 and \$399 a month, while 25.4 percent rented for a contract rent of \$400 to \$599 (Table 6.16). In addition, 28.9 percent had rents of \$600 to \$799, while another 14.6 percent had rents of \$800 to \$999. The rents of the remaining 15.2 percent were \$1,000 or more: 9.5 percent rented for \$1,000 to \$1,499 and 5.7 percent rented for \$1,500 to \$2,000 or more. Compared to this city-wide distribution of rent, a substantially larger proportion of rent-controlled units were low-rent units. Of all rent-controlled units in the City, seven in ten rented for

			Bo	rough		
Regulatory Status	All	Bronx <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Staten Island
			1996			
All	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 539	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 686	<sup>\$</sup> 636
Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 454	<sup>\$</sup> 373	<sup>\$</sup> 435	<sup>\$</sup> 530	<sup>\$</sup> 424	**
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 557	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 795	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 610
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 606	<sup>\$</sup> 540	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 636*
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 610	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 1,166	<sup>\$</sup> 659	<sup>\$</sup> 610
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 562	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 557	<sup>\$</sup> 530	<sup>\$</sup> 539	<sup>\$</sup> 505*
Mitchell-Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 583	<sup>\$</sup> 610	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 541	**
Other <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 448	<sup>\$</sup> 547	<sup>\$</sup> 373	<sup>\$</sup> 435	<sup>\$</sup> 508	<sup>\$</sup> 505*
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 732	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 1,272	<sup>\$</sup> 742	<sup>\$</sup> 663
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 1,246	<sup>\$</sup> 742	<sup>\$</sup> 663
In Coops/Condos	<sup>\$</sup> 848	<sup>\$</sup> 762	<sup>\$</sup> 710	<sup>\$</sup> 1,378	<sup>\$</sup> 795	<sup>\$</sup> 636
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 239	<sup>\$</sup> 221	<sup>\$</sup> 256	<sup>\$</sup> 235	<sup>\$</sup> 235	<sup>\$</sup> 289
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 265	<sup>\$</sup> 303	<sup>\$</sup> 265	<sup>\$</sup> 265	**	**
			1999			
All	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 605	<sup>\$</sup> 727	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 642
Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 477	<sup>\$</sup> 400	<sup>\$</sup> 475	<sup>\$</sup> 500	<sup>\$</sup> 500	**
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 607	<sup>\$</sup> 800	<sup>\$</sup> 690	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 620	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 718	<sup>\$</sup> 675	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 1,052	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 536	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 544	<sup>\$</sup> 530	<sup>\$</sup> 522	**
Mitchell-Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 642	<sup>\$</sup> 543	**
Other <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 350	<sup>\$</sup> 332	<sup>\$</sup> 296	<sup>\$</sup> 421	<sup>\$</sup> 420	**
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 1,995	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 650
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 2,040	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 650
In Coops/Condos	<sup>\$</sup> 860	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 1,470	<sup>\$</sup> 800	<sup>\$</sup> 700
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 250	<sup>\$</sup> 200	<sup>\$</sup> 253	<sup>\$</sup> 268	<sup>\$</sup> 261	<sup>\$</sup> 280
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 280	<sup>\$</sup> 286	<sup>\$</sup> 286	<sup>\$</sup> 270	**	**

# Table 6.15Median Contract Rents (in 1999 Dollars) by Borough and by Regulatory Status<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

b Includes primarily units whose rents are regulated by HUD, and also units with rents regulated by the Loft Board or under the provisions of the Article 4 program (which built limited-profit rental buildings for households with moderate incomes under Article 4 of the state PHFL).

\* Since the number of renter-occupied units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.



Figure 6.4 Median Contract Rents by Regulatory Status by Borough New York City 1999

between \$1 and \$599: 37.6 percent for between \$1 and \$399 and 31.6 percent for \$400 to \$599. On the other hand, of all rent-stabilized units, more than six in ten rented for \$400 to \$799: 30.8 percent for \$400 to \$599 and 31.3 percent for \$600 to \$799. In addition, another three in ten rented for \$800 or more: 13.8 percent for \$800 to \$999 and 15.3 percent for \$1,000 or more (10.2 percent for \$1,000 to \$1,499 and 5.1 percent for \$1,500 or more). Of rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947, close to a fifth rented for \$1,000 or more: 11.7 percent for \$1,000 to \$1,499 and 6.8 percent for \$1,500 or more (Figure 6.5).

Compared to the city-wide distribution of all rental units and to the distribution in other rental categories, a substantially larger proportion of unregulated rental units rented for middle or higher rents (Table 6.16). Eight in ten of all unregulated rental units rented for a contract rent of \$600 or more: 56.9 percent for \$600 to \$999 and 22.5 percent for \$1,000 or more. It is worth noting that one in ten of unregulated rental units in the City rented for \$1,500 or more.

*In rem* and public housing units were the least expensive. Eight in ten of *in rem* units rented for a contract rent between \$1 and \$399, while 57.0 percent rented for between \$1 and \$299 (Table 6.16). At the same time, more than seven in ten of public housing units rented for between \$1 and \$399, while six in ten rented for between \$1 and \$299.

			H	Rent Stabilized					
<b>Contract Rent</b>	All	Rent Controlled	All	Pre-1947	Post-1947	- Other Regulated	Unregulated	Fublic Housing	In Rem
All Renter Occupied <sup>a</sup>	1,953,289	52,562	1,020,588	749,010	271,578	122,685	572,862	169,339	15,253
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<sup>s</sup> 1 - <sup>s</sup> 299	10.5%	24.1%	4.2%	4.8%	2.6%	24.4%	1.4%	59.5%	57.0%
<sup>8</sup> 300 - <sup>8</sup> 399	5.3%	13.5%	4.5%	5.5%	1.8%	7.1%	2.7%	13.8%	23.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 499	10.4%	13.3%	11.7%	13.1%	7.8%	12.3%	5.8%	15.8%	12.4%*
865 <sub>s</sub> - 005 <sub>s</sub>	15.0%	18.3%	19.1%	20.7%	14.5%	13.7%	10.8%	5.3%	* *
669 <sub>s</sub> - 009 <sub>s</sub>	16.3%	11.8%	18.5%	18.0%	19.9%	11.2%	17.8%	4.3%	* *
800 <sup>s</sup> - 007 <sup>s</sup>	12.6%	4.4%	12.8%	11.5%	16.5%	10.8%	17.0%	0.9%*	* *
668s <sup>-</sup> 008s	8.9%	4.8%	8.4%	7.3%	11.2%	6.4%	13.5%	* *	*
666s <sup>-</sup> 006 <sub>s</sub>	5.7%	3.6%*	5.4%	4.8%	7.1%	4.5%	8.6%	* *	* *
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000- <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	6.9%	4.4%	7.1%	6.6%	8.5%	5.5%	9.4%	* *	* *
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,499	2.6%	* *	3.1%	3.1%	3.2%	2.9%	2.7%	* *	* *
<sup>\$</sup> 1,500 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,999	3.0%	* *	4.0%	3.7%	5.0%	* *	3.0%	* *	* *
	7 70%	*	1.1%	0.8%	1.8%	* *	7.4%	*	*

\* \* D Includes households paying no cash rent (24,448) which are not included in percent distribution. Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. Too few households to report.

Table 6.16

The pattern of rent distribution by rent-regulation category in 1999 repeats that in 1996, except that, in 1999, the number of units renting for between \$1 and \$799 declined, while the number of units renting for \$800 and above increased (Table 6.16).<sup>8</sup>



Figure 6.5 Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent within Rent Regulatory Status New York City 1999

#### Differences in Rent by Unit Size

As in most housing markets, it is expected that, in the City, rent will increase as the size of units increases. However, this relationship was not consistently steady and positive for all sizes of units in the City, since the rent pattern varied from borough to borough. In 1999, there was no appreciable difference in the median contract rent for studios (\$605) and one-bedroom units (\$600) (Table 6.17). This is because six in ten of the studio rentals in the City were located in Manhattan, where rents are the highest of all the boroughs.<sup>9</sup> However, the rent for two-bedroom units in the City was \$668, 11.3 percent higher than that for one-bedroom units, while the rent of three-or-more-bedroom units was \$725, 8.5 percent higher than that for two-bedroom units.

- <sup>8</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.
- <sup>9</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

			-		
		N	umber of Bedroor	ns	
Borough	All	0	1	2	3 or More
All Renter Occupied Units	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 605	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 668	<sup>\$</sup> 725
Bronx	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 475	<sup>\$</sup> 530	<sup>\$</sup> 585	<sup>\$</sup> 676
Brooklyn	<sup>\$</sup> 605	<sup>\$</sup> 507	<sup>\$</sup> 588	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 700
Manhattan	<sup>\$</sup> 727	<sup>\$</sup> 825	<sup>\$</sup> 780	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 600
Queens	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 560	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 731	<sup>\$</sup> 900
Staten Island	<sup>\$</sup> 642	<sup>\$</sup> 500*	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 810

#### Table 6.17 Median Contract Rents by Number of Bedrooms and by Borough New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

However, a positive and linear relationship between the size of units and their rent existed within all the boroughs, except Manhattan. In Manhattan, the relationship was linear but negative (Figure 6.6). The median contract rent for studios was \$825, the highest of any size of units. The median rents for one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-or-more-bedroom units were \$780, \$700, and \$600 respectively. Major reasons for this reverse pattern are as follows. In Manhattan, negligibly few rental studios were in the heavily rent-subsidized very-low rent categories of public housing, in rem, "other" rent-regulated, and rent-controlled (Table 6.18), while relatively larger proportions were in the categories of rent-stabilized units or unregulated rental units in rental buildings or in cooperative or condominium buildings, the rents of which were very high. Specifically, the median contract rent for unregulated rental units in the borough was \$1,995, 2.7 times the borough-wide median rent, and more than seven times the rent for public housing (\$268) or in rem (\$270) units in the borough. Also, compared to their proportion of all rental units, a larger proportion of rental studios were in rent-stabilized buildings built after 1947, the median rent for which was \$1,052, or 1.4 times the Manhattan median rent and 3.9 times the rent for public housing or in rem units. On the other hand, a large proportion of two-bedroom and three-ormore-bedroom units were very-low-rent public housing, in rem, "other" regulated, or rent-controlled units. For example, three-quarters of public housing units were either two-bedroom units (46.7 percent) or three-bedroom units (28.5 percent), while fewer than one in ten rent-stabilized units and unregulated rental units had three or more bedrooms. Particularly, a negligible number of rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947 were three-bedroom units.

A consistently positive relationship between unit size and level of rent is exhibited within each rent-regulation category, except for very old units, such as rent-controlled units and rent-stabilized units in buildings built in 1947 or before. The median contract rent for pre-1947 rent-stabilized studio units was \$634, higher than that for one-bedroom units in the same rental category, which was \$600, while the



Figure 6.6 Monthly Contract Rent by Number of Bedrooms New York City and Manhattan 1999

median contract rent for two-bedroom and three-or-more-bedroom units in this rental category was the same, \$650 (Table 6.19). At the same time, for rent-controlled units, the rent for studios was \$565, or \$115 higher than the rent for one-bedroom units. The median rents for two-bedroom units and three-or-more-bedroom units in this category were \$500 and \$550 respectively, lower than the rent for studios. This is because more than seven in ten of rent-controlled and pre-1947 rent-stabilized studios were located in Manhattan.<sup>10</sup>

#### Rent and Housing and Neighborhood Conditions

Two of the most important determinants of rent are, first, the condition of rental units and, second, the condition of the neighborhood where the units are located. Thus, it is expected that the rents for units with better housing, building, and neighborhood conditions than others will be higher than the rents for units with poorer conditions. The 1999 HVS reveals that such a clearly positive relationship between rents and housing and/or neighborhood conditions exists in the City. Specifically, the median contract rent of units in buildings that were not dilapidated was \$650, or \$150 higher than that of units in dilapidated buildings (Table 6.20). The rent of units in buildings without any building defects was \$650, but the level of rent decreased steadily as the number of defects increased: \$592 for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

	All Rente	r Occunied				Number o	f Bedrooms			
	Units in I	Manhattan		0			2		3 or 1	More
		Median		Median		Median		Median		Median
Rent		Contract		Contract		Contract		Contract		Contract
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	Number	Rent	Number	Rent	Number	Rent	Number	Rent	Number	Rent
All	561,534	<sup>\$</sup> 727	97,631	<sup>\$</sup> 825	244,948	$084_{S}$	158,503	$007^{\circ}$	60,452	$009_{\$}$
Controlled	24,184	$^{s}500$	* *	*119 <sub>s</sub>	14,183	$^{\$}400$	6,394	<sup>\$</sup> 565	2,029*	$^{\$}360$
Stabilized	354,595	$008_{\$}$	79,208	<sup>\$</sup> 825	159,450	<sup>\$</sup> 820	87,938	684 <sub>\$</sub>	27,999	$899_{\$}$
Pre-1947	291,725	<sup>\$</sup> 718	64,892	664s	127,295	<sup>\$</sup> 727	73,423	<sup>\$</sup> 725	26,115	<sup>\$</sup> 657
Post-1947	62,871	<sup>\$</sup> 1,052	14,317	$^{\$950}$	$32,\!154$	<sup>\$</sup> 1,058	14,515	<sup>\$</sup> 1,164	* *	<sup>\$</sup> 1,718*
Other Regulated	42,601	<sup>\$</sup> 530	4,518	$^{s}500$	19,444	$^{s}500$	13,487	<sup>\$</sup> 615	5,152	<sup>\$</sup> 491
Mitchell-Lama	22,365	<sup>\$</sup> 642	3,355	<sup>\$</sup> 487	10,470	800	6,354	<sup>\$</sup> 735	2,186*	<sup>\$</sup> 700
Non-Mitchell Lama <sup>a</sup>	20,235	<sup>\$</sup> 421	* *	$*005^{\circ}$	8,973	<sup>\$</sup> 450	7,133	$00\varepsilon^{s}$	2,965*	<sup>\$</sup> 424
Unregulated	78,552	<sup>\$</sup> 1,995	10,814	$^{\$}1,100$	37,267	<sup>\$</sup> 1,895	22,719	<sup>\$</sup> 2,400	7,752	<sup>\$</sup> 2,600
In Rental Buildings	54,390	<sup>\$</sup> 2,040	5,359	<sup>\$</sup> 1,090	24,589	<sup>\$</sup> 2,000	17,704	<sup>\$</sup> 2,400	6,738	<sup>\$</sup> 2,700
Sublet Coops	24,162	<sup>\$</sup> 1,470	5,454	<sup>\$</sup> 1,250	12,677	<sup>\$</sup> 1,650	5,015	<sup>\$</sup> 1,450	* *	$^{\$}1,100*$
Public Housing	$53,\!199$	<sup>\$</sup> 268	* *	$^{\$}350*$	12,111	<sup>\$</sup> 221	24,820	<sup>\$</sup> 264	15,151	<sup>\$</sup> 307
In Rem	8,403	<sup>\$</sup> 270	* *	* *	2,495*	<sup>\$</sup> 215	3,145	<sup>\$</sup> 250	2,369*	<sup>\$</sup> 312
Year Built										
1980 or Later	26,671	<sup>\$</sup> 1,900	4,088	<sup>\$</sup> 1,250	13,896	<sup>\$</sup> 1,800	7,496	<sup>\$</sup> 2,500	* *	<sup>\$</sup> 2,700*
1970 - 1979	$20,\!486$	$^{\$810}$	2,424*	<sup>\$</sup> 642	9,937	<sup>\$</sup> 760	5,858	<sup>\$</sup> 894	2,267*	<sup>\$</sup> 1,200
1947 - 1969	124,030	<sup>\$</sup> 642	16,328	<sup>\$</sup> 925	47,062	$^{\$}810$	41,784	$^{\$}500$	18,856	<sup>\$</sup> 382
Before 1947	390,347	<sup>\$</sup> 720	74,789	$008_{\$}$	174,053	<sup>\$</sup> 705	103,366	<sup>\$</sup> 725	38,138	<sup>\$</sup> 665
	100			¥7						
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Notes:	he Census, 1999	) New York Cit	y Housing and	Vacancy Sur	vey.					
a Includes primari	ly units whose r	ents are regulate	d by HUD, an	d also units wi	th rents regulat	ed by the Loft I	3oard or under	the provisions of	of the Article 4	
program (which	built limited-pro	ofit rental buildir	ngs for househ	olds with mode	erate incomes u	inder Article 4 (	of the state PHI	ĨĻ		

 Table 6.18

 Median Contract Rents and Number of Units in Manhattan

 by Rent Regulatory Status and Year Built, by Number of Bedrooms

 New York City 1999

\* \*

Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. Too few households to report.
		N	umber of Bedroo	oms	
Rent Regulatory Status	All	0	1	2	3 or More
All	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 605	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 668	<sup>\$</sup> 725
Controlled	<sup>\$</sup> 477	<sup>\$</sup> 565	<sup>\$</sup> 450	<sup>\$</sup> 500	<sup>\$</sup> 550
Stabilized	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 625	<sup>\$</sup> 625	<sup>\$</sup> 681	<sup>\$</sup> 695
Pre-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 620	<sup>\$</sup> 634	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Post-1947	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 617	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 860
Other Regulated	<sup>\$</sup> 536	<sup>\$</sup> 435	<sup>\$</sup> 475	<sup>\$</sup> 600	\$772
Mitchell-Lama	<sup>\$</sup> 600	<sup>\$</sup> 470	<sup>\$</sup> 522	<sup>\$</sup> 668	<sup>\$</sup> 853
Non Mitchell-Lama <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 350	<sup>\$</sup> 220	<sup>\$</sup> 239	<sup>\$</sup> 400	\$719
Unregulated	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 662	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 870
In Rental Buildings	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 550	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 852
Sublet Coop	<sup>\$</sup> 860	<sup>\$</sup> 900	<sup>\$</sup> 825	<sup>\$</sup> 950	<sup>\$</sup> 988
Public Housing	<sup>\$</sup> 250	<sup>\$</sup> 218	<sup>\$</sup> 200	<sup>\$</sup> 254	<sup>\$</sup> 298
In Rem	<sup>\$</sup> 280	*	<sup>\$</sup> 247	<sup>\$</sup> 286	\$312

## Table 6.19 Median Contract Rents by Regulatory Status and by Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Includes primarily units whose rents are regulated by HUD, and also units with rents regulated by the Loft Board or under the provisions of the Article 4 program (which built limited-profit rental buildings for households with moderate incomes under Article 4 of the state PHFL).

\* Too few units to report.

units in buildings with one building defect type, \$567 for units in buildings with two building defect types, and \$470 for units in buildings with three or more building defect types.

A positive relationship between housing maintenance condition and rent was also vividly displayed, according to the 1999 HVS. The rent of units without maintenance deficiencies was \$675; it fell to \$627, \$595, and \$525 respectively for units with 1-2, 3-4, and 5 or more maintenance deficiencies (Table 6.20).

A solidly positive relationship also existed between neighborhood conditions and rent. The rent for units located on a street where there were no boarded-up buildings was \$650, while it was \$550 for units located on a street were boarded-up buildings were present (Table 6.20). The rent level was highest, \$800, for units in neighborhoods rated "excellent" by survey respondents; the level declines as the neighborhood rating declines: \$650 for units in neighborhoods rated "good"; \$579 for units in neighborhoods rated "fair"; and \$508 for units in neighborhoods rated "poor."

Housing and Neighborhood Conditions	Median Contract Rent
Dilapidation Status	
Dilapidated	<sup>\$</sup> 500
Not Dilapidated	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Number of Building Defect Types	
None	<sup>\$</sup> 650
1	<sup>\$</sup> 592
2	<sup>\$</sup> 567
3 or More	<sup>\$</sup> 470
Number of Maintenance Deficiencies	
None	<sup>\$</sup> 675
1-2	<sup>\$</sup> 627
3-4	<sup>\$</sup> 595
5 or More	<sup>\$</sup> 525
Presence of Boarded-Up Building on Same Street	
Yes	<sup>\$</sup> 550
No	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Neighborhood Satisfaction Rating	
Excellent	<sup>\$</sup> 800
Good	<sup>\$</sup> 650
Fair	<sup>\$</sup> 579
Poor	<sup>\$</sup> 508

## Table 6.20 Median Contract Rent by Housing and Neighborhood Conditions New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Rents for Unregulated Rental Units

Of the 1,953,000 occupied rental units in the City in 1999, 573,000, or 29.3 percent, were unregulated rental units. Of all occupied unregulated rental units, 507,000, or 88.6 percent, were in rental buildings, while 65,000 were in cooperative or condominium buildings. In 1999, the median contract rent for unregulated rental units, particularly those in cooperative or condominium buildings, was the highest of any rental category in the City. Furthermore, the rents for unregulated rental units as a whole and for two separate sub-categories of this rental category--units in rental buildings and units in cooperative or condominium buildings in Manhattan--were the highest of rents in all the boroughs (see Table 6.15). The rent for all unregulated rental units in the borough was \$1,995, or 2.7 times the rent for such units in the City as a whole. The rents for such units in other boroughs ranged from \$650 in Staten Island to \$700 in the Bronx and Brooklyn and \$750 in Queens (Table 6.21). The rent for such units in the City as a 2,040, again 2.7 times the rent for all such units in the City as repeated in each of the boroughs. The rent for such units in the City was repeated in each of the boroughs. The rent for such units in cooperative or condominium suildings in Manhattan was \$2,040, again 2.7 times the rent for all such units in the City was repeated in each of the boroughs. The rent for such units in cooperative or condominium suildings in Manhattan was \$2,040, again 2.7 times the rent for all such units in the City was repeated in each of the boroughs. The rent for such units in cooperative or condominium buildings in Manhattan was \$2,040, again 2.7 times the rent for all such units in the City was repeated in each of the boroughs. The rent for such units in cooperative or condominium buildings in Manhattan

Borough	Total	In Rental Buildings	In Coops and Condos
	1996		
Total <sup>a</sup>	545,198	478,828	66,370
All	<sup>\$</sup> 732	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 848
Bronx <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 689	<sup>\$</sup> 762
Brooklyn	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 710
Manhattan <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 1,272	<sup>\$</sup> 1,246	<sup>\$</sup> 1,378
Queens	<sup>\$</sup> 742	<sup>\$</sup> 742	<sup>\$</sup> 795
Staten Island	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 663	<sup>\$</sup> 636
	1999		
Total <sup>a</sup>	572,862	507,371	65,492
All	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 860
Bronx <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 750
Brooklyn	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 750
Manhattan <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 1,995	<sup>\$</sup> 2,040	<sup>\$</sup> 1,470
Queens	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 750	<sup>\$</sup> 800
Staten Island	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 700

## Table 6.21 Median Contract Rent (in 1999 Dollars) of Unregulated Units by Borough and by Type of Building New York City 1996 and 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

a Includes households paying no cash rent, which are not included in median rent tabulations.

b Marble Hill in the Bronx.

was \$1,470, or 1.7 times the rent for all such units in the City and the highest for such units in any of the other boroughs, which ranged from \$700 in Staten Island to \$750 in the Bronx and Brooklyn and \$800 in Queens.

As discussed earlier, more unregulated rental units in the City were in the middle and upper rent ranges in 1999. The rent for eight in ten unregulated rental units was \$600 or more: 56.9 percent rented for \$600-\$999 and 22.5 percent rented for \$1,000 or more (Table 6.22). The rent distribution of unregulated rental units in rental buildings was very similar to that of all unregulated rental units. However, of such units in cooperative or condominium buildings, more units had high rents. The rents of close to four in ten of such units were \$1,000 or more: 17.9 percent rented for \$1,000-\$1,499 and 20.5 percent rented for \$1,500 or more.

Note:

From 1996 to 1999, the proportion of unregulated rental units renting for rents between \$1 and \$799 declined, while the proportion of such units renting for high rents (\$800 and over) increased. Particularly, the proportion of unregulated rental units renting at the highest rent level (\$2,000 and over) soared by 5.0 percentage points for all unregulated rental units, by 3.9 percentage points for such units in cooperative and condominium buildings, and by 5.1 percentage points for such units in rental buildings (Table 6.22).

Of all 41,000 unregulated rental units renting for \$2,000 or more in 1999, 80.8 percent were in rental buildings, while only 19.2 percent were in cooperative or condominium buildings. The number of unregulated units in rental buildings renting for \$2,000 or more soared by 26,000 units--or 3.6 times-from 7,200 in 1996 to 33,300 in 1999. This increase of 26,000 units does not appear to have resulted merely from increases in the rents of units at the next lower rent level, since the entire number of unregulated units renting for \$1,500-\$1,999 in 1996 was only 7,800. Much of the increase appears to consist of units that were rent-stabilized at the highest levels of rent in 1996 and, between 1996 and 1999, became unregulated rental units as their rents rose above the \$2,000 level. In fact, the 1999 HVS reports that, of the 29,000 unregulated rental units in rental buildings with six or more units renting for \$2,000 units, or 75.0 percent, were rent-stabilized units in 1996.<sup>11</sup>

	Т	'otal	In Coops a	and Condos	In Rental	Buildings
<b>Contract Rent Interval</b>	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 299	2.3%	1.4%	**	**	2.6%	1.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 300 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	3.6%	2.7%	**	2.1%*	3.9%	2.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 499	8.0%	5.8%	5.9%	3.0%*	8.3%	6.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 500 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	13.4%	10.8%	8.0%	7.0%	14.1%	11.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	19.9%	17.8%	12.3%	12.2%	21.0%	18.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 799	18.0%	17.0%	15.1%	13.7%	18.4%	17.4%
<sup>\$</sup> 800 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	8.6%	13.5%	11.3%	13.6%	8.2%	13.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 999	10.1%	8.6%	10.0%	9.5%	10.1%	8.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,000 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	8.4%	9.4%	12.6%	10.3%	7.9%	9.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,499	2.9%	2.7%	7.6%	7.6%	2.2%	2.1%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,500 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,999	2.4%	3.0%	7.3%	8.3%	1.7%	2.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 2,000 and Over	2.4%	7.4%	8.3%	12.2%	1.6%	6.7%

Table 6.22 Distribution of Unregulated Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Interval (in 1999 Dollars) by Type of Building New York City 1996 and 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

\* Since the number of renter occupied households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

#### Rents of Units in Cooperative and Condominium Buildings

The number of rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings in New York City changes as the demand for and supply of rental or owner units in the City change, since the tenure of unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings can change as owners of buildings and/or units want. The number of all occupied rental units in cooperative or condominium buildings was 141,000 in 1999. This was 10,000, or 6.7 percent, less than the number three years earlier (Table 6.23). This is most probably the result of the conversion of rental units into owner units in the three years during which the owner housing market in the City expanded, as discussed in Chapter 4, "New York City's Housing Market." Most of the reduction in the number of rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings came from the rent-regulated category. During the three-year period, the number of rent-regulated units in such buildings dropped by 9,000, or by 11.0 percent, to 75,000 in 1999. This drop represents nine in ten of the rental units in such buildings lost over the three years. As a result, the share of rent-regulated units in such buildings declined from 56.1 percent in 1996 to 53.5 percent in 1999.

Table 6.23
Number of Renter Occupied Units
in Cooperative and Condominium Buildings by Regulatory Status of Unit
New York City 1996 and 1999

	1	1996	1	999	Percent Change
Regulatory Status	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1996-1999
All Renter Occupied Units in Coops and Condo <sup>a</sup>	151,131	100.0%	140,933	100.0%	-6.7%
Rent Regulated	84,762	56.1%	75,442	53.5%	-11.0%
Unregulated	66,370	43.9%	65,492	46.5%	-1.3%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives.

In 1999 as in 1996, the rent of unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings was substantially higher than that of rent-regulated units in such buildings. In 1999, the median contract rent of unregulated rental units in such buildings was \$860, which was \$160 or 22.9 percent higher than the rent of rent-regulated units in such buildings (Table 6.24). The difference was exceptionally large in Manhattan. The rent of unregulated rental units in such buildings in the borough was \$1,470--that is, \$475, or 47.7 percent, higher than the rent for rent-regulated units in such buildings.

For rent-regulated or unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings, the relationship between the size of the unit and the level of rent was not consistently positive for all sizes

of units. The median contract rents for rent-regulated units in such buildings were \$668 for studios, \$686 for one-bedroom units, and \$795 for two-bedroom units (Table 6.25). However, the rent for three-bedroom units, \$790, was not appreciably different from the rent for two-bedroom units. At the same time, the median rents for unregulated rental units in such buildings showed no consistent relationship: \$900 for studios, \$825 for one-bedroom units, \$950 for two-bedroom units, and \$988 for three-or-more-bedroom units.

## Table 6.24 Median Contract Rent (in 1999 Dollars) of Renter Occupied Units in Cooperative or Condominium Buildings by Borough and by Regulatory Status New York City 1996 and 1999

_		Regula	tory Status		_	
Borough	Rent R	egulated	Unreg	ulated	Percent l	Difference
	1996	1999	1996	1999	1996	1999
All Renter Occupied Units in Coops and Condos <sup>a</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 684	<sup>\$</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 848	<sup>\$</sup> 860	24.0%	22.9%
Bronx <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 620	<sup>\$</sup> 634	<sup>\$</sup> 762	<sup>\$</sup> 750	22.9%	18.3%
Brooklyn	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 635	<sup>\$</sup> 710	<sup>\$</sup> 750	11.6%	18.1%
Manhattan <sup>b</sup>	<sup>\$</sup> 997	<sup>\$</sup> 995	<sup>\$</sup> 1,378	<sup>\$</sup> 1,470	38.2%	47.7%
Queens	<sup>\$</sup> 604	<sup>\$</sup> 683	<sup>\$</sup> 795	<sup>\$</sup> 800	31.6%	17.1%
Staten Island	*	*	<sup>\$</sup> 636	<sup>\$</sup> 700		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives.

b Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Too few units to report.

#### Table 6.25

## Median Contract Rents of Renter Occupied Units in Cooperative or Condominium Buildings<sup>a</sup> by Number of Bedrooms New York City 1999

	Regulator	ry Status	
Number of Bedrooms	Rent Regulated	Unregulated	Percent Difference
0	<sup>\$</sup> 668	<sup>\$</sup> 900	34.7%
1	<sup>\$</sup> 686	<sup>\$</sup> 825	20.3%
2	<sup>\$</sup> 795	<sup>\$</sup> 950	19.5%
3 or More	<sup>\$</sup> 790	<sup>\$</sup> 988	25.1%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

a Excluding Mitchell-Lama cooperatives.

## Affordability (Rent-Income Ratio) of Rental Housing

The rent-income ratio, a composite measure of rent viewed in relation to household income, is one of the most serious issues tenants, owners, and policy-makers face in considering how the rental housing market performs in providing affordable housing to renter households in the area. However, the rent-income ratio, as an affordability indicator, has the following two major limitations, among other things: first, it does not take into account the needs of different households for specific kinds of housing units in certain locations; and, second, it does not reflect certain needs of different households for basic non-housing goods and services that these households should have in order to maintain a decent life.<sup>12</sup> Despite these limitations, the rent-income ratio is the most commonly used measure of the proportion of household income tenants should spend for rent, since so far there appears to be no better alternative indicator that is easy to use and understand.

INEW TOFK City, S	selected fears 1960-1999
Year	Gross Rent/Income Ratio <sup>a</sup>
1999	29.4%
1996	30.0%
1993	30.0%
1991	28.5%
1987	29%
1984	29%
1981	27%
1978	28%
1975	25%
1970	20%
1968	21%
1965	20%
1960	19%

Table 6.26 Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio New York City, Selected Years 1960-1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 and 1970 Decennial Censuses, and 1965, 1968, 1975, 1978, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

For 1996 and 1999 the ratio was calculated using imputed rent and income. For prior years the ratio was based on reported rent and income only.

<sup>12</sup> For further discussion on the limitations of the rent-income ratio, see Paul L. Niebanck, Rent Control and the Rental Housing Market, New York City, 1968, page 148.

The median gross rent-income ratio, or the proportion of income that households spend for the gross rent of the units they occupy, was 29.4 percent in 1999.<sup>13</sup> (In this report, the rent-income ratio is estimated using gross rent, which is the contract rent plus any charges for fuel or utilities paid separately from the rent by the tenants.) This was a slight decline, but the first since 1993, when the ratio was 30.0 percent; it remained unchanged three years later in 1996 (Table 6.26).

The overall median gross rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized households was 58.8 percent (Table 6.27). That is, the overall gross rent of the apartment of a household receiving Section 8, SCRIE, or some other type of federal, state, or city subsidy was altogether--as a combination of both the household's out-of-pocket rent and the rent subsidy--58.8 percent of the household's income. On the other hand, the out-of-pocket rent-income ratio--that is, the portion of the household's income that was actually spent out of pocket for the rent of the subsidized unit--was only 27.8 percent of the household's monthly income.

	New York City 19	99	
Household Subsidy Category	Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Number of Households	Percent
All Renter Households <sup>b</sup>	29.4	1,797,768	100.0%
Subsidized Households	58.8	162,200	11.0%
Out-of-Pocket Rent/ Income Ratio	27.8		
Unsubsidized Households	27.8	1,318,151	89.0%

Table 6.27 Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio, Distribution of All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Data includes imputed rent and income where not reported by respondent, but excludes households with no cash rent or zero or negative income.

317.418

31.0

b Excludes households with no cash rent or zero or negative income and those for whom the cost for utilities and fuel was not reported and not imputed.

This means that, if rent-subsidized households had had to pay the total rent asked by the landlord out of their own pockets for the units these households occupied, without any rent subsidy, the amount of their rent would have been 58.8 percent of their income, although the rent they actually paid was only 27.8 percent of their income. The difference between the rents landlords received, as a proportion of these households' incomes, and the portion of the rent the households actually paid out of pocket, as a

<sup>13</sup> Rent data are for the survey year, while income data are for the year before the survey year.

Not-Reporting Subsidy

proportion of their household income, was extremely large: 31.0 percentage points (58.8 percent-27.8 percent). Even applying the standard of thirty percent of household income for rent, which is the rentincome ratio HUD uses for determining affordability in the Consolidated Plan and the Section 8 program, the affordability gap here was 28.8 percentage points (58.8 percent-30.0 percent). Thus, many of these subsidized households could not have afforded the apartments they occupied without the subsidy they received.

The gross rent for rent-subsidized households is the overall housing cost they pay for their units (including any additional charges for fuel and utilities paid by the household)--that is, it is the rent the landlord receives from the renter and/or the government. On the other hand, out-of-pocket rent is the portion of gross rent the renter actually pays, in addition to the rent subsidy paid by the government to the renter or directly to the landlord. Therefore, a discussion of the difference between the gross rent-income ratio and the out-of-pocket rent-income ratio will aid an adequate understanding of the rent burden subsidized households face. The standard affordability measure of thirty percent for the gross rent-income ratio will be used in estimating comparably the affordability gap these subsidized households might have experienced if they had not received a subsidy. The affordability gap defined here is the difference between the gross rent-income ratio of rent subsidized households and the standard thirty percent rent-income ratio affordability measurement.

Analysis of the components of the median contract rent for subsidized households--that is, the sum of out-of-pocket rent and rent subsidy--sheds additional light on the serious affordability gap these households face.<sup>14</sup> The median contract rent for households that received HUD Section 8 subsidies was \$640, the highest of the four household types in terms of rent subsidies they received. Of this amount, the household paid only 29.0 percent, or \$164, out of pocket (see Table 6.3). The difference between the rent the landlord received and the portion of that rent these households actually paid was \$476 (\$640-\$164) on average, which was the amount of Section 8 subsidy, whether it was a Section 8 certificate or voucher. This was 2.9 times these households' out-of-pocket rent. For households that received a federal subsidy other than Section 8, the rent was the lowest, \$320. Of this, 57.8 percent, or \$185, was paid by the households out of pocket; consequently, the subsidy they received was \$135 (\$320-\$185), 73.0 percent of their out-of-pocket rent. The rent for households that received the City's SCRIE was the second lowest, \$430, and these households paid the highest proportion of their rent, 82.6 percent or a median of \$355, out of pocket. Thus, these households received a rent increase exemption of \$75 (\$430-\$355), which was only 21.1 percent of their out-of-pocket rent. The rent for households that received another New York State or City rent subsidy other than SCRIE was \$535. The proportion of the rent that was paid out of pocket by these households was 32.0 percent, or \$171. Thus, the rent subsidy these households received was \$362, or 2.1 times their out-of-pocket rent.

The median gross rent-income ratio for households that did not receive any of the four subsidies covered in the 1999 HVS and that had to pay the total amount of their rent out of their own pockets was 27.8 percent, exactly the same as the out-of-pocket rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized households (Table 6.27). However, these rent-income ratios are quite different in meaning one from the other. Rent-unsubsidized households were able to afford the apartments they occupied by spending less than the affordability standard of 30 percent of their own incomes for rent, without any rent subsidies, while it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>Contract rent, rather than gross rent, is used in this paragraph, since the paragraph covers rent data, not rent-income ratio data.

is most unlikely that rent-subsidized households could have afforded the apartments they occupied without the subsidies they received, since, although the rent they paid from their own pockets was only 27.8 percent of their income, their total housing costs--that is, the contract rent the landlord received as a combination of these households' out-of-pocket rent and rent subsidy--were 58.8 percent of their income.

#### Affordability for Different Rent-Regulation Categories

Affordability, the proportion of income households living in rental housing units pay for their units, varies among the different rent-regulation categories. The median gross rent-income ratio for households in rent-controlled units, most of which were elderly households with low incomes, was high: 33.8 percent, the highest of any rent-regulatory category and 4.4 percentage points higher than the ratio of 29.4 percent for all renter households in 1999 (Table 6.28). The rent-income ratio for households in

## Table 6.28 Median Gross Rent/Income Ratios of All Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households and Out-of-Pocket Rent/Income Ratios of Subsidized Households by Regulatory Status New York City 1999

		All Renter Households	Subsidized	Households	Unsubsidized Households
Regulatory Status		Gross Rent/Income Ratio	Gross Rent/Income Ratio	Out-of-Pocket Rent/Income Ratio	Gross Rent/Income Ratio
All	Rent/Income	29.4	58.8	27.8	27.8
	% of Units	100.0%	11.0%		89.0%
Controlled	<b>Rent/Income</b>	33.8	49.3	47.3	28.9
	% of Units	100.0%	7.9%		92.1%
Stabilized	<b>Rent/Income</b>	30.1	76.5	27.8	28.0
	% of Units	100.0%	10.8%		89.2%
Pre-1947	<b>Rent/Income</b>	30.6	77.1	27.5	28.4
	% of Units	100.0%	11.7%		88.3%
Post-1947	<b>Rent/Income</b>	28.7	62.4	30.3	27.0
	% of Units	100.0%	8.1%		91.9%
Unregulated	<b>Rent/Income</b>	28.4	86.6	26.2	27.0
	% of Units	100.0%	4.9%		95.1%
In Rental	<b>Rent/Income</b>	29.0	89.9	25.9	27.7
Buildings	% of Units	100.0%	5.3%		94.7%
In Coops and	<b>Rent/Income</b>	24.6	**	**	23.8
Condos	% of Units	100.0%	1.8%*		98.2%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

rent-stabilized units was 30.1 percent, slightly higher than the city-wide ratio. However, the ratio for households in post-1947 rent-stabilized units was 28.7 percent, considerably lower than the city-wide ratio, while the ratio for households in pre-1947 rent-stabilized units was 30.6 percent. The ratio for unregulated rental units as a whole was 28.4 percent, again considerably lower than the city-wide ratio, while the ratio for unregulated rental units in cooperative and condominium buildings was only 24.6 percent, the lowest of any rent regulation category.

The gross rent-income ratio for rent subsidized renter households as a whole was 58.8 percent in 1999, while it was 27.8 percent for unsubsidized households, as discussed earlier (Table 6.28). Thus, using overall rent--which is a combination of out-of-pocket rent plus any subsidies a household receives--without subsidies, subsidized households would have had to pay more than twice the proportion of their income for rent that the average renter household or unsubsidized household paid. The rent burden for subsidized households was particularly unbearable for rent-subsidized households in unregulated rental units. The difference between the rent-income ratio and the out-of-pocket rentincome ratio for rent-subsidized households in unregulated rental units as a whole was extremely high. The total rent, as the sum of out-of-pocket rent plus rent subsidy, for rent-subsidized households in unregulated rental units was 86.6 percent of their income in 1999, while the proportion of the total rent paid out of their own pockets was only 26.2 percent (Table 6.28). The resulting difference between their overall rent-income ratio and their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was 60.4 percentage points (86.6 percent-26.2 percent), and the affordability gap between their overall rent-income ratio and the standard rent-income ratio of 30.0 percent was 56.6 percentage points. As a result, without the subsidies they received, most of these households could not have afforded to rent the units they occupied. This situation of such a high overall rent-income ratio, a lower out-of-pocket rent-income ratio, and a high affordability gap was repeated for subsidized households in unregulated rental units in rental buildings. A high affordability gap situation also occurred for subsidized households in pre-1947 rent stabilized units. The rent-income ratio and the out-of-pocket rent-income ratio for subsidized households in pre-1947 rent stabilized units were 77.1 percent and 27.5 percent respectively, with an affordability gap of 47.1 percentage points (77.1 percent-30.0 percent). Judging from these findings, it can be inferred that the affordability gap was so large that they were in housing poverty and, without rent subsidies, could not have afforded their apartments--even if they had made sacrifices on other necessities--and could, thus, even have been at great risk of homelessness.

On the other hand, with a rent-income ratio of 27.8 percent, the rent burden unsubsidized households bore was generally low enough for them to be able to afford the units they occupied without any subsidies, except for single elderly households and single households with minor children, which will be discussed later. Still, 45.1 percent of unsubsidized households paid 30.0 percent or more of their income for housing costs, and 22.8 percent had a rent burden of 50.0 percent or more.

## Affordability by Different Racial and Ethnic Groups

The rent burden each racial and ethnic group experienced in 1999 was considerably different from group to group. In 1999, the gross rent-income ratio for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was 33.2 percent, 3.8 percentage points higher than the rent-income ratio of 29.4 percent for all renter households and 1.1 percentage points higher than it was for the group in 1996 (Table 6.29). On the other

All Renter Households Subsidized Households		Unsubsidized	l Households
Median         Median         Median Ou           Gross         Median Gross         Gross         Median Gross           Race/Ethnicity         Rent         Rent/Income Ratio         Rent         Rent/Income	dian Out-of- Pocket /Income Ratio	Median Gross Rent	Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio
1996			
All <sup>8</sup> 679 30.0 <sup>8</sup> 586 63.7 27.2	27.2	8679	28.6
White <sup>\$756</sup> 27.9 <sup>\$</sup> 530 60.3 28.5	28.5	<sup>\$759</sup>	26.5
Black <sup>\$</sup> 615 30.6 <sup>\$</sup> 647 62.5 26.5	26.5	$909_{s}$	29.0
Puerto Rican         \$578         34.6         \$594         73.0         25.8	25.8	<sup>\$</sup> 567	32.3
Non-Puerto <sup>8</sup> 664         32.1 <sup>8</sup> 620         73.5         26.8           Rican Hispanic         26.8	26.8	<sup>\$</sup> 665	31.1
Asian <sup>\$</sup> 769 28.4 <sup>\$</sup> 347* 44.9* 17.7*	17.7*	<sup>\$</sup> 774	28.4
1999			
All <sup>\$</sup> 700 29.4 <sup>\$</sup> 624 58.8 27.8	27.8	$004_{s}$	27.8
White <sup>\$</sup> 797 27.5 <sup>\$</sup> 580 64.6 29.8	29.8	508 <sup>s</sup>	25.8
Black <sup>\$</sup> 627 29.2 <sup>\$</sup> 675 49.2 26.2	26.2	<sup>\$</sup> 625	27.7
Puerto Rican         \$575         30.6         \$591         58.8         26.9	26.9	<sup>\$</sup> 570	28.4
Non-Puerto         8670         33.2         8630         68.4         29.2	29.2	<sup>\$</sup> 675	31.2
Asian <sup>\$</sup> 795 28.7 <sup>\$</sup> 632 52.9 28.8	28.8	$008_{s}$	28.5

Table 6.29 Median Gross Rent (in 1999 Dollars) and Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio hand, the ratio for Puerto Rican households was 30.6 percent, slightly higher than the overall ratio but 4.0 percentage points lower than it was for the group three years earlier. The ratio for black households was 29.2 percent in 1999, down 1.4 percentage points from the ratio in 1996. The ratios for white and Asian households in 1999, 27.5 percent and 28.7 percent respectively, were lower than the city-wide ratio and remained practically unchanged from what they were in 1996.

The reason for the high rent-income ratio for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic households was not their high rent level, but their low household income level. Even though their median gross rent was \$670, which was 95.7 percent of the city-wide rent (Table 6.29), their median household income was only \$21,840, the second-lowest household income of any racial and ethnic group and only 84.0 percent of the median household income of all renter households, as seen in Chapter 3, "Household Incomes in New York City."





The median gross rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized households, their out-of-pocket rentincome ratio, and the difference between the two ratios varied for the different racial and ethnic groups. For non-Puerto Rican Hispanic rent-subsidized households, the median gross rent-income ratio was 68.4 percent, while their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was only 29.2 percent (Table 6.29). This means that the rent landlords received was 68.4 percent of the renter households' incomes, while the portion of rent actually paid by these renter households out of pocket was only 29.2 percent of their income. The difference was, thus, 39.2 percentage points. Using thirty percent of household income as the affordability standard, the affordability gap here was 38.4 percent. Based on this, it can be said that, without the rent subsidies they received, most non-Puerto Rican Hispanic rent-subsidized households could not have afforded the apartments they occupied. The rent-income ratio for rent-subsidized white households was also extremely high, 64.6 percent, while their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was 29.8 percent, an affordability gap of 34.6 percentage points (Figure 6.7).

Other racial and ethnic groups that received some kind of rent subsidy also had to pay a high proportion of their income for rent. It was 58.8 percent for Puerto Rican households, 52.9 percent for Asian households, and 49.2 percent for black households (Table 6.29). These groups' out-of-pocket rent-income ratios were 26.9 percent, 28.8 percent, and 26.2 percent respectively. The affordability gaps were 28.8 percentage points, 22.9 percentage points, and 19.2 percentage points respectively.

## Affordability of Rental Housing by Household Type

Single households with minor children paid the highest proportion of their income for rent of any household group: a seriously high 51.8 percent in 1999, 22.4 percentage points higher than the average renter household in the City (Table 6.30). The affordability gap for these single households with minor children was 21.8 percentage points. The rent burden for single elderly households was also very serious: their median gross rent-income ratio of 51.4 percent was 22.0 percentage points higher than the median rent-income ratio for the City. The affordability gap for these households was 21.4 percentage points. The rent-income ratio for elderly households was 32.0 percent, 2.6 percentage points higher than the city-wide ratio.

The proportion of income that adult households paid for rent in 1999 was the lowest of any household group, only 21.4 percent, or 8.0 percentage points lower than the median gross rent-income ratio for the City (Table 6.30). Adult households with minor children paid 26.3 percent of their income for rent, 3.1 percentage points lower than the citywide median. Single adult households paid 29.2 percent, almost the same proportion of their income for rent as the average renter in the City.

Compared to their incomes, the gross rent that the various rent-subsidized household groups had to pay, as a combination of their out-of-pocket rent and their rent subsidy, was extremely high in 1999. Particularly, the median gross rent-income ratio for subsidized single households with minor children was unbearably high: 88.3 percent (Table 6.30). This means that, if these households had had to pay their total rent without any rent subsidy, they would have had to spend almost all of their household income for rent. But because these households received some kind of rent subsidy, the proportion of rent they actually paid out of pocket was only 28.1 percent of their income. The affordability gap was 58.3

Table 6.30Median Gross Rent/Income Ratioof All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Householdsby Household TypeNew York City 1999	All Renter Households Subsidized Households Unsubsidized Households	Out-of-Pocket         Gross       Gross       Gross       Gross         Gross <th c<="" th=""><th><sup>5</sup>700 <sup>5</sup>26,000 29.4 <sup>5</sup>624 <sup>5</sup>9,448 58.8 27.8 <sup>5</sup>700 <sup>5</sup>29,700 27.8</th><th><math>{}^{8}</math>537 <math>{}^{8}</math>9,300 51.4 <math>{}^{8}</math>485 <math>{}^{8}</math>7,284 64.3 30.6 <math>{}^{8}</math>513 <math>{}^{8}</math>9,769 43.2</th><th><math>{}^{8}698</math> <math>{}^{8}28,000</math> 29.2 <math>{}^{8}546</math> <math>{}^{8}7,049</math> 60.0 27.8 <math>{}^{8}700</math> <math>{}^{8}30,000</math> 28.1</th><th><sup>\$</sup>635 <sup>\$</sup>10,000 51.8 <sup>\$</sup>7,044 88.3 28.1 <sup>\$</sup>605 <sup>\$</sup>12,000 43.8</th><th><sup>\$</sup>629 <sup>\$</sup>21,000 32.0 <sup>\$</sup>573 <sup>\$</sup>14,400 41.2 28.2 <sup>\$</sup>625 <sup>\$</sup>21,700 31.3</th><th><sup>8</sup>769 <sup>8</sup>45,292 21.4 <sup>8</sup>615 <sup>8</sup>21,415 29.1 18.1 <sup>8</sup>774 <sup>8</sup>46,000 21.3</th><th><sup>5</sup>750 <sup>5</sup>32,200 26.3 <sup>5</sup>750 <sup>5</sup>15,000 45.4 23.0 <sup>5</sup>752 <sup>5</sup>34,200 25.7</th><th>of the Ceneric 1000 New Vork City Housing and Vacency Survey</th></th>	<th><sup>5</sup>700 <sup>5</sup>26,000 29.4 <sup>5</sup>624 <sup>5</sup>9,448 58.8 27.8 <sup>5</sup>700 <sup>5</sup>29,700 27.8</th> <th><math>{}^{8}</math>537 <math>{}^{8}</math>9,300 51.4 <math>{}^{8}</math>485 <math>{}^{8}</math>7,284 64.3 30.6 <math>{}^{8}</math>513 <math>{}^{8}</math>9,769 43.2</th> <th><math>{}^{8}698</math> <math>{}^{8}28,000</math> 29.2 <math>{}^{8}546</math> <math>{}^{8}7,049</math> 60.0 27.8 <math>{}^{8}700</math> <math>{}^{8}30,000</math> 28.1</th> <th><sup>\$</sup>635 <sup>\$</sup>10,000 51.8 <sup>\$</sup>7,044 88.3 28.1 <sup>\$</sup>605 <sup>\$</sup>12,000 43.8</th> <th><sup>\$</sup>629 <sup>\$</sup>21,000 32.0 <sup>\$</sup>573 <sup>\$</sup>14,400 41.2 28.2 <sup>\$</sup>625 <sup>\$</sup>21,700 31.3</th> <th><sup>8</sup>769 <sup>8</sup>45,292 21.4 <sup>8</sup>615 <sup>8</sup>21,415 29.1 18.1 <sup>8</sup>774 <sup>8</sup>46,000 21.3</th> <th><sup>5</sup>750 <sup>5</sup>32,200 26.3 <sup>5</sup>750 <sup>5</sup>15,000 45.4 23.0 <sup>5</sup>752 <sup>5</sup>34,200 25.7</th> <th>of the Ceneric 1000 New Vork City Housing and Vacency Survey</th>	<sup>5</sup> 700 <sup>5</sup> 26,000 29.4 <sup>5</sup> 624 <sup>5</sup> 9,448 58.8 27.8 <sup>5</sup> 700 <sup>5</sup> 29,700 27.8	${}^{8}$ 537 ${}^{8}$ 9,300 51.4 ${}^{8}$ 485 ${}^{8}$ 7,284 64.3 30.6 ${}^{8}$ 513 ${}^{8}$ 9,769 43.2	${}^{8}698$ ${}^{8}28,000$ 29.2 ${}^{8}546$ ${}^{8}7,049$ 60.0 27.8 ${}^{8}700$ ${}^{8}30,000$ 28.1	<sup>\$</sup> 635 <sup>\$</sup> 10,000 51.8 <sup>\$</sup> 7,044 88.3 28.1 <sup>\$</sup> 605 <sup>\$</sup> 12,000 43.8	<sup>\$</sup> 629 <sup>\$</sup> 21,000 32.0 <sup>\$</sup> 573 <sup>\$</sup> 14,400 41.2 28.2 <sup>\$</sup> 625 <sup>\$</sup> 21,700 31.3	<sup>8</sup> 769 <sup>8</sup> 45,292 21.4 <sup>8</sup> 615 <sup>8</sup> 21,415 29.1 18.1 <sup>8</sup> 774 <sup>8</sup> 46,000 21.3	<sup>5</sup> 750 <sup>5</sup> 32,200 26.3 <sup>5</sup> 750 <sup>5</sup> 15,000 45.4 23.0 <sup>5</sup> 752 <sup>5</sup> 34,200 25.7	of the Ceneric 1000 New Vork City Housing and Vacency Survey
Median of A	IIA	Gross Rent	<sup>8</sup> 700	<sup>\$</sup> 537	869 <sub>8</sub>	<sup>\$</sup> 635	<sup>\$</sup> 629	69L <sub>\$</sub>	<sup>\$</sup> 750	Por Concrect 1	
		Household Type	All	Single Elderly	Single Adult	Single with Minor Child(ren)	Elderly Household	Adult Household Adult Household	with Minor Child(ren)	Courses II & Dunsan of 4	

percentage points. This means that, without the subsidy they received, these households, which were in housing poverty, would have been too poor to afford the rent of the units they occupied and might, thus, have been at great risk of homelessness, unless they had doubled up with other households.

The total median gross rent-income ratios for rent-subsidized single-elderly and single-adult households were also extremely high: 64.3 percent and 60.0 percent respectively of their household income in 1999. But the proportions of their income that went out of pocket toward rent were 30.6 percent and 27.8 percent respectively, producing affordability gaps of 34.3 and 30.0 percentage points (Table 6.30). Again, most of these single-elderly and single-adult households could not have afforded the apartments in which they lived without the rent subsidy they received.

The median gross rent-income ratios for other subsidized household types were lower than the ratio of 58.8 percent for all subsidized households in the City (Table 6.30). However, the differences between rent-income ratios and out-of-pocket rent-income ratios and the affordability gaps for these other subsidized households were considerably large. Particularly, the rent-income ratio for subsidized adult households with minor children was 45.4 percent, while their out-of-pocket rent-income ratio was 23.0 percent. Their affordability gap was 15.4 percentage points.

It is important to note that it is not high median gross rents that create the very high median gross rent-income ratios for subsidized households. Rather, it is because of the very low incomes of subsidized households that their gross rent-income ratios are so high (Table 6.30). The median income of all subsidized households was only \$9,400 in 1998, a mere 36.3 percent of the median household income of all renter households. Subsidized single households with minor children, the household type with the highest affordability gap, was the poorest. Their median income was only \$7,000, a mere 27.1 percent of all renter households' median income and the lowest household income of any household type in 1998. The median incomes of subsidized single adult and single elderly households were also extremely low: \$7,000 and \$7,300 respectively.

In general, the proportion of income that rent-unsubsidized household groups paid for rent was considerably smaller than that paid by subsidized household groups. However, unsubsidized single households with minor children and single-elderly households, in particular, paid disproportionately high proportions of their income for rent: 43.8 percent and 43.2 percent respectively (Table 6.30). Again, the cause of this high rent-income ratio for these two unsubsidized household types was their extremely low incomes, not their high rents. The median incomes of these two household types were \$12,000 and \$9,800, only 46.2 percent and 37.6 percent respectively of the median income of all renter households in 1998. Many of these unsubsidized single adult households with minor children and single elderly households needed to receive some kind of rent subsidy in order to lower their seriously high rent burdens.

## Affordability by Rent-Income Ratio Level

In 1999, half of all renter households paid 29.4 percent of their income, lower than the standard

affordability measure of 30.0 percent, or more for rent: 21.9 percent paid between 30.0 and 49.9 percent, and 27.1 percent paid 50.0 percent or more (Table 6.31).

On the other hand, of rent-subsidized households, 75.1 percent paid 30.0 percent or more of their income for rent: 20.1 percent paid between 30.0 percent and 49.9 percent, and the remaining 55.0 percent paid 50.0 percent or more (Table 6.31). However, only 42.0 percent of subsidized households had out-of-pocket rent-income ratios higher than 30.0 percent. Of this proportion, 25.9 percent had out-of-pocket rent-income ratios between 30.0 percent and 49.9 percent, and the remaining 16.1 percent had ratios of 50.0 percent or more.

## Table 6.31 Distribution of Gross Rent/Income Ratio of All Renter Households, Subsidized Households and Unsubsidized Households New York City 1999

		Subsidiz	ed Households	Unsubsidized Households
Ratio	All Households	Gross Rent/Income Ratio	Out-of-Pocket Gross Rent/Income Ratio	Gross Rent/Income Ratio
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than 10%	5.6%	1.9%	12.8%	5.7%
10% - 19.9%	22.7%	8.4%	18.4%	24.9%
20% - 29.9%	22.6%	14.5%	26.9%	24.2%
30% - 39.9%	13.3%	11.0%	16.4%	14.0%
40% - 49.9%	8.6%	9.1%	9.5%	8.3%
50% - 59.9%	5.2%	5.7%	3.8%	5.0%
60% - 69.9%	4.0%	4.9%	3.1%	3.7%
70% - 79.9%	2.9%	5.2%	2.5%	2.4%
80% - 99.9%	4.6%	10.5%	2.3%	3.7%
100% and Over	10.4%	28.7%	4.4%	8.0%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

The majority of unsubsidized households, 54.8 percent, had rent-income ratios below 30.0 percent in 1999 (Table 6.31). On the other hand, 45.2 percent had ratios of 30.0 percent or more: 22.3 percent had ratios between 30.0 percent and 49.9 percent; 22.8 percent had ratios of 50.0 percent or more.

#### Affordability by Location

In terms of the proportion of household income that went to contract rent plus fuel and utilities, rental units in Staten Island were the most affordable of all those in the five boroughs in 1999 for the households that occupied them. In Staten Island, where the median gross rent-income ratio was only 26.4 percent, 56.8 percent of renters paid less than 30.0 percent of their income for rent, compared to 50.9 percent of renter households in the City as a whole (Table 6.32) (Map 6.3).

Table 6.32 Distribution of Renter Households by Gross Rent/Income Ratio Within Borough New York City 1999

Gross Rent/						Staten
Income Ratio	Total	<b>Bronx</b> <sup>a</sup>	Brooklyn	Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	Queens	Island
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Less than 10%	5.6%	3.9%	4.5%	7.5%	6.0%	6.3%
10% - 19.9%	22.7%	19.7%	21.7%	23.8%	24.3%	29.4%
20% - 29.9%	22.6%	20.2%	22.7%	23.7%	23.2%	21.1%
30% - 39.9%	13.3%	14.3%	13.2%	13.0%	13.2%	13.6%
40% - 49.9%	8.6%	9.2%	9.0%	7.8%	8.5%	7.0%
50% - 59.9%	5.2%	4.9%	5.8%	4.7%	5.3%	4.1%
60% - 69.9%	4.0%	4.1%	3.9%	3.7%	4.5%	4.4%
70% - 79.9%	2.9%	3.5%	3.1%	2.9%	2.3%	**
80% - 99.9%	4.6%	6.8%	4.5%	3.7%	4.3%	3.3%*
100% and Over	10.4%	13.5%	11.6%	9.3%	8.2%	8.8%
Median	29.4	33.9	30.6	27.7	28.2	26.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few households to report.

Map 6.3 Median Gross Rent to Income Ratios New York City 1999



Compared to those in the Bronx and Brooklyn, rental units in Manhattan and Queens were also relatively more affordable overall for their occupants. In Manhattan and Queens, where the median gross rent-income ratios were 27.7 percent and 28.2 percent respectively, 55.0 percent and 53.5 percent respectively of renter households paid less than 30.0 percent of their income for rent (Table 6.32). The median rent-income ratio for renters in the Bronx was 33.9 percent, the highest proportion of any of the boroughs. The median rent-income ratio in Brooklyn was 30.6 percent, higher than the city-wide ratio. In the Bronx and Brooklyn, 43.8 percent and 48.9 percent respectively of renter households paid less than 30.0 percent of their income for rent (Table 6.32 and Figure 6.8).





# 7 Housing Conditions in New York City

## Introduction

Housing conditions are often assessed by emphasizing the following three aspects of those conditions: the physical condition of housing units and buildings, neighborhood conditions, and the adequacy of space. Physical conditions are usually measured by focusing on the structural conditions of the buildings where the housing units are located and of the units themselves, as well as on the presence and functional adequacy of the equipment within the units. At the beginning of this chapter, the structural condition of buildings where residential units are located will be discussed. A basic element of good housing is the structural safety of the buildings in which the housing is located, since the primary function of housing is protecting the occupants of the building in which it is located. The HVS provides data on two specific structural conditions: units in dilapidated buildings and units in buildings with certain structural defects. An analysis of these two measures of structural conditions will portray the level of structural soundness of dwelling units.

The second part of the chapter analyzes a set of non-structural housing quality elements. The quality of housing condition is not only a question of structural deficiencies; questions of unit maintenance and equipment deficiencies are just as vital. Thus, in addition to structural soundness, good housing is expected to provide a level of maintenance of the unit and its equipment adequate for residents to be able to conduct a wide variety of necessary activities in a way that is safe and convenient for decent daily lives.

Although there are numerous factors which, alone or in combination, could provide infinite gradations of unit maintenance and equipment deficiencies, the HVS provides data on seven categories of such deficiencies: three categories of housing maintenance deficiencies, three categories of equipment deficiencies, and one category of public-health-related deficiency. Analyses of data on these seven maintenance and equipment deficiencies and their relationship to structural conditions will help to depict physical housing conditions in the City.

The third part of the chapter deals with neighborhood conditions. In addition to building structural and unit maintenance conditions, good housing should provide a bundle of neighborhood services. For example, when households select housing units in which they want to live, they not only select those particular housing units, but also the neighborhoods where the housing units are located. The services a neighborhood provides relate not only to the physical condition of the neighborhood, but also to the quality of a broad combination of private and public services needed for daily living in a suitable environment. Neighborhood quality is increasingly important to a household's satisfaction with its housing, since more and more residents in New York City, as in other large central cities in the country, are concerned about the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

The HVS does not provide data on all important elements of neighborhood services. This part of the chapter covers only data on the following two characteristics of neighborhood physical conditions: the first is the interviewer's or resident's observation of whether or not there are buildings with broken or boarded-up windows on the street where the sample unit is located; the second is the resident's rating of the residential structures in his or her neighborhood. Analysis of the data on these two neighborhood characteristics allows for a general judgment on, first, how many households face a situation that has the ingredients of present blight and probable future decay and, second, how many households feel that they live in good neighborhoods, at least in terms of physical residential conditions.

The fourth part of the chapter presents and analyzes data on the aggregate number and characteristics of physically poor rental units and the characteristics of households residing in them. According to recent HVSs, the City of New York has made tremendous improvements in physical housing and neighborhood conditions. In 1999, these conditions were the best since the HVS started covering comparable conditions in the 1970s, as discussed later in this chapter. But there is still a substantial number of units--particularly rental units--with structural defects and maintenance deficiencies. Thus, it is useful to estimate the changes in the number of physically poor rental units and the characteristics of households in such units between recent survey years. Analytic efforts will also be made here to portray geographical areas, defined at the census tract level, where marked improvements have been made in structural and maintenance conditions between recent survey years.

At the end of the analysis of physical housing conditions, the impact of City-sponsored new construction, rehabilitation, and other efforts to improve housing conditions in the City will be reviewed. As findings of Chapter 4, "New York City's Housing Inventory," and this chapter reveal, not only did the housing inventory expand considerably between 1996 and 1999, but physical housing condition greatly improved as well. Thus, the City's contribution to these significant improvements in the condition of housing in the City deserves to be analytically reviewed.

Finally, the chapter will discuss the utilization of residential space in the City. The HVS provides data on the size of housing units and the size of households in them. With data on these two characteristics, the chapter will analyze the adequacy of indoor housing space. Crowding has been a growing problem in the City in recent years. The crowding rate is a measure of space utilization--that is, how much space is available to each member of a household. The availability of space for an individual can also be analyzed by comparing the availability of affordable housing units of different sizes to the number of households of different numbers of persons. As a result, efforts here to analyze the insistent problem of crowding and related issues will provide valuable insights into not only a numerical summary of housing conditions related to space utilization, but also the causes and implications of this situation for the City.

## Structural Condition of Housing

In organizing and presenting data on units in dilapidated buildings, the Census Bureau treats vacant units in such buildings as vacant unavailable units, as explained in Chapter 5, "Housing Vacancies and Vacancy Rates." Therefore, in discussing the number and proportion of units in dilapidated

buildings, previous HVS reports have covered only occupied units. On the other hand, in counting units in buildings with structural defects, the Census Bureau covers both occupied and vacant units. However, to make analyses of housing conditions easy to compare, this chapter covers only occupied units.

## Occupied Rental Units in Dilapidated Buildings

One useful description of structural condition that the HVS provides is the number and proportion of housing units in dilapidated buildings. The Census Bureau's interviewers determine that the structural condition of a building containing a sample unit is dilapidated by observing that it has at least one critical structural defect, or a combination of intermediate defects, or inadequate construction. Critical defects include continued neglect, or deep and serious damage to the structure requiring extensive repair work to correct the problems; in some cases, the damage is so severe that the building or unit should be torn down. Intermediate defects are those which need repairs if the building or housing unit is to continue to provide safe and adequate shelter. These defects are more serious than those that can be corrected by normal maintenance and repairs.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the term "dilapidation" describes buildings that provide residents with inadequate protection from elements that create a danger to the physical safety of the occupants.

Conceptually, research on the measurement of the structural adequacy of housing conditions has advanced greatly. However, it is still very difficult to measure these conditions in a reliable manner. This is mainly because many aspects of structural condition can only be assessed correctly by engineers, architects, and/or well-trained technicians and because, in general surveys of large samples, they often involve interviewers' and respondents' subjective judgments of the utility and application of their values, preferences, tastes, images of social status, and other socio-economic characteristics.

Because the determination of dilapidation is subjective, it is too subject to enumeration variability to be quantitatively reliable on an individual unit basis, although aggregate estimates of dilapidation appear to be reasonably reliable. Interviewers have to exercise considerable personal judgment in classifying buildings or units as dilapidated, and no matter how carefully criteria and instructions have been prepared and provided to interviewers, a substantial amount of variability among interviewers is bound to occur. Thus, according to the Census Bureau's evaluation of the consistency of interviewers' determination of dilapidated by interviewers on both the first and second visits was low. However, the overall proportion of dilapidated units determined by the second visit approximated the proportion determined by the first visit. Because of such general consistency in the aggregate, although not on an individual unit basis,<sup>2</sup> HVS data on dilapidation are believed to be reasonably reliable and useful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, Field Representative's Manual, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey, Appendix B: Determining Building Condition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For further information on the reliability of dilapidation data, see Peter Marcuse, Rental Housing in the City of New York: Supply and Condition, 1975-1978, pages 145-149.

The 1999 HVS reports that the dilapidation rate, the proportion of renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings, was just 1.0 percent in 1999, a further improvement over 1996, when the rate was 1.3 percent (Table 7.1). Based on the dilapidation rate, it can be said that almost all renter-occupied units in the City were in structurally sound buildings. The 1999 dilapidation rate was the lowest in the thirty-four-year period since the first HVS in 1965 (Figure 7.1).

		-	
Year	Number of Renter Occupied Units in Dilapidated Buildings <sup>a</sup>	Dilapidation Rate <sup>b</sup>	
1999	19,000	1.0%	
1996	26,000	1.3%	
1993	23,000	1.2%	
1991	24,000	1.2%	
1987	37,000	2.1%	
1984	62,000	3.4%	
1981	79,000	4.2%	
1978	64,000	3.4%	
1975	110,000	5.7%	
1970	106,000	5.0%	

## Table 7.1 Incidence of Dilapidation in Renter Occupied Units New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999

Sources: 1970-1975 data from Stegman, Michael A., *Housing and Vacancy Report: New York City, 1991*, p. 232; 1978-1996 data from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Estimated number of units in dilapidated buildings rounded to the nearest thousand.

b Percentages based on unrounded numbers. Dilapidation rate is defined as the number of renter occupied units in dilapidated buildings as a percentage of total renter occupied units.

The dilapidation rate in Manhattan was 1.6 percent in 1999, while it was 1.8 percent in 1996 (Table 7.2). The 1999 rate in the borough was considerably higher than the city-wide rate of 1.0 percent and the highest of any of the boroughs. Of the 19,000 renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings in the City in 1999, close to half were in Manhattan (46.9 percent). Brooklyn accounted for close to a quarter of renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings (23.4 percent) in the City in 1999, but the dilapidation rate in the borough was 0.8 percent, lower than the city-wide rate and an improvement over 1996. The dilapidation rate in the Bronx also declined.



Figure 7.1 Dilapidation Rate for Renter Occupied Units New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999

Table 7.2Incidence of Renter Occupied Units in Dilapidated Buildings by Borough<br/>New York City 1996 and 1999

-		1996			1999	
Borough	Number of Units	Dilapidation Rate	Percent of Total	Number of Units	Dilapidation Rate	Percent of Total
All	25,561	1.3%	100.0%	19,006	1.0%	100.0%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	4,860	1.5%	19.0%	2,505*	0.8%	13.2%
Brooklyn	7,211	1.2%	28.2%	4,442	0.8%	23.4%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	10,071	1.8%	39.4%	8,920	1.6%	46.9%
Queens	2,651*	0.6%	10.4%	2,952*	0.7%	15.5%
Staten Island	**	**	**	**	**	**

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

In general, structural condition is closely related to a building's structural type and age. In 1999, almost three-quarters of renter-occupied units in dilapidated buildings in the City were either in Old-Law tenements (41.0 percent), where the dilapidation rate was a disproportionately high 4.0 percent, or in New-Law tenements (33.7 percent), where the rate was 1.0 percent (Table 7.3).

Table 7.3
Incidence of Dilapidation in Renter Occupied Housing by Building Structure Classification
New York City 1999

Structure Classification	Number of Units	<b>Dilapidation Rate</b>	Percent of Dilapidated <sup>b</sup>
All <sup>a</sup>	19,006	1.0%	100.0%
Multiple Dwellings <sup>a</sup>	17,289	1.0%	89.7%
Old Law Tenement	6,852	4.0%	41.0%
New Law Tenement	5,627	1.0%	33.7%
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	**	0.2%*	8.3%*
Other	**	0.8%*	6.7%*
1-2 Unit Family Houses	**	0.7%*	10.3%*

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a Includes units for which structure classification within multiple dwellings class was not reported.

b Excludes units in multiple dwellings whose structure class was not reported.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

## Occupied Rental Units in Buildings with Structural Defects

The second perspective of the Census Bureau's efforts to determine the structural condition of buildings in which housing units are located is the interviewer's observation of the condition of the following thirteen specific structural features of buildings:

- A. External walls
  - 1. Missing bricks, siding, or other outside wall material
  - 2. Sloping or bulging outside walls
  - 3. Major cracks in outside walls
  - 4. Loose or hanging cornices, roofing, or other material
- B. Windows
  - 1. Broken or missing windows
  - 2. Rotted/loose window frames/sashes
  - 3. Boarded-up windows

## C. Stairways (exterior and interior)

- 1. Loose, broken, or missing stair railings
- 2. Loose, broken, or missing steps

## D. Floors

- 1. Sagging or sloping floors
- 2. Slanted or shifted doorsills or door frames
- 3. Deep wear in floors causing depressions
- 4. Holes or missing flooring

The determination of structural defects is considered to be more objective and reliable than the dilapidation rate, since structural defects cover specific areas of buildings and the defects to be observed are relatively less ambiguous than the determination of dilapidation, which is largely based on the composite judgment of interviewers regarding the overall condition of buildings.

Structural defects of buildings that are covered in the HVS, as shown above, must be repaired if the structure is to continue to provide safe and proper housing services. The proportion of renteroccupied units in buildings with any of the thirteen building defects--grouped into the four types shown above--was 10.9 percent in 1999, while it was 11.4 percent in 1996 (Table 7.4).

The level of the structural condition of buildings varies from borough to borough. Between 1996 and 1999, structural condition, as measured by the incidence of one or more observable building defects, worsened slightly in the Bronx, while it improved in Manhattan and Staten Island. In the Bronx, between 1991 and 1993 the proportion of renter-occupied units in buildings with one or more building defects decreased significantly by 15.2 percentage points from 24.0 percent to 8.8 percent. Then, it increased to 14.3 percent in 1996 and 15.8 percent in 1999. The overall improvement in structural condition in the borough, particularly in the southern part, since 1991 was very visible (Maps 7.1 and 7.2). Between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of renter-occupied units with one or more building defects declined in Manhattan and Staten Island from 12.0 percent to 9.2 percent and from 9.1 percent to 3.9 percent respectively (Table 7.5). The improvement in structural condition in the eastern portions of sub-borough areas 1 (North Shore) and 2 (Mid-Island) in Staten Island between 1991 and 1999 was especially discernable.

Structural condition, as measured by building defects, is associated with building structure class and age, as was the case with the dilapidation rate. In 1999, of occupied renter units in Old-Law tenement buildings (which were built before 1901), 21.8 percent were in buildings with one or more building defects, the highest percentage of any building structure class, as in 1996, when it was 23.0 percent, and twice the city-wide proportion (Table 7.6). At the same time, of occupied rental units in New-Law tenement buildings (which were built between 1901 and 1929), 17.6 percent were in buildings with one or more building defects. The comparable proportion for units in buildings built after 1929 was only 4.1 percent, about a fifth of the proportion for all occupied rental units in Old-Law tenement buildings and less than half the city-wide proportion. An analysis of building defects by rent categories further proves that, the older the building, the more building defects. Of rent-stabilized units in buildings built in or before 1947, one in six were in buildings with one or more building defects, while one in thirty such units in buildings built after 1947 were in buildings with one or more building defects (Table 7.7). The proportion of rent-controlled units in buildings with building defects was also high: 12.8 percent compared to the city-wide proportion of 10.9 percent. This is because all rent-controlled units were built in or before 1947.

	Percent of Units in B	uildings with Defects
Type of Building Defect	1996	1999
Any Defect	11.4%	10.9%
Any External Defect	3.4%	2.8%
Missing Siding	1.6%	1.5%
Sloping or Bulging Walls	0.4%	0.4%
Major Cracks	0.9%	0.6%
Loose Cornice or Roofing	1.0%	0.8%
Any Window Defect	4.8%	3.4%
Broken or Missing	2.2%	1.5%
Rotted/Loose Frames/Sashes	2.6%	2.0%
Boarded-Up	0.5%	0.6%
Any Stairway Defect	6.4%	5.7%
Loose/Broken Railings	2.5%	1.7%
Loose/Broken Steps	4.9%	4.4%
Any Floor Defect	4.9%	5.9%
Sagging or Sloping	2.1%	2.8%
Doorsills or Frames Slanted/Shifted	0.8%	1.0%
Deeply Worn	2.3%	2.1%
Holes or Missing Flooring	1.3%	1.5%

Table 7.4
Incidence of Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Housing by Type of Defect
New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Map 7.1 Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with One or More Defect Types New York City 1991



Map 7.2 Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with One or More Defect Types New York City 1999



## Table 7.5 Incidence of One or More Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Housing by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1991 - 1999

_	Perc	cent of Units in Build	dings with One or Mor	e Defects	
Borough	1991	1993	1996	1999	_
All	14.0%	10.7%	11.4%	10.9%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	24.0%	8.8%	14.3%	15.8%	
Brooklyn	13.0%	10.0%	13.1%	13.6%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	14.1%	15.0%	12.0%	9.2%	
Queens	5.8%	7.0%	5.8%	6.4%	
Staten Island	19.8%	10.9%	9.1%	3.9%*	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

## Table 7.6 Incidence of One or More Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Housing by Building Structure Classification New York City 1996 and 1999

	Percent of Units in Buildings with One or More Defects				
Structure Classification	1996	1999			
All	11.4%	10.9%			
Multiple Dwellings	11.7%	11.1%			
Old-Law Tenement	23.0%	21.8%			
New-Law Tenement	17.7%	17.6%			
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	3.9%	4.1%			
Other	12.1%	7.0%			
1-2 Unit Family Houses	9.5%	7.6%			

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Table 7.7
Incidence of Observable Building Defects
in Renter Occupied Housing by Regulatory Status
New York City 1996 and 1999

Regulatory Status	Percent of Units with One or More Defects		
	1996	1999	
All	11.4%	10.9%	
Controlled	11.1%	12.8%	
Stabilized	12.6%	13.1%	
Pre-1947	16.6%	16.6%	
Post-1947	2.1%	3.3%	
Other Regulated	2.4%*	5.1%	
Mitchell-Lama Rental	5.9%	2.6%*	
Unregulated	10.3%	8.4%	
In Rental Buildings	11.3%	9.2%	
In Coops and Condos	4.1%	2.8%*	
Public Housing	6.3%	5.7%	
In Rem	55.3%	54.8%	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

The structure of public housing in the City was very good. In 1999, only a little more than one in twenty public housing units were in buildings with one or more building defects (Table 7.7). The proportion of units in *in rem* buildings with one or more defects was 54.8 percent in 1999, not meaningfully different from the proportion three years earlier. There are two reasons why the proportion remains high: first, since these *in rem* units are in tax-delinquent buildings that have not been properly maintained or repaired by the owner for a long period of time, improvements to a building's structural condition after the City takes over also require a long period of time (nevertheless, the number of *in rem* units in such structurally poor buildings was cut by 36.6 percent, or more than 4,000 units, in the three years between 1996 and 1999); and, second, HPD returns *in rem* buildings that have been upgraded for the good of tenants to a better overall condition (by replacing and repairing critical buildings systems, including elevators, boilers, roofs, and entrance doors) to responsible private owners, at which time the buildings are no longer classified as *in rem*. In fact, the number of *in rem* units declined by 34.2 percent, or about 9,000 units, during the same three year period, as discussed in Chapter 4, "New York City's Housing Inventory."

Notes:

A review of the incidence of building defects by building size (number of units) discloses the following relationship between these two building characteristics: the larger the building the better the structural condition, except for the smallest buildings (those with one through five units). In 1999, of renter-occupied units in buildings with 6-19 units, the proportion of units in buildings with one or more building defects was 19.6 percent, the highest proportion of any size building in the City (Table 7.8). The proportions declined steadily as building size increased, to 14.5 percent, 8.9 percent, and 3.6 percent respectively for such units in buildings with 20-49 units, 50-99 units, and 100 or more units. This relationship between structural condition and building size derives largely from the fact that smaller buildings are older buildings and, as discussed earlier, older buildings have more defects, again except for the smallest buildings. In 1999, 85.5 percent of units in buildings with 6-19 units were built in or before 1947 (Table 7.9). The proportion declined as the size of the building increased: 79.8 percent for buildings with 20-49 units, 59.1 percent for buildings with 50-99 units, and 25.9 percent for buildings with 100 or more units.

 
 Table 7.8

 Incidence of Observable Building Defects in Renter Occupied Units by Building Size Category New York City 1999

Building Size Category	Percent Units with One or More Defects
All	10.9%
1-5	9.9%
6-19 Units	19.6%
20-49 Units	14.5%
50-99 Units	8.9%
100 or More Units	3.6%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

The higher the rent, the lower the proportion of units in buildings with defects. This inverse relationship was maintained throughout the rent intervals, except for the lowest level (\$1-\$399), where many units were public housing units. Of units renting for less than \$400, 40.6 percent were public housing units, a structurally well-maintained sector of the housing stock, as discussed above. Of all units in public housing, 73.3 percent rented for less than \$400.<sup>3</sup> The proportion of units in buildings with zero defects was 84.8 percent for units with contract rents of \$400-\$599; it was 88.7 percent for units in the \$600-\$699 rent level (Table 7.10). The proportion continued to increase to 90.5 percent, 94.0 percent, and 96.7 percent respectively for units with rents of \$700-\$899, \$900-\$1,249, and \$1,250 and over.

The two measurements of the structural condition of buildings--the dilapidation rate, which is an overall approximation of building condition, and the proportion of building defects, which is a specific measure of building defects in particular areas of buildings--appear to supplement each other.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Building Size Category	All	Pre-1947	1947-69	1970-79	1980+
All	100.0%	63.2%	28.7%	4.1%	4.0%
1-2	100.0%	66.5%	23.7%	3.8%	5.9%
3-5	100.0%	70.7%	17.6%	5.8%	5.8%
6-19 Units	100.0%	85.5%	10.6%	0.8%	3.1%
20-49 Units	100.0%	79.8%	18.2%	1.0%	1.0%
50-99 Units	100.0%	59.1%	37.1%	1.8%	2.1%
100 or More Units	100.0%	25.9%	55.4%	11.1%	7.6%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

## Table 7.10 Incidence of Observable Building Defects by Number of Building Defect Types Present and by Contract Rent Level for Renter Occupied Units New York City 1999

_	Number of Building Defect Types Present				
<b>Contract Rent Level</b>	Total	0	1	2	3 or More
All	100.0%	89.1%	6.2%	3.1%	1.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	100.0%	86.5%	6.3%	3.9%	3.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	100.0%	84.8%	8.3%	4.2%	2.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	100.0%	88.7%	7.0%	3.4%	1.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	100.0%	90.5%	5.6%	3.2%	0.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	100.0%	94.0%	4.1%	1.4%	0.5%*
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and Over	100.0%	96.7%	3.1%	**	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

The 1999 HVS reports that, of occupied rental units in non-dilapidated buildings, nine in ten were in buildings with zero defects, while of such units in dilapidated buildings, only one in four were in buildings with zero defects (Table 7.11). On the other hand, of occupied rental units in non-dilapidated buildings, only one in a hundred were in buildings with three or more defects, while of such units in dilapidated buildings, almost one in two had as many defects.

## Table 7.11 Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Number of Building Defect Types by Dilapidation Status New York City 1999

Dilapidation Status	Number of Building Defect Types				
	Total	0	1	2	3 or More
All	100.0%	89.1%	6.2%	3.1%	1.6%
Dilapidated	100.0%	25.3%	6.1%*	19.9%	48.7%
Non-Dilapidated	100.0%	89.8%	6.2%	2.9%	1.1%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note:

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

## Table 7.12

## Incidence of Dilapidation and Observable Building Defects in Owner Occupied Housing New York City 1996 and 1999

Condition	1996	1999
In Dilapidated Building	0.5%	0.6%
In Building with Observable Defects	4.3%	4.4%
1 Defect	3.3%	3.4%
2 Defects	0.8%	0.6%
3 or More Defects	0.3%	0.4%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

#### Structural Condition of Owner Occupied Units

Compared to the structural condition of buildings containing renter-occupied units, the condition of buildings containing owner-occupied units was substantially better. In 1999, only 0.6 percent of owner-occupied units were in dilapidated buildings, compared to 1.0 percent of renter-occupied units (Table 7.12). The comparable dilapidation rate for owner units in 1996 was 0.5 percent.

At the same time, 4.4 percent of owner-occupied units were in buildings with one or more defects in 1999. The comparable proportion of renter units in such buildings was 10.9 percent.

## Maintenance Condition of the Occupied Housing Inventory

Another set of physical conditions of central importance to an adequate understanding of the condition of housing units is the level of maintenance and equipment deficiencies.

The Census Bureau's interviewers gathered information on the level of maintenance deficiencies in the following seven categories from the occupants of the housing units: (1) inadequate heating; (2) heating breakdowns; (3) cracks or holes in walls, ceilings, or floors; (4) non-intact plaster or paint; (5) the presence of rodents; (6) inoperative toilets; and (7) water leakage from outside the unit. Since the HVS only provides data on maintenance deficiencies for occupied units, the discussion in this section will only deal with occupied units.

## Maintenance Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Units

Housing maintenance conditions improved extensively: between 1996 and 1999, the condition of the maintenance of housing units and the operation of units' facilities and equipment covered in the recent HVS improved on almost all measures (Table 7.13, Figure 7.2). The proportion of renter-occupied units with no maintenance deficiencies increased from 42.1 percent to 45.5 percent (Table 7.14).

Deficiency Type	1991	1993	1996	1999		
Heating Inadequate	20.9%	18.2%	18.7%	15.3%		
Heating Breakdowns						
None	75.9%	79.9%	80.4%	83.7%		
1 or More Times	24.1%	20.1%	19.6%	16.3%		
4 or More Times	9.9%	7.5%	8.2%	6.5%		
Cracks or Holes in Walls, Ceilings, Floors	23.9%	21.8%	20.6%	18.9%		
Non-intact Plaster or Paint <sup>a</sup>	13.2%	11.4%	11.1%	9.6%		
Rodents Present	32.4%	31.2%	30.1%	27.1%		
Inoperative Toilets	13.1%	10.9%	12.0%	12.5%		
Water Leakage from Outside Unit	27.4%	24.1%	24.9%	21.7%		

Table 7.13 Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Units by Type of Deficiency New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:


Figure 7.2 Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Units by Type of Deficiency New York City, Selected Years 1978-1999

Maintenance conditions improved greatly in Staten Island: the proportion climbed 10.1 percentage points, from 58.3 percent to 68.4 percent. In 1999 as in 1996, maintenance conditions in Staten Island were the best of any of the boroughs. In the Bronx and Manhattan, maintenance conditions also improved considerably over the three years. In the Bronx, the proportion of renter-occupied units with no maintenance deficiencies increased from 30.4 percent to 36.7 percent, while, in Manhattan, it increased from 37.9 percent to 44.7 percent. Maintenance conditions also improved in Queens. In Brooklyn, they improved greatly between 1991 and 1996 and then declined slightly. The marked improvements in maintenance conditions in the City, between 1991 and 1999, in all five boroughs-particularly in the south Bronx; Harlem and the rest of northern Manhattan; Crown Heights, Flatbush, and Brownsville/Ocean Hill in Brooklyn; and the western portion of Staten Island--were graphically visible (Maps 7.3 and 7.4).

Map 7.3 Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with Four or More Maintenance Deficiencies New York City 1991



Map 7.4 Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units in Buildings with Four or More Maintenance Deficiencies New York City 1999



# Table 7.14 Incidence of No Deficiencies and of Five or More Maintenance Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Units by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999

	Percent of Renter Occupied Units With					
	No Deficiencies		5 or More I	Deficiencies		
Borough	1996	1999	1996	1999		
All	42.1%	45.5%	6.1%	4.4%		
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	30.4%	36.7%	9.7%	6.5%		
Brooklyn	43.1%	41.8%	6.0%	5.3%		
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	37.9%	44.7%	7.3%	4.3%		
Queens	53.2%	55.9%	2.6%	2.1%		
Staten Island	58.3%	68.4%	2.2%*	**		

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

As maintenance conditions in the City improved considerably between 1996 and 1999, the condition of units in all structural categories, particularly units in Old-Law and New-Law tenements, improved markedly. The proportion of renter units with five or more maintenance deficiencies in Old-Law tenement buildings was cut by 40.5 percent (from 11.1 percent to 6.6 percent), while the proportion of such units in New-Law tenement buildings was cut by 36.1 percent (from 9.7 percent to 6.2 percent) (Table 7.15). However, the proportions of units with five or more maintenance deficiencies in Old-Law and New-Law tenement buildings were still considerably higher than either the city-wide proportion or the proportion in any other structural category. The equivalent proportion for post-1929 multiple dwellings was 4.0 percent, while the proportion for one- or two-family houses was only 1.3 percent, less than a third of the city-wide proportion of 4.4 percent.

This finding confirms that the level of maintenance condition of renter-occupied units is linked to the structural category of the building where the unit is located--that is, the older the unit, the poorer the maintenance condition.

Reviewing the proportion of renter units with maintenance deficiencies by rent-regulation categories discloses that the maintenance condition of units in each category is identifiably different. Measured by units with no maintenance deficiencies, the maintenance condition of unregulated rental units was the best of all categories in 1999, as in 1996. Of such units, 59.1 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, a 3.2-percentage-point improvement over 1996 (Table 7.16). Of unregulated rental units, the condition of those in rental buildings was noticeably better than the condition of those in

# Table 7.15 Incidence of Five or More Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies in Renter Occupied Housing by Building Structure Classification New York City 1996 and 1999

	Percent of Units in Buildings with Five or More Deficiencies			
Structure Classification	1996	1999		
All	6.1%	4.4%		
Multiple Dwellings	6.9%	5.0%		
Old-Law Tenement	11.1%	6.6%		
New-Law Tenement	9.7%	6.2%		
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	4.3%	4.0%		
Other	3.5%	3.0%		
1-2 Unit Family Houses	2.5%	1.3%		

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

#### Table 7.16

# Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies (None and Five or More) in Renter Occupied Units by Regulatory Status New York City 1996 and 1999

	No Defi	ciencies	5 or More I	Deficiencies
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	1996	1999	1996	1999
All	42.1%	45.5%	6.1%	4.4%
Controlled	44.2%	41.5%	6.0%	3.9%*
Stabilized	36.6%	40.0%	7.5%	4.9%
Pre-1947	32.4%	35.4%	9.1%	5.9%
Post-1947	48.3%	53.4%	3.2%	2.2%
Other Regulated	45.9%	45.5%	4.0%	4.2%
Mitchell-Lama	53.2%	48.9%	2.6%*	3.4%*
Non-Mitchell-Lama	37.9%	41.8%	5.5%	5.1%
Unregulated	55.9%	59.1%	3.1%	2.0%
In Rental Buildings	56.1%	59.6%	3.2%	2.0%
In Coops and Condos	54.6%	55.2%	2.1%*	**
Public Housing	30.0%	36.1%	6.9%	8.3%
In Rem	10.5%*	13.5%*	26.3%	20.4%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Notes:

Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.
Too few units to report

cooperative and condominium buildings: 59.6 percent compared to 55.2 percent had no maintenance deficiencies. During the three-year period, the condition of such units in rental buildings improved by 3.5 percentage points, while the condition of such units in cooperative and condominium buildings remained virtually the same. The maintenance conditions of rent-stabilized units in buildings built after 1947 and Mitchell-Lama rental units were also very good, relatively speaking. Of post-1947 rent-stabilized units, 53.4 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while of all stabilized units, only 40.0 percent had no maintenance deficiencies. The condition of post-1947 rent-stabilized units improved by 5.1 percentage points over the three years, while the condition of all rent-stabilized units made a 3.4-percentage-point improvement. At the same time, 48.9 percent of Mitchell-Lama rental units were free of maintenance deficiencies. This represents a 4.3-percentage-point decline from 1996.

On the other hand, the maintenance condition of rent-controlled units, rent-stabilized units in buildings built in or before 1947, and public housing units were relatively poor in 1999: 41.5 percent of rent-controlled units and 35.4 percent of pre-1947 rent-stabilized units had no maintenance deficiencies; and the proportion of public housing units with no maintenance deficiencies was still only 36.1 percent, although this was 6.1 percentage points improvement over the three years. The maintenance deficiencies declined by 5.9 percentage points, from 26.3 percent to 20.4 percent between 1996 and 1999. However, still only 13.5 percent of *in rem* units were free of maintenance deficiencies.

As the relationship between the number of building defects and the size of a building revealed, maintenance condition improves as the size of a building increases, except for the smallest buildings of 1 through 5 units. In 1999, of units in buildings with 6-19 units, 7.0 percent had five or more maintenance deficiencies. However, the proportion declined as the size of the building increased: 5.9 percent for buildings with 20-49 units; 4.8 percent for buildings with 50-99 units, and 3.3 percent for buildings with 100 or more units (Table 7.17).

The higher the rent, the better the maintenance condition. This relationship was maintained in a positive linear pattern throughout the rent intervals. In 1999, the maintenance condition of rental units with contract rents of \$1-\$399 was very poor: only 35.5 percent of such units had no maintenance deficiencies, while 45.5 percent of all rental units in the City had no maintenance deficiencies (Table 7.18). The proportion climbs as the rent level increases. The proportion for units with rents of \$400-\$599 was 40.4 percent, still lower than the city-wide proportion, while the proportion for units with rents of \$600-\$699 was 45.8 percent, practically the same as the city-wide proportion. The proportion of renter units with no deficiencies passed the city-wide proportion as rents passed the city-wide median rent of \$648. Of units with rents of \$700-\$899 and \$900-\$1,249, the proportions with no maintenance deficiencies were 49.2 percent and 49.9 percent respectively; the proportion for units with rents of \$1,250 or more was 61.2 percent.

Functionally, structural deficiencies of buildings and unit maintenance and equipment deficiencies provide two sets of information about housing condition that reflect different situations. They support and reinforce each other, but the general distinction between them is still clear, and they have quite different implications. However, an analysis of the relationship between the two conditions reveals that both should be good if the condition of the housing unit is to be considered good; and, in

# Table 7.17 Incidence of Five or More Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies in All Renter Occupied Units by Building Size New York City 1999

Building Size Category	Percent Units with Five or More Deficiencies
All	4.4%
1-5 Units	2.2%
6-19 Units	7.0%
20-49 Units	5.9%
50-99 Units	4.8%
100 or More Units	3.3%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Table 7.18
Incidence of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies
by Number of Deficiencies and by Contract Rent Level
for Renter Occupied Units
New York City 1999

Contract Rent Level	Number of Deficiencies						
	Total	0	1-2	3-4	5 or More		
All	100.0%	45.5%	36.4%	13.6%	4.4%		
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	100.0%	35.5%	40.1%	16.9%	7.5%		
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	100.0%	40.4%	36.7%	16.3%	6.6%		
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	100.0%	45.8%	35.1%	14.8%	4.2%		
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	100.0%	49.2%	35.7%	12.2%	2.9%		
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	100.0%	49.9%	38.4%	10.1%	1.6%		
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and Over	100.0%	61.2%	32.3%	6.1%	*		
Median Contract Rent	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 675	<sup>\$</sup> 627	<sup>\$</sup> 595	<sup>\$</sup> 525		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

fact, they support each other's importance and supplement each other's limitations. For example, structural defects measure problems that are more deeply seated, less easily repaired, and more serious than maintenance deficiencies. On the other hand, maintenance deficiencies are linked to the operation and maintenance of a building and the units in it and are usually less profound and more easily repaired than are structural problems. At the same time, both are a function of investment decisions; but structural deficiencies are largely connected to capital disinvestment, while maintenance deficiencies are a reflection of efforts to reduce current expenses.

In 1999, of rental units in dilapidated buildings, only 19.3 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while 30.9 percent had five or more deficiencies (Table 7.19). On the other hand, of rental units in non-dilapidated buildings, 45.8 percent had no deficiencies, while only 4.1 percent had five or more deficiencies. A similar inverse relationship existed between building defects and maintenance conditions in 1999. Of rental units in buildings with no defects, 47.7 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while only 3.3 percent had five or more maintenance deficiencies. On the other hand, of rental units in buildings with three or more defect types, only 15.8 percent had no maintenance deficiencies, while 23.7 percent had five or more deficiencies.

	Number of Deficiencies							
<b>Building Condition</b>	Total	0	1-2	3-4	5 or More			
All	100.0%	45.5%	36.4%	13.6%	4.4%			
<b>Dilapidation Status</b>								
Dilapidated	100.0%	19.3%	19.9%	30.0%	30.9%			
Not Dilapidated	100.0%	45.8%	36.6%	13.4%	4.1%			
Number of Building Defect Types								
None	100.0%	47.7%	36.9%	12.0%	3.3%			
One	100.0%	31.6%	36.0%	22.7%	9.7%			
Two	100.0%	19.7%	33.6%	30.5%	16.2%			
Three or More	100.0%	15.8%	20.4%	40.1%	23.7%			

Table 7.19
Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Building Condition
by Number of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies
New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Maintenance Deficiencies in Owner Occupied Units

Maintenance conditions of owner units were substantially better than those of rental units. In 1999, 70.2 percent of owner units, compared to 45.5 percent of renter units, had no maintenance deficiencies (Tables 7.19 and 7.20). Of owner units, Mitchell-Lama cooperatives had the best maintenance condition: 74.8 percent had no maintenance deficiencies (Table 7.20). Conventional owner units were the next best (71.3 percent were maintenance-deficiency free), followed by private cooperatives (67.2 percent had no deficiencies), and condominiums (63.6 percent had no deficiencies).

New Tork City 1999								
	Number of Deficiencies							
Form of Ownership	Total	0	1-2	3-4	5 or More			
All	100.0%	70.2%	26.7%	2.7%	0.4%			
Conventional	100.0%	71.3%	25.8%	2.6%	0.4%*			
Coop								
Private	100.0%	67.2%	29.4%	2.8%	**			
Mitchell-Lama	100.0%	74.8%	22.8%	2.4%*	**			
Condominium	100.0%	63.6%	31.9%	4.0%*	**			

#### Table 7.20 Distribution of Maintenance and Equipment Deficiencies in Owner Occupied Units by Form of Ownership New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

# **Physically Poor Occupied Rental Units**

#### Characteristics of Physically Poor Occupied Rental Units

As discussed above, physical housing conditions can be approximated by two housing-condition components covered in the HVS: the structural condition of the building containing the unit, and the adequacy of maintenance and equipment for the unit. Also as discussed above, these two components reflect quite different aspects of physical conditions. "Dilapidation" and "structural defects" do not describe physical problems occupants suffer that are caused by "deficiencies in maintenance and equipment." At the same time, "deficiencies in maintenance and equipment" does not indicate the level of potential danger occupants face because of poor structural conditions. Some buildings are too poor structurally to be habitable, while some units have too many maintenance deficiencies to provide decent housing services to occupants. Thus, it is useful to assess the number of housing units that are in physically poor condition due to structural and/or maintenance defects. In doing this, it appears reasonable to focus on renter-occupied units, since owner units do not have serious physical problems and the HVS does not provide data on maintenance deficiencies for vacant units.

The definition of a physically poor housing unit used by the City for many years in the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) and Consolidated Plan, which have been required by and submitted to HUD, is "a housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bath for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects." Applying this definition, the 1999 HVS reports that the physical condition of housing units in the City improved markedly. There were 203,000 physically poor renter-occupied units in 1999 (Table 7.21). This is a 23.1-percent decline from 1996, when the number was 264,000, and a 37.9-percent decline from 1991, when the number was 327,000. As a result of this decline, physically poor occupied renter units' share of all occupied rental units in the City declined by 6.4 percentage points from 16.8 percent in 1991 to 10.4 percent in 1999.

Table 7.21
Number and Incidence of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Borough
New York City, Selected Years 1991 - 1999

	Number and Percent Physically Poor Units								
	19	91	1993		1996		1999		
Borough	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
All	327,234	16.8%	263,872	13.4%	263,955	13.6%	203,086	10.4%	
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	73,006	22.0%	51,627	15.8%	62,227	19.0%	47,435	14.5%	
Brooklyn	109,046	18.1%	84,714	14.2%	84,640	14.3%	70,215	11.9%	
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	107,377	18.9%	96,360	16.7%	87,529	15.6%	61,184	10.9%	
Queens	33,406	8.4%	28,063	6.7%	25,152	6.1%	21,822	5.2%	
Staten Island	4,400	8.8%	3,108	6.1%	4,407	8.4%	2,428*	4.6%	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

b A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

The proportion of physically poor occupied renter units declined noticeably in each of the five boroughs--particularly in the south Bronx, Harlem in Manhattan, and the northern portion of Brooklyn-in the eight years between 1991 and 1999 (Maps 7.5 and 7.6). The decline in each of the boroughs between 1996 and 1999 alone was considerable.

Map 7.5 Physically Poor\* Occupied Rental Units as a Percentage of Total Occupied Rental Units New York City 1991



Map 7.6 Physically Poor\* Occupied Rental Units as a Percentage of Total Occupied Rental Units New York City 1999



Physically poor occupied renter units were not evenly scattered around the five boroughs. When their distribution is examined by borough, the unique geographical concentrations of such units emerge. The number of physically poor units in the Bronx dropped by 23.8 percent or 15,000 units, from 62,000 in 1996 to 47,000 in 1999 (Table 7.21, Figure 7.3). However, in 1999 the number of physically poor renter-occupied units in the borough was still 23.4 percent of the 203,000 such units in the City, while only 16.8 percent of all renter-occupied units in the City were located in the borough (Table 7.22). The Bronx still had the highest incidence of physically poor housing of any borough: 14.5 percent. In Manhattan, the number of physically poor units also declined, by 30.1 percent or 26,000 units, from 88,000 in 1996 to 61,000 in 1999, but the borough still had a higher proportion of physically poor units than its share of renter-occupied units, 30.1 percent compared to 28.7 percent. The number of physically poor units dropped as well in Brooklyn (by 17.0 percent or 14,000 units, from 85,000 in 1996 to 70,000 in 1999), where 34.6 percent of the physically poor renter units in the City were located, compared to the borough's share of 30.1 percent of the City's renter-occupied units.

On the other hand, Queens' proportionate share of physically poor units, compared to its share of renter-occupied units, was low. In 1999, of all the physically poor renter-occupied units in the City, 22,000, or 10.7 percent, were located in Queens, while 21.7 percent of all renter-occupied units in the City were in the borough (Table 7.22).



Figure 7.3 Number of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Borough New York City 1999

			Type of Physically Poor Condition				
Borough	Total	Physically Poor <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies	
Number							
All	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380	
Bronx <sup>b</sup>	327,444	47,435	6,381	2,505*	8,521	35,876	
Brooklyn	587,780	70,215	11,455	4,442	7,492	53,591	
Manhattan <sup>b</sup>	561,534	61,184	17,375	8,920	9,927	37,976	
Queens	423,405	21,822	2,836*	2,952*	2,085*	16,441	
Staten Island	53,126	2,428*	**	**	**	**	
Distribution							
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Bronx <sup>b</sup>	16.8	23.4	16.4%	13.2%	30.4%	24.7%	
Brooklyn	30.1	34.6	29.5%	23.4%	26.7%	36.9%	
Manhattan <sup>b</sup>	28.7	30.1	44.8%	46.9%	35.4%	26.1%	
Queens	21.7	10.7	7.3%	15.5%	7.4%	11.3%	
Staten Island	2.7	1.2	**	**	**	1.0%*	

# Table 7.22 Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Borough by Type of Physically Poor Condition New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

Physical housing condition is most closely related to the age of the dwelling. Of all physically poor occupied renter units in 1999, close to six in ten were in either Old-Law tenement buildings (13.8 percent) or New-Law tenement buildings (41.8 percent), a much higher share than their proportion of renter-occupied units in these two structure classes (9.4 percent and 31.0 percent respectively) (Table 7.23). On the other hand, only a quarter (25.8 percent) of physically poor renter-occupied units were located in multiple dwellings built after 1929, although 38.1 percent of the occupied renter units in the City were in such dwellings.

			Type of Physically Poor Condition				
Structure Class	All	Physically Poor <sup>c</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies	
Number				1	<b>JT</b>		
All <sup>a</sup>	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380	
Multiple Dwellings							
Old-Law Tenement	174,539	26,236	**	6,852	7,493	17,661	
New-Law Tenement	575,118	79,368	8,266	5,627	13,362	63,278	
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	705,257	49,064	4,939	**	2,141*	42,443	
Other	53,842	15,873	14,556	**	**	**	
Converted	90,565	6,412	2,047*	**	**	4,028	
1-2 Unit Houses	253,622	13,109	2,653*	**	**	8,973	
Distribution							
All <sup>b</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Multiple Dwellings							
Old-Law Tenement	9.4%	13.8%	5.6%	41.0%	29.5%	12.8%	
New-Law Tenement	31.0%	41.8%	24.0%	33.7%	52.6%	45.7%	
Post-1929 Multiple Dwelling	38.1%	25.8%	14.4%	8.3%*	8.4%	30.7%	
Other	2.9%	8.4%	42.3%	**	**	1.4%*	
Converted	4.9%	3.4%	5.9%	**	**	2.9%	
1-2 Unit Houses	13.7%	6.9%	7.7%	10.3%*	5.1%*	6.5%	

# Table 7.23 Number and Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Structure Class by Type of Physically Poor Condition New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Includes units whose structure class within multiple dwellings was not reported.

b Excludes units whose structure class was not reported.

c A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

	1101	Tork Ony 1777		
Number of Units In Building	Total Renter Occupied Units	Number Physically Poor <sup>a</sup>	Percent that are Physically Poor (Incidence)	Percent of Physically Poor Renter Units
All	1,953,289	203,086	10.4%	100.0%
1 – 2	253,622	13,109	5.2%	6.5%
3 – 19	513,937	64,524	12.6%	31.8%
20 - 49	448,629	59,962	13.4%	29.5%
50 - 99	335,655	33,927	10.1%	16.7%
100 +	401,446	31,563	7.9%	15.5%

# Table 7.24 Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Building Size New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

Smaller multi-family buildings have a relatively higher incidence of poor housing. Of renteroccupied units in buildings with 3-19 units and buildings with 20-49 units, 12.6 percent and 13.4 percent respectively were in physically poor housing, compared to 10.1 percent for buildings with 50-99 units and just 7.9 percent for buildings with more than 100 units. At the same time, the city-wide proportion for rental housing in physically poor condition was 10.4 percent (Table 7.24).

Compared to their overall share of renter-occupied units in the City, larger units (those with three or more bedrooms) had a higher share of physically poor units in 1999. Of the physically poor renter-occupied units in the City, 17.1 percent were units with three or more bedrooms, while only 14.5 percent of renter-occupied units in the City as a whole were such large units (Table 7.25). This is a very serious finding, since for the City as a whole, there has been and remains a great shortage of large units compared to the number of large households, particularly large households with low incomes. Specifically, the crowding rates for four-person and five-person households were 22.2 percent and 51.6 percent respectively, while the rate for all renter households as a whole was 11.0 percent (see Table 7.46) (The seriousness of the shortage of large units, in terms of crowding, will be further discussed in the section on crowding below.) Studios also had a higher share of physically poor rental units compared to the physically poor studios were in such condition because they did not have complete kitchens and/or bathrooms for the exclusive use of the tenant. In other words, they were SROs or SRO-type rental units.

In 1999, in *in rem* housing, 42.0 percent of units were physically poor. Rent-stabilized housing built in or before 1947 also had a higher incidence of physically poor housing, with 14.8 percent of its units in poor condition, compared to 10.4 percent of all renter units in the City. In fact, because a very high proportion of the City's rental units were in pre-1947 stabilized housing, this category contained more than half (54.7 percent) of the units in poor condition in the City (Table 7.26).

# Table 7.25 Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Unit Size (Number of Bedrooms) by Type of Physically Poor Condition New York City 1999

			Type of Physically Poor Condition				
Number of Bedrooms	Total	Physically Poor <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies	
Number							
All	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380	
None	169,916	25,550	18,553	**	**	7,393	
One	797,476	71,931	11,296	8,707	13,470	51,236	
Two	703,189	70,794	6,429	6,741	8,902	57,525	
Three or More	282,708	34,811	2,515*	3,109	4,124	29,226	
Distribution							
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
None	8.7%	12.6%	47.8%	**	5.5%*	5.1%	
One	40.8%	35.4%	29.1%	45.8%	48.1%	35.2%	
Two	36.0%	34.9%	16.6%	35.5%	31.8%	39.6%	
Three or More	14.5%	17.1%	6.5%	16.4%	14.7%	20.1%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

The lower the rent, the more likely it is that units will be in physically poor condition. In 1999, the majority of physically poor occupied renter units were low-rent units: six in ten had contract rents of either \$1-\$399 (27.1 percent) or \$400-\$599 (34.1 percent) (Table 7.27). On the other hand, of occupied rental units with rents of \$900-\$1,249, only a little over one in twenty were physically poor units, while, of such units with rents of \$1,250 or more, the proportion of physically poor units was just less than one in forty.

#### Characteristics of Households Occupying Physically Poor Rental Units

Three-quarters of the households occupying physically poor rental units in 1999 were either black, Puerto Rican, or non-Puerto Rican Hispanic (Figure 7.4). Of households living in such units,

Regulatory Status	Total	Number Physically Poor <sup>a</sup>	Percent that are Physically Poor (Incidence)	Percent of Physically Poor Renter Units
All	1,953,289	203,086	10.4%	100.0%
Controlled	52,562	5,013	9.5%	2.5%
Stabilized	1,020,588	122,780	12.0%	60.5%
Pre-1947	749,010	111,120	14.8%	54.7%
Post-1947	271,578	11,660	4.3%	5.7%
Other Regulated	122,685	9,920	8.1%	4.9%
Mitchell-Lama	67,146	4,207	6.3%	2.1%
Other <sup>b</sup>	55,539	5,714	10.3%	2.8%
Unregulated	572,862	37,909	6.6%	18.7%
In Rental Buildings	507,371	34,753	6.8%	17.1%
Sublet Coops	65,492	3,156	4.8%	1.6%
Public Housing	169,339	21,053	12.4%	10.4%
In Rem	15,253	6,411	42.0%	3.2%

# Table 7.26Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Rent Regulatory Status<br/>New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Includes primarily units whose rents are regulated by HUD, and also units with rents regulated by the Loft Board or under the provisions of the Article 4 program, which built limited-profit rental buildings for households with moderate incomes under Article 4 of the state PHFL.

blacks accounted for 36.5 percent. In comparison, 24.5 percent of all renter households were black (Table 7.28). Puerto Ricans' and non-Puerto Rican Hispanics' shares of households in such units were 18.5 percent and 19.9 percent respectively, while their corresponding shares of all renter households were 12.3 percent and 16.2 percent respectively.

Compared to their share of all renter households, proportionately more households with children lived in physically poor rental units. In 1999, of households in such units, 17.4 percent were single adults with minor children, while this household type's share of all renter households in the City was only 10.2 percent (Table 7.29). At the same time, 29.7 percent of households in physically poor rental units were adults with minor children, while this household type's share of all renter households was 24.6 percent. On the other hand, relatively fewer single-elderly households and adult households lived in physically poor rental units. Of households in physically poor occupied rental units, only 7.2 percent were single-elderly households, while their share of all renter households was 12.2 percent. At the same time, 17.0 percent of households in such units were adult households was 22.7 percent.

Table 7.27
Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Interval (in 1999 dollars)
New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999

			1999				
<b>Contract Rent</b>			All Renter	Occupied	Physically Poor Units <sup>a</sup>		
Interval	1993	1996	Number	Percent <sup>c</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>c</sup>	
$\mathrm{All}^\mathrm{b}$	263,872	263,955	1,953,289	100.0%	203,086	100.0%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	86,059	72,245	305,269	15.8%	54,755	27.1%	
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	95,992	88,961	489,969	25.4%	68,808	34.1%	
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	28,001	43,446	313,967	16.3%	29,533	14.6%	
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	29,530	33,375	413,068	21.4%	30,785	15.3%	
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	14,945	15,203	243,965	12.6%	13,353	6.6%	
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and Over	5,366	7,513	162,603	8.4%	4,489	2.2%	

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Total includes units for which no cash rent was reported.

c Total excludes units for which no cash rent was reported.

As seen in the pattern revealed in the relationship between the proportion of physically poor occupied rental units and the level of contract rent, the lower the household income, the more likely it is that a household will be living in physically poor rental units. Of households in physically poor rental units, six in ten were households with incomes of less than \$25,000 in 1998, while a little fewer than five in ten of all renter households had incomes at that level (Table 7.30). Of households in physically poor rental units, a markedly high 43.0 percent had incomes below \$15,000 (Figure 7.5).

Among households with incomes below the poverty level in 1998, 15.3 percent lived in physically poor housing, and 19.5 percent of households receiving public assistance lived in physically poor housing, compared to 10.4 percent of all renter households in 1999.<sup>4</sup>

Of households occupying physically poor rental units in the City in 1999, 52.7 percent paid more than 30.0 percent of their incomes for gross rent, while the city-wide median rent-income ratio was 29.4 percent (Table 7.31). At the same time, 31.8 percent of households occupying physically poor units paid more than 50.0 percent of their incomes for rent, while 26.7 percent of all renter households in the City paid that much.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Figure 7.4 Incidence of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units and Specific Physically Poor Conditions by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999



Of heads of all renter households in the City in 1999, 21.4 percent were born in Puerto Rico or the rest of the Caribbean. But 29.7 percent, or three in ten, of the heads of households living in physically poor rental units were born in Puerto Rico or the rest of the Caribbean (Table 7.32). On the other hand, 9.3 percent, or almost one in ten, of renter household heads in the City were from Europe, while only 4.1 percent, or less than one in twenty, of the household heads living in physically poor rental units were from Europe. In short, a relatively large proportion of households in physically poor rental units were from the Caribbean, while a relatively small proportion of households in such units were from Europe.

# **Neighborhood Physical Condition**

Neighborhood quality is important to residents' satisfaction with their housing and is certainly one of the most serious of community concerns. But measuring neighborhood quality in a reliable manner is not easy. There is neither a standard conceptual definition of what a suitable neighborhood is, nor are there generally accepted and usable operational standards by which to measure neighborhood

			Type of Physically Poor Condition					
Race/ Ethnicity	All	Physically Poor Units <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies		
Number								
All	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380		
White	769,226	38,988	11,737	3,723	4,014	22,900		
Black	477,632	74,147	12,574	6,845	7,527	58,480		
Puerto Rican	239,354	37,561	3,893	2,687*	6,963	29,768		
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	316,173	40,323	6,584	3,995	8,636	27,640		
Asian	141,667	10,435	3,818	**	**	5,370		
Native American	9,236	**	**	**	**	**		
Distribution								
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
White	39.4%	19.2%	30.3%	19.6%	14.3%	15.8%		
Black	24.5%	36.5%	32.4%	36.0%	26.9%	40.2%		
Puerto Rican	12.3%	18.5%	10.0%	14.1%	24.8%	20.5%		
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	16.2%	19.9%	17.0%	21.0%	30.8%	19.0%		
Asian	7.3%	5.1%	9.8%	8.1%*	**	3.7%		
Native American	0.5%	0.8%*	**	**	**	0.8%*		

# Table 7.28 Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Race/Ethnicity by Type of Physically Poor Condition New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

# Table 7.29 Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Household Type by Type of Physically Poor Condition New York City 1999

			Type of Physically Poor Condition				
Household Type	All	Physically Poor Units <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies	
Number							
All	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380	
Single Elderly	238,139	14,592	5,415	**	2,166*	7,675	
Single Adult	463,055	48,932	18,656	6,149	7,619	24,746	
Single with Minor Child(ren)	199,974	35,335	2,979*	2,283*	4,278	31,166	
Elderly Household	126,795	9,472	**	**	**	6,450	
Adult Household	444,556	34,539	4,382	2,774*	3,777	27,117	
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	480,770	60,217	6,007	4,919	9,067	48,225	
Distribution							
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Single Elderly	12.2%	7.2%	14.0%	9.8*%	7.7%	5.3%	
Single Adult	23.7%	24.1%	48.1%	32.4%	27.2%	17.0%	
Single with Minor Child(ren)	10.2%	17.4%	7.7%	12.0%	15.3%	21.4%	
Elderly Household	6.5%	4.7%	3.5%*	5.4%*	4.0*%	4.4%	
Adult Household	22.7%	17.0%	11.3%	14.6%	13.5%	18.7%	
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	24.6%	29.7%	15.5%	25.9%	32.4%	33.2%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

			Type of Physically Poor Condition					
Household Income Group	All	Physically Poor Units <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies		
Number								
$All^b$	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380		
< \$15,000	627,151	87,305	17,489	7,154	13,906	63,458		
<sup>\$</sup> 15-24,999	300,746	37,750	6,472	3,468	6,367	27,429		
<sup>\$</sup> 25-39,999	360,678	31,970	5,708	3,264	3,895	21,981		
<sup>\$</sup> 40-49,999	170,439	15,375	2,802*	2,297*	**	11,036		
<sup>\$</sup> 50-69,999	231,490	17,624	3,606	**	**	12,179		
<sup>\$</sup> 70,000 +	262,784	13,062	2,716*	**	**	9,297		
Distribution								
All	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
< \$15,000	32.1%	43.0%	45.1%	37.6%	49.6%	43.6%		
<sup>\$</sup> 15-24,999	15.4%	18.6%	16.7%	18.2%	22.7%	18.9%		
<sup>\$</sup> 25-39,999	18.5%	15.7%	14.7%	17.2%	13.9%	15.1%		
<sup>\$</sup> 40-49,999	8.7%	7.6%	7.2%	12.1%	5.0%*	7.6%		
<sup>\$</sup> 50-69,999	11.9%	8.7%	9.3%	9.1%*	5.6%*	8.4%		
<sup>\$</sup> 70,000 +	13.5%	6.4%	7.0%	5.8%*	**	6.4%		

# Table 7.30 Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units by Income Group by Type of Physically Poor Condition New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Includes units occupied by households whose incomes are zero or negative.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

Figure 7.5 Incidence of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units and Specific Physically Poor Conditions by Income Group New York City 1999



quality. One of the major difficulties in measuring it stems from the subjectivity of residents' judgments about their present neighborhoods and their preferences toward alternative neighborhoods. These judgments and preferences are influenced by residents' current and previous life experiences. Residents' reactions to existing as well as hypothetical neighborhoods are influenced by their social and economic situations; and their preferences for and judgments about living environments undergo changes with changes in age, life status, and income level, among other things.<sup>5</sup>

# Neighborhood Conditions of Renter-Occupied Housing

The HVS collects information on three variables intended to indicate the physical condition of buildings in the neighborhood of each sampled unit. First, the interviewer objectively notes his or her observation of the presence or absence of buildings with broken or boarded-up windows on the street where the sample unit is located. Second, the respondent residing in the sample unit is asked to report

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Peter Marcuse, Rental Housing in the City of New York: Supply and Condition, 1975-1978, page 176.

			Type of Physically Poor Condition				
Gross Rent/Income Ratio	All	Physically Poor Units <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies	
Number							
All <sup>b</sup>	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380	
30% or less	932,635	88,744	17,641	9,031	10,511	61,681	
31% - 40%	236,353	25,932	3,999	2,040*	4,201	20,188	
41% - 50%	147,388	13,387	3,438	**	**	9,286	
51% - 70%	162,490	16,077	2,581*	**	2,458*	12,039	
Over 70%	318,902	43,437	6,762	3,256	7,573	32,399	
Distribution							
All <sup>c</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
30% or less	51.9%	47.3%	51.3%	52.5%	39.7%	45.5%	
31% - 40%	13.1%	13.8%	11.6%	11.9%	15.9%	14.9%	
41% - 50%	8.2%	7.1%	10.0%	9.4%*	6.6%*	6.8%	
51% - 70%	9.0%	8.6%	7.5%	7.3%*	9.3%	8.9%	
Over 70%	17.7%	23.2%	19.6%	18.9%	28.6%	23.9%	

# Table 7.31Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Unitsby Gross Rent/Income Ratio by Type of Physically Poor ConditionNew York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Includes units occupied by households with zero or negative incomes and households with no cash rent.

c Excludes households with zero or negative incomes and households with no cash rent.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

Table 7.32
Distribution of Physically Poor Renter Occupied Units
by Birthplace of Household Head by Type of Physically Poor Condition
New York City 1999

			Type of Physically Poor Condition					
Birthplace Region	All	Physically Poor Units <sup>a</sup>	Incomplete Bathroom or Kitchen	Dilapidated	3 or More Building Defect Types	4 or More Maintenance Deficiencies		
Number								
All <sup>b</sup>	1,953,289	203,086	38,792	19,006	28,025	145,380		
USA	825,588	95,499	16,597	7,078	9,866	75,105		
Puerto Rico	117,957	17,964	**	**	3,765	14,184		
Caribbean	231,335	38,515	4,666	3,661	7,217	29,622		
Latin America	137,132	13,768	2,901*	**	2,260*	8,737		
Europe	152,435	7,808	**	**	**	5,512		
Asia	113,827	8,959	2,556*	**	**	5,495		
Africa	22,075	3,927	**	**	**	3,227		
Other	30,885	3,718	**	**	**	2,866*		
Distribution								
All <sup>c</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		
USA	50.6%	50.2%	54.6%	45.0%	38.1%	51.9%		
Puerto Rico	7.2%	9.4%	3.9%*	9.1%*	14.6%	9.8%		
Caribbean	14.2%	20.3%	15.4%	23.3%	27.9%	20.5%		
Latin America	8.4%	7.2%	9.5%	6.6%*	8.7%	6.0%		
Europe	9.3%	4.1%	5.4%*	**	**	3.8%		
Asia	7.0%	4.7%	8.4%	7.4%*	**	3.8%		
Africa	1.4%	2.1%	**	**	**	2.2%		
Other	1.9%	2.0%	**	**	**	2.0%		

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Includes units occupied by households that did not report birthplace region.

c Excludes units occupied by households that did not report birthplace region.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

if there are any boarded-up buildings in the neighborhood where the sample unit is located. In asking the respondent this question, the HVS does not provide a definition of "neighborhood." Instead, "neighborhood" can be defined any way the respondent wants to define it. The third variable is based on a perception-based rating by the sample unit's respondent of the "physical condition of residential structures in this neighborhood." When the question is asked, again, "neighborhood" is not defined, so answers relate to what the respondent perceives to be his or her neighborhood. It is important to note that the HVS questionnaire limits the definition of neighborhood quality to a physical aspect of that quality and excludes neighborhood services, such as schools, hospitals, sanitation, and many other services provided by public or private agencies or individuals; it also excludes psychological, social, and/or socio-economic aspects of neighborhood characteristics. This ensures that survey interviewers and respondents understand the definition clearly, thereby making it possible to gather reliable and easyto-understand data on the subject.

The 1999 HVS reports that neighborhood physical conditions in New York City improved markedly between 1996 and 1999. The proportion of renter-occupied units on the same street as a building with broken or boarded-up windows (boarded-up buildings) declined by 2.6 percentage points (from 11.4 percent to 8.8 percent) during the three-year period (Table 7.33). Since 1991, this indicator of neighborhood physical condition has improved steadily, going from 15.7 percent in 1991 to 13.7 percent in 1993, 11.4 percent in 1996, and 8.8 percent in 1999.

		-		
Borough	1991	1993	1996	1999
All	15.7%	13.7%	11.4%	8.8%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	16.2%	9.1%	10.0%	6.9%
Brooklyn	18.0%	14.7%	16.0%	12.7%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	20.6%	22.0%	12.6%	11.3%
Queens	4.7%	5.0%	4.7%	2.4%
Staten Island	17.1%	9.9%	9.4%	2.1%*

Table 7.33 Incidence of Renter Occupied Units on Same Street as a Building with Broken/Boarded-Up Windows, by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1991-1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx (1993, 1996, and 1999); in Manhattan (1991)

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

Figure 7.6 Incidence of Renter Occupied Units on Same Street as a Building with Broken/Boarded-Up Windows by Borough New York City, Selected Years 1981-1999



Neighborhood physical condition improved in every borough between 1996 and 1999 (Figure 7.6). The greatest improvement was made in Staten Island, where the proportion of units on streets with boarded-up buildings declined overall by 15.0 percentage points (from 17.1 percent in 1991, to 9.9 percent in 1993, 9.4 percent in 1996, and 2.1 percent in 1999) (Table 7.33) (Maps 7.7 and 7.8). During the eight years between 1991 and 1999, neighborhood physical condition also improved in the Bronx and Brooklyn: by 9.3 percentage points (from 16.2 percent to 6.9 percent) and by 5.3 percentage points (from 18.0 percent to 12.7 percent) respectively. The improvement in two areas of the two boroughs, the south Bronx and the northern portion of Brooklyn, during the eight-year period was particularly noticeable.

Map 7.7 Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units on the Same Street as a Building with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows New York City 1991



After a substantial 9.4-percentage-point improvement during the previous three years, neighborhood condition in Manhattan improved further by another 1.3 percentage points (from 12.6 percent to 11.3 percent) between 1996 and 1999. Between 1993 and 1999, neighborhood condition in the borough improved by 10.7 percentage points (from 22.0 percent to 11.3 percent). Altogether, this represents a 48.6-percent improvement over the six years. The improvement in the northern portion of Manhattan, particularly Harlem and Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights, between 1991 and 1999 was visibly apparent.

Map 7.8 Percentage of Renter-Occupied Units on the Same Street as a Building with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows New York City 1999



As expected, there is an inverse relationship between the level of rent and neighborhood condition: the higher the contract rent in a neighborhood, the better the physical condition of that neighborhood. In other words, the proportion of renter-occupied units on streets with boarded-up buildings declines as the level of contract rent increases. Of renter-occupied units with contract rents of \$1-\$399, 14.0 percent were on streets with boarded-up buildings (Table 7.34). The corresponding proportion for units with contract rents of \$400-\$599 was 11.2 percent. The proportions were 7.3 percent for units with rents of \$600-\$699 and 6.9 percent for units with rents of \$700-\$899. The proportion continued to decline as rents grew, dropping to 4.7 percent for units with rents of \$900-\$1,249; but it did not decrease further for units in the highest rent level, \$1,250 and above.

# Table 7.34 Percentage of Renter Occupied Units on Same Street as a Building with Broken/Boarded-Up Windows by Contract Rent Level New York City 1999

Contract Rent Level <sup>a</sup>	Percentage on Street with a Building with Broken/Boarded-Up Windows
All	8.8%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	14.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	11.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	7.3%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	6.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	4.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and Over	5.4%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

Notes:

a Excludes units occupied by households who paid no cash rent.

#### Residents' Satisfaction with the Physical Condition of Neighborhood Residential Structures

The opinions of the City's residents supported the Census Bureau's observation of considerable improvement in neighborhood physical conditions between 1996 and 1999. According to the 1999 HVS, of renter households in the City, 68.6 percent rated the condition of their neighborhoods' residential structures as either "good" (54.0 percent) or "excellent" (14.6 percent) (Table 7.35). This was an improvement of 4.7 percentage points over the three-year period.

In 1999, renter residents in each of the five boroughs gave higher ratings of neighborhood conditions in their borough than they did three years earlier. The levels of tenants' ratings of the physical condition of residential structures in their neighborhoods increased visibly in all five boroughs in the three-year period between 1996 and 1999, as they did in the eight-year period between 1991 and 1999 (Maps 7.9 and 7.10). In Manhattan, the proportion of renters who rated the physical condition of their neighborhood as "good" or "excellent" increased by 6.8 percentage points, from 66.8 percent to 73.6 percent (Table 7.35). This increase derived mostly from a 5.7-percentage-point increase (from 17.0 percent to 22.7 percent) in those rating the physical condition of their Manhattan neighborhood as "excellent." A similar improvement occurred in Staten Island. In 1999, 83.6 percent of renters there rated their neighborhood's physical condition as either "good" or "excellent," a 5.2-percentage-point increase in those rating the condition of their neighborhood as "excellent." Of renters in Queens, 74.6 percent rated the condition of their neighborhood as either "good" or "excellent" in 1999 (Figure 7.7). Almost all of this 3.3-percentage-point improvement over the three years was a consequence of a 3.2-percentage-point improvement in those rating the condition of their neighborhood as "excellent."

Rating of Physical Condition of Residential Structures in Neighborhood					
Borough	All	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1996					
All	100.0%	12.1%	51.8%	28.6%	7.5%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	7.3%	47.5%	34.8%	10.5%
Brooklyn	100.0%	9.5%	50.6%	31.4%	8.5%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	17.0%	49.8%	25.4%	7.8%
Queens	100.0%	10.9%	60.4%	25.1%	3.7%
Staten Island	100.0%	30.3%	48.1%	18.1%	3.4%*
1999					
All	100.0%	14.6%	54.0%	25.7%	5.7%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	7.4%	51.0%	34.4%	7.3%
Brooklyn	100.0%	10.3%	54.1%	29.3%	6.4%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	22.7%	50.9%	20.8%	5.6%
Queens	100.0%	14.1%	60.5%	21.7%	3.7%
Staten Island	100.0%	35.6%	48.0%	12.3%	4.0%*

# Table 7.35 Distribution of Renter Ratings of the Physical Condition of Residential Structures in the Neighborhood by Borough New York City 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Note:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

In general, in neighborhoods where the rent was higher, renters' ratings of neighborhood physical condition were also higher. This relationship was valid throughout the rent levels, particularly for ratings of "excellent" and "poor." Of renters who paid contract rents of \$1-\$399, only 7.1 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "excellent" (Table 7.36). But the rating moved up steadily as rent levels moved up: to 8.2 percent for renters paying \$400-\$599, 11.9 percent for those paying \$600-\$699, and 15.9 percent for those paying \$700-\$899. The rating climbed to 23.4 percent for renters paying \$900-\$1,249 and to 37.8 percent for those paying \$1,250 or more.

The relationship between rent level and neighborhood rating is also clearly illustrated by the steady decline in the level of median contract rent from the \$800 paid by those rating their neighborhood residential structures as "excellent," to the lower median contract rents of \$650, \$579, and \$508 paid respectively by those rating their neighborhood residential structures as "good," "fair," and "poor" (Table 7.36).

Map 7.9 Percentage of Renters Rating the Physical Condition of Residential Buildings in Their Neighborhood as "Good" or "Excellent" New York City 1991



Map 7.10 Percentage of Renters Rating the Physical Condition of Residential Buildings in Their Neighborhood as "Good" or "Excellent" New York City, 1999



Figure 7.7 Renter Household Ratings of Physical Condition of Residential Structures in the Neighborhood by Borough New York City 1999



Table 7.36
Distribution of Renter Ratings of the Physical Condition
of Residential Structures in the Neighborhood by Contract Rent Level
New York City 1999

	0	v		· ·	, ,
Contract Rent Level	All	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
All <sup>a</sup>	100.0%	14.6%	54.0%	25.7%	5.7%
<sup>\$</sup> 1 - <sup>\$</sup> 399	100.0%	7.1%	48.9%	34.1%	9.9%
<sup>\$</sup> 400 - <sup>\$</sup> 599	100.0%	8.2%	53.2%	30.6%	8.0%
<sup>\$</sup> 600 - <sup>\$</sup> 699	100.0%	11.9%	55.7%	27.9%	4.5%
<sup>\$</sup> 700 - <sup>\$</sup> 899	100.0%	15.9%	58.0%	22.5%	3.6%
<sup>\$</sup> 900 - <sup>\$</sup> 1,249	100.0%	23.4%	54.8%	18.6%	3.2%
<sup>\$</sup> 1,250 and Over	100.0%	37.8%	51.1%	10.0%	1.1%*
Median Contract Rent	<sup>\$</sup> 648	<sup>\$</sup> 800	<sup>\$</sup> 650	<sup>\$</sup> 579	<sup>\$</sup> 508

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note:

a Includes those who reported no cash rent.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

On the other hand, the level of tenants' rating the physical condition of their neighborhood as "poor" decreased as rent levels increased. Of tenants paying a contract rent of \$1-\$399, 9.9 percent rated the physical condition of their neighborhood as "poor" (Table 7.36). The rate decreased steadily, without exceptions, as the rent level increased, dwindling to 1.1 percent for renters paying rents of \$1,250 or more.

Compared to the interviewers' observations of the existence of buildings with broken or boarded-up windows on the streets where sample units were located, residents' ratings of the physical condition of their neighborhoods were relatively less objective. However, according to the 1999 HVS, data on two neighborhood conditions supported each other. Specifically, of renters whose units were on streets with boarded-up buildings, 15.6 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "poor," while of renters whose units were on streets without boarded-up buildings, only 4.6 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as "poor" (Table 7.37). Conversely, of renters who lived on streets without boarded-up buildings, 71.2 percent rated their neighborhood's physical condition as either "good" or "excellent," while only 4.6 percent rated it as "poor."

New York City 1999			
Rating of the Physical Condition of Residential	Presence/Absence of Buildings with Broken or Boarded- Up Windows on Renter's Street		
Buildings in Renter's Neighborhood	Present	Absent	
All	100.0%	100.0%	
Excellent	5.5%	15.6%	
Good	38.2%	55.6%	
Fair	40.8%	24.2%	
Poor	15.6%	4.6%	

Table 7.37 Distribution of Renter Ratings of the Physical Condition of Residential Buildings in the Renter's Neighborhood by the Presence/Absence of Buildings with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows on Renter's Street New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

#### Housing and Neighborhood Conditions of Immigrant Renter Households

Housing unit and building conditions, as well as neighborhood condition, for immigrant renter households were slightly poorer than for all renter households. In 1999, of renter units occupied by immigrant households, 12.6 percent were in buildings with one or more building defect types, compared to 10.8 percent for non-immigrant renter households (Table 7.38). The percent of immigrant-household rental units with no maintenance deficiencies was 43.4 percent, compared to 45.8 percent for non-immigrant renter households.
In 1999, the percent of immigrant renter households living on the same street as any buildings with broken or boarded-up windows was 7.3 percent, compared to 9.8 percent for non-immigrant renters (Table 7.38). At the same time, 65.8 percent of immigrant renter households rated the physical condition of their neighborhood's residential structures as "good" or "excellent," compared to 70.0 percent of non-immigrant renter households.

Condition Characteristic	All Renter Households	Immigrant Households	Non-Immigrant Households <sup>b</sup>
Total	1,953,289	559,695	1,023,180
Physically Poor <sup>a</sup>	10.4%	11.3%	11.9%
Unit Conditions			
0 Maintenance Deficiencies	45.5%	43.4%	45.8%
4+ Maintenance Deficiencies	9.7%	9.2%	10.3%
Crowding			
1.01+ persons per room	11.0%	21.2%	6.9%
1.51+ persons per room	3.9%	6.9%	2.4%
Mean household size	2.48	3.02	2.34
<b>Building Conditions</b>			
Dilapidated	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%
One or More Defect Types	10.9%	12.6%	10.8%
Neighborhood Conditions			
Rating Good/Excellent	68.6%	65.8%	70.0%
Rating Fair/Poor	31.4%	34.2%	30.0%
Boarded Up Buildings on Block	8.8%	7.3%	9.8%

### Table 7.38 Incidence of Unit, Building and Neighborhood Condition Problems By Immigrant Status for Renter Households New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

a A housing unit that is in a dilapidated building, lacks a complete kitchen and/or bathroom for exclusive use, has four or more maintenance deficiencies, or is in a building with three or more types of building defects.

b Includes householders born in U.S. or Puerto Rico.

### Neighborhood Conditions of Owner-Occupied Housing

Based on interviewers' observation of the presence or absence of boarded-up buildings and on occupants' satisfaction, measured by their own ratings of their neighborhood's physical condition, the physical condition of neighborhoods where owner housing units were located was substantially better than was the case for renters. In 1999, of all owners, the proportion living on a street with a boarded-up building was only 4.1 percent, less than half the corresponding rate for renters. The 1999 rate for owners represents a 2.5-percentage-point improvement over the three years (Table 7.39). At the same time, owner ratings of the physical condition of residential structures in their neighborhoods as either "good" or "excellent" were substantially higher than those of renters: 87.3 percent of owners rated the condition of their neighborhood as "good" (57.9 percent) or "excellent" (29.4 percent), compared to 68.6 percent of renters (Tables 7.35 and 7.39). The rate for owners was 23.4 percentage points higher than the corresponding rate for renters who rated the physical condition of their neighborhood as either "good" or "excellent" was also higher than the 1996 rate, which was 85.3 percent.

### Table 7.39 Incidence of Owner Occupied Units on Same Street as Building with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows and Distribution of Owner Ratings of the Physical Condition of Residential Structures in the Neighborhood New York City 1996 and 1999

	1996	1999
Percentage on Same Street with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows	6.6%	4.1%
Percentage Rating Physical Condition of Residential Structures in Neighborhood		
Excellent	28.0%	29.4%
Good	57.3%	57.9%
Fair	12.9%	11.5%
Poor	1.8%	1.1%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

### Physical Housing and Neighborhood Conditions and City-Sponsored Rehabilitation and New Construction

With concerted efforts to meet the increased demand for housing, break the cycle of abandonment, and focus on preservation, the City completely rehabilitated or newly constructed a total of 24,528 units through various City-funded housing programs between June 1996 and May 1999, the three-year period between the 1996 HVS and the 1999 HVS. Of these units, 14,954 were moderately

rehabilitated, 9,574 were gut-rehabilitated or newly constructed.<sup>6</sup> In addition, the City made another remarkable contribution to maintaining good housing conditions and further improving neighborhood conditions by approving J-51 tax abatements in the amount of \$365,701,000 for improving the physical conditions of buildings containing 276,920 housing units in the City.<sup>7</sup> Along with remarkable improvements in the quality of life and significant economic growth, the City's housing efforts contributed not only to meeting the increased demand for housing but also to improving the conditions of existing affordable housing and neighborhoods.

Additionally, the City supported and/or worked with quasi-public agencies (such as HDC, which creates new housing with financial support from the City and private financial institutions) and non-profit and private groups in their efforts to preserve and create affordable new housing.

### **Crowded Households**

In New York City, as population and households continued to increase faster than the number of newly created housing units in the three years between 1996 and 1999, the proportion of renter households that were crowded (more than one person per room) increased from 10.3 percent in 1996 to 11.0 percent in 1999 (Table 7.40). The 1999 crowding rate for renter households was the highest since 1965, when it was also 11.0 percent. At the same time, 3.9 percent of renter households were severely crowded (more than 1.5 persons per room) in 1999, also the highest since 1965 (Figure 7.8).

Between 1996 and 1999, the crowding rate for renters in Queens increased markedly by 2.4 percentage points, from 11.8 percent to 14.2 percent (Table 7.41). The borough's 1999 rate was the highest of any borough and 3.2 percentage points higher than the city-wide rate of 11.0 percent. The rates in the Bronx and Brooklyn in 1999 were also high at 12.0 percent and 11.1 percent respectively, but not meaningfully different from rates three years earlier. The crowding rate in Manhattan was 8.3 percent in 1999, while it was 7.4 percent in 1996. However, the borough's 1999 rate of 8.3 percent was still 2.7 percentage points lower than the city-wide rate. The crowding rate in Staten Island in 1999 was 6.2 percent, the lowest of any of the boroughs and 4.8 percentage points lower than the city-wide rate. The borough's 1999 crowding rate was 2.1 percentage points lower than the rate three years earlier.

Crowding is, in general, a phenomenon of big households: the larger the number of big households, the larger the number of crowded households. The 1999 HVS again confirms this phenomenon. In the City as a whole, 9.2 percent of renter households were households with five or more persons. Of these large households, 66.1 percent were crowded (Table 7.42). Looking at this phenomenon from a different perspective, 55.3 percent of crowded renter households in the City were households with five or more persons.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Office of Planning and Policy, Division of Policy and Program Analysis.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Office of the Commissioner, Division of Tax Incentives.

	Crowded Un (>1 Person Per F	its Room)	Severely Crowde (>1.5 Persons Per	d Units Room)
Year	Number	Percent <sup>a</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>a</sup>
1999	215,057	11.0%	75,715	3.9%
1996	200,000	10.3%	68,000	3.5%
1993	203,000	10.3%	68,000	3.4%
1991	202,000	10.4%	71,000	3.6%
1987	132,000	7.1%	42,000	2.3%
1984	144,000	7.7%	45,000	2.4%
1981	123,000	6.5%	31,000	1.7%
1978	125,000	6.5%	29,000	1.5%
1975	160,000	8.1%	38,000	1.9%
1970	233,000	10.8%	64,000	3.0%
1965	227,000	11.0%	68,000	2.9%
1960	292,000	14.1%	99,000	4.8%

### Table 7.40 Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units New York City, Selected Years 1960-1999

Sources: 1960-1975 data from Stegman, Michael A., *Housing and Vacancy Report: New York City, 1991*, Table 7.44, p. 266; 1978-1999 data from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1978, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

Note:

a Percent based on unrounded numbers.

From this, it becomes apparent that the source of such a high crowding rate in Queens was the relatively high proportion of big households in the borough. In 1999, 11.9 percent of renter households in the borough were households with five or more persons, compared to the city-wide proportion of 9.2 percent. Of these big renter households in Queens, 63.0 percent were crowded. Of all crowded renter households in the borough, 52.8 percent were such big households. In addition, the proportion of renter households with three to four persons in the borough was also relatively high, 32.4 percent, compared to the city-wide proportion of 28.2 percent. Of these households with three to four persons in Queens, 16.8 percent were crowded; and 38.2 percent of the crowded renter households in the borough were households with three or four persons.

The source of the high crowding rate in the Bronx appears also to be the high proportion of big households in the borough. Of renter households there, 11.2 percent housed five or more persons. The crowding rate for these big households was 67.2 percent, and 62.8 percent of crowded households in the borough were such big households.

On the other hand, the lower crowding rate in Manhattan appears to be the result of its very low

Figure 7.8 Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units New York City, Selected Years 1970-1999



 Table 7.41

 Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units by Borough New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999

	Percent Crowded (>1 Person Per Room)		Perce (>1.5	wded oom)		
Borough	1993	1996	1999	1993	1996	1999
All	10.3%	10.3%	11.0%	3.4%	3.5%	3.9%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>	11.2%	12.3%	12.0%	3.3%	4.0%	4.2%
Brooklyn	12.1%	10.9%	11.1%	3.6%	3.2%	3.1%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>	8.3%	7.4%	8.3%	3.8%	3.4%	3.7%
Queens	10.6%	11.8%	14.2%	3.2%	3.6%	5.2%
Staten Island	4.5%	8.3%	6.2%	**	3.1%*	**

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996, and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

		Household Size			
Borough	All	1 Person	2 Persons	3-4 Persons	5 or More Persons
All					
Percent Crowded	11.0%		4.4%	13.3%	66.1%
Percent of Households	100.0%	35.9%	26.7%	28.2%	9.2%
Percent of Crowded	100.0%		10.6%	34.0%	55.3%
Bronx <sup>a</sup>					
Percent Crowded	12.0%		1.3%*	12.6%	67.2%
Percent of Households	100.0%	30.7%	25.3%	32.8%	11.2%
Percent of Crowded	100.0%		2.8%*	34.4%	62.8%
Brooklyn					
Percent Crowded	11.1%		3.2%	10.7%	67.3%
Percent of Households	100.0%	31.9%	26.8%	30.9%	10.4%
Percent of Crowded	100.0%		7.6%	29.6%	62.8%
Manhattan <sup>a</sup>					
Percent Crowded	8.3%		7.5%	15.0%	67.9%
Percent of Households	100.0%	48.8%	26.5%	19.8%	4.9%
Percent of Crowded	100.0%		24.0%	35.8%	40.3%
Queens					
Percent Crowded	14.2%		4.7%	16.8%	63.0%
Percent of Households	100.0%	28.4%	27.3%	32.4%	11.9%
Percent of Crowded	100.0%		9.0%	38.2%	52.8%
Staten Island					
Percent Crowded	6.2%		**	**	65.8%
Percent of Households	100.0%	35.4%	30.9%	26.4%	7.3%
Percent of Crowded	100.0%		**	**	78.0%

### Table 7.42 Incidence of Crowding in Renter Occupied Units by Borough by Household Size New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes:

a Marble Hill in the Bronx.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

	Percent Crowded (>1 Person Per Room)		Percent Severely Crowded (>1.5 Persons Per Room)		owded oom)	
<b>Regulatory Status</b>	1993	1996	1999	1993	1996	1999
All	10.3%	10.3%	11.0%	3.4%	3.5%	3.9%
Controlled	3.3%	1.8%*	**	1.4%*	**	**
Stabilized	12.1%	11.8%	13.2%	4.4%	4.8%	5.3%
Pre-1947	13.8%	12.8%	13.6%	4.8%	5.0%	5.3%
Post-1947	7.7%	9.2%	11.9%	3.3%	4.4%	5.3%
Other Regulated <sup>a</sup>	5.0%	5.4%	6.3%	1.6%	**	2.1%
Unregulated	9.8%	10.0%	9.5%	3.2%	2.8%	2.6%
Public Housing	9.2%	8.4%	9.5%	1.4%	1.0%*	2.1%
In Rem	14.9%	13.8%	11.4%*	3.4%*	**	**

## Table 7.43Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units by Regulatory Status<br/>New York City 1993, 1996 and 1999

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys. Notes:

a Includes Mitchell-Lama, Article 4, HUD and Loft Board rent regulated units.

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

proportion of big households: only 4.9 percent of all renter households in the borough in 1999 were households with five or more persons, while 48.8 percent consisted of one person only (Table 7.42).

The crowding rate for rent-stabilized units as a whole was 13.2 percent, considerably higher than the city-wide rate of 11.0 percent (Table 7.43). The higher crowding rate for rent-stabilized units was a phenomenon of the category's pre-1947 units, where the rate was 13.6 percent, compared to 11.9 percent for the category's post-1947 units. Crowding did not exist in rent-controlled units, where, in fact, 78.3 percent of units were occupied at the rate of 0.50-person-per-room, or less, which means that there was one person for two or more rooms in these units. At the same time, about half of "other regulated" and public housing units were occupied at the rate of 0.50-person-per-room, or less.<sup>8</sup> The crowding rate in "other-regulated" units--which includes Mitchell-Lama rentals and Article 4, HUD, and Loft Board rent-regulated units--was also very low: 6.3 percent.

In 1999 as in 1996, in terms of race and ethnicity, crowding was a phenomenon of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic and Asian renter households (Figure 7.9). The crowding rates for non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renters and Asian renters--whose populations have increased markedly in recent years, as discussed in Chapter 2, "Residential Population and Households"--were extraordinarily high: 23.9 percent and 21.4 percent respectively (Table 7.44). Again, the source of these high crowding rates

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Figure 7.9 Crowding and Mean Household Size in Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity New York City 1999



Table 7.44
Crowding, Severe Crowding and Mean Household Size
of Renter Households by Race/Ethnicity
New York City 1996 and 1999

Race/Ethnicity	Crov (> 1 person	vded per room)	Severely (>1.5 persor	Crowded 1s per room)	Me Househ	ean old Size
	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1999</u>
All	10.3%	11.0%	3.5%	3.9%	2.54%	2.48%
White	4.8%	5.4%	2.1%	2.5%	1.95%	1.94%
Black	10.6%	9.6%	2.6%	2.7%	2.80%	2.68%
Puerto Rican	10.1%	8.5%	3.3%	2.6%	2.64%	2.61%
Non-Puerto Rican Hispanic	20.1%	23.9%	7.1%	7.8%	3.39%	3.25%
Asian	21.7%	21.4%	8.0%	9.0%	3.08%	2.80%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys.

appears to be large household size. The mean household sizes of non-Puerto Rican Hispanic renters and Asian renters were 3.25 and 2.80 respectively, considerably larger than the city-wide average of 2.48. The crowding rate for white renters was only 5.4 percent, half the city-wide rate of 11.0 percent. The rates declined noticeably from 10.6 percent to 9.6 percent for black renter households and from 10.1 percent to 8.5 percent for Puerto Rican renter households.

No renter household type had a crowding rate higher than the city-wide average of 11.0 percent, except for adult households with minor children. The crowding rate for this household type was 32.2 percent in 1999. That is to say, almost one in every three households of this type was crowded (Table 7.45). The source of this extremely high crowding rate was the household type's relatively large mean household size of 4.30, compared to 2.48 for renter households overall.

As discussed earlier, crowding is a phenomenon of big households. The distribution of the crowding rate by household size vividly confirms this relationship. For renter households in 1999, the crowding rate for two-person households was only 4.4 percent, and the rate for three-person households was 6.7 percent (Table 7.46). However, the rate for four-person households was 22.2 percent, twice the city-wide rate. The rate climbed further as household size increased, jumping to 51.6 percent for five-person households and 79.0 percent for six-person households. The rate for households with seven or more persons was an incredibly high 94.2 percent. In other words, almost all such large renter households were crowded.

A much larger proportion of immigrant renter households were crowded: 21.2 percent, more than three times the proportion of non-immigrant households (see Table 7.38). Again, this is attributable to the larger mean household size of 3.02 for immigrant households.

Mean Household Size by Household Type New York City 1999				
Household Type	Percent Crowded (>1 person per room)	Percent Severely Crowded (>1.5 persons per room)	Mean Household Size	
All	11.0%	3.9%	2.48	
Single Elderly			1.00	
Single Adult			1.00	
Single with Minor Child(ren)	10.6%	3.9%	2.97	
Elderly Household	2.4%	1.5%*	2.56	
Adult Household	8.1%	5.3%	2.59	
Adult Household with Minor Child(ren)	32.2%	8.8%	4.30	

# Table 7.45

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Note:

\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

In general, owner households were not crowded. In 1999, the crowding rate for all owner households in the City was a mere 3.6 percent. However, even owner households were crowded if they were big households (Table 7.47). The rate for six-person owner households was 32.0 percent, and it was 57.3 percent for owner households with seven or more persons. In other words, more than half of such large owner households were crowded.

### Table 7.46 Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Renter Occupied Units by Number of Persons in Household New York City 1999

Number of Persons in Household	Percent Crowded (>1 Person Per Room)	Percent Severely Crowded (>1.5 Persons Per Room)
All	11.0%	3.9%
1		
2	4.4%	4.4%
3	6.7%	2.2%
4	22.2%	4.2%
5	51.6%	16.6%
6	79.0%	11.4%
7 or More	94.2%	42.6%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

### Table 7.47

### Incidence of Crowding and Severe Crowding in Owner Occupied Units by Number of Persons in Household New York City 1999

Number of Persons in Household	Percent Crowded (>1 Person Per Room)	Percent Severely Crowded (>1.5 Persons Per Room)
All	3.6%	1.0%
1		
2	1.0%	1.0%
3	0.9%*	**
4	3.7%	1.0%*
5	9.0%	1.9%*
6	32.0%	**
7 or More	57.3%	14.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

Notes:

Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

\*\* Too few units to report.

### A 1999 HVS Data for Sub-Borough Areas

There are 59 Community Districts (CDs) in New York City. However, because of the Census Bureau's confidentiality requirements and CD/census tract boundary incompatibility for many CDs, the Census Bureau cannot provide data for each of the 59 CDs. Therefore, as an alternative to using CDs, beginning with the 1991 HVS, the Census Bureau developed 55 sub-borough areas containing 100,000 or more persons, based on the 1990 census. Although the boundaries of the current 55 sub-borough areas do not completely conform to the City's 59 CD boundaries, they generally provide a reasonably good approximation for most CDs.<sup>1</sup>

For the 1991 HVS, the Census Bureau made significant changes in the boundaries of many sub-borough areas used for the 1987 HVS; these changes have been maintained in the subsequent three HVSs. Therefore, the 1987 data for many sub-borough areas are not comparable with the data from the HVSs in 1991 and the following survey years, even when the data are based on a large enough number of sample units.

On average, the statistical reliability of the data from the 1991 and subsequent HVSs for sub-borough areas is higher than that of the 1987 data because, unlike the 1987 HVS sample, the 1991 and following HVS samples were stratified by sub-borough areas to improve the statistical reliability of the data at the sub-borough level. However, the HVS is still principally designed to provide statistically reliable data for New York City as a whole and for each of the five boroughs. Data for sub-borough areas are not as reliable as data for the City or for the boroughs. Thus, sub-borough area data should be used with an adequate understanding of the probable statistical limitations of the data and, particularly where sample sizes remain small, sub-borough area data should be interpreted with caution.

Comparisons of sub-borough area data between two survey years should be done with great caution, since the sample size covered for housing and household characteristics for many sub-borough areas is very small, and the reliability of changes in such characteristics between survey years, thus, might be very low. For this reason, the HVS reports have never presented sub-borough data for two or more survey years in a comparative manner.

All of the statistical limitations mentioned above have been applied in the sub-borough area tables presented in this report, according to the general rule described in Chapter 1, "Overview of the 1999 Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) and the *Housing New York City, 1999* Report."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The map for the New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey, prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in 1995, shows the boundaries of the City, each of the five boroughs, each of the 59 CDs and 55 sub-borough areas, and all census tracts.

As for the 1993 and 1996 reports, considering the usefulness and statistical limitations of the subborough area data, this report covers only 23 tables of data on the most often sought population, housing, and neighborhood characteristics. The sub-borough area data tables presented here can be grouped into five categories:

- 1. **Population and Households:** Population (A.1), Households (A.1), Household Size (A.1), Race/Ethnicity (A.2 and A.9), Age Composition (A.3), Educational Attainment (A.4), Singles/Couples (A.5), Secondary (Doubling-Up) (A.5), Birth Region (A.6), Tenure (A.7), Household Type (A.8).
- 2. **Income and Public Assistance:** Median Income (A.10), Income Distribution (A.11), Poverty Rates (A.12), Public Assistance Dependency (A.12).
- 3. **Housing Inventory:** Regulatory Status (A.13), Size of Units (A.14), Structure Class (A.15), Forms of Ownership (A.16), Estimated Home Values (A.16), Homeownership Rates (A.7).
- 4. **Contract Rent and Gross Rent:** Median Contract Rents (A.17), Distribution of Contract Rents (A.18), Median Gross Rents (A.17), Distribution of Gross Rents (A.19), Gross Rent-Income Ratios (A.17).
- 5. **Housing and Neighborhood Conditions:** Building Defects (A.20), Board-Ups (A.20), Maintenance Deficiencies (A.21), Crowding (A.22), Severe Crowding (A.22), Neighborhood Rating (A.23).



### Sub-Borough Areas

- 1) Mott Haven/Hunts Point
- 2) Morrisania/East Tremont
- 3) Highbridge/S. Concourse
- 4) University Heights/Fordham
- 5) Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu
- 6) Riverdale/Kingsbridge
- 7) Soundview/Parkchester
- 8) Throgs Neck/Co-op City
- 9) Pelham Parkway
- 10) Williamsbridge/Baychester

The City of New York • Department of Housing Preservation and Development • Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research



### Sub-Borough Areas

- 1) Williamsburg/Greenpoint
- 2) Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene
- 3) Bedford Stuyvesant
- 4) Bushwick
- 5) East New York/Starrett City
- 6) Park Slope/Carroll Gardens
- 7) Sunset Park
- 8) North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights
- 9) South Crown Heights

- 10) Bay Ridge
- 11) Bensonhurst
- 12) Borough Park
- 13) Coney Island
- 14) Flatbush
- 15) Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend
- 16) Brownsville/Ocean Hill
- 17) East Flatbush
- 18) Flatlands/Canarsie

The City of New York • Department of Housing Preservation and Development • Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research



The City of New York • Department of Housing Preservation and Development • Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research



The City of New York • Department of Housing Preservation and Development • Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research

### **Staten Island**



The City of New York • Department of Housing Preservation and Development • Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research

Sub-Borough Area	Households	Population	Mean Size
Bronx			
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	37,603	105,486	2.81
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	38,920	115,165	2.96
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	34,437	95,734	2.78
4. University Heights/Fordham	36,791	114,974	3.13
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	42,670	123,645	2.90
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridgeª	45,477	107,788	2.37
7. Soundview/Parkchester	56,815	158,944	2.80
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	41,312	98,911	2.39
9. Pelham Parkway	41,859	101,731	2.43
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	43,156	118,398	2.74
Brooklyn			
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	49,500	132,092	2.67
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	43,766	92,418	2.11
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	37,667	102,991	2.73
4. Bushwick	34,924	111,610	3.20
5. East New York/Starrett City	40,993	127,508	3.11
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	43,992	95,690	2.18
7. Sunset Park	43,424	128,103	2.95
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	40.972	97,395	2.38
9. South Crown Heights	39.681	107.767	2.72
10. Bay Ridge	51.337	112.084	2.18
11 Bensonhurst	59 100	146 684	2.48
12. Borough Park	45 088	135 810	3.01
13 Coney Island	44 744	113 574	2 54
14 Flatbush	54 321	155 740	2.87
15 Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	53 927	145 089	2.69
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	34 750	95 683	2.07
17 East Elathush	43.842	136.945	3.12
18 Flatlands/Canarsie	59 264	172 013	2.90
Manhattan	59,204	172,015	2.70
	(2.(0))	100 515	1 71
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	63,624	108,515	1./1
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	53,591	125,281	2.34
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	66,282	108,974	1.64
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	85,404	138,562	1.62
5. Upper West Side	117,287	218,334	1.86
6. Upper East Side	137,823	259,321	1.88
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	44,941	122,408	2.72
8. Central Harlem	39,836	107,031	2.69
9. East Harlem	42,711	117,070	2.74
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	75,937	238,931	3.15
Queens			
1. Astoria	70,499	157,528	2.23
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	43,947	107,488	2.45
3. Jackson Heights	50,572	148,074	2.93
4. Elmhurst/Corona	43,422	118,715	2.73
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	60,388	142,991	2.37
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	57,606	119,328	2.07
7. Flushing/Whitestone	91,674	228,058	2.49
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	57,729	146,793	2.54
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	39,324	106,166	2.70
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	38,289	106,146	2.77
11. Bayside/Little Neck	44,139	108,086	2.45
12. Jamaica	64,364	194,167	3.02
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	56,530	169,127	2.99
14. Rockaways	37,254	99,516	2.67
Staten Island	,	·	
1 North Shore	55 442	143 093	2.58
2 Mid-Island	41 116	114 450	2.50
3 South Shore	48 350	141 126	2.70
2. Mid-Island 3. South Shore	41,116 48,350	114,450	2.78

Number of Households, Number of Individuals and Mean Household Size by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.1

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge.

Source: Note:

Table A.2	Number of Individuals b	v Race	Ethnicity by	v Sub-Borough, 1	New York City 1999
		J/			

In the proof of					Duerto	Non Duomo		Matino
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		A 11	White	Black	Rican	Rican Hispanic	Acion	American
Bronx 1. Mort Haven/Hans Point 1. Mort Haven/H	Sub-Borough Area	All	white	DIACK	Ricali	Rican Thispanic	Asian	American
1. Mort Haven, /Huns Point	Bronx							
2. Morrisania/Last Termont 115,165 4,506 42,006 29,993 36,34 ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **	1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	105,486	**	25,345	53,361	25,147	**	**
3. Highbridge/South Concourse 95,734 ** 34,992 21,185 37,77 ** ** 4. University Heights/Todiham 114,974 ** 49,322 27,051 34,568 2,53* ** 5. Kingshridge Heights/Notsholu 123,645 12,500 24,583 33,150 45,568 7,057 ** 6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge 107,788 43,587 21,332 11,970 26,676 4,224 ** 7. Soundrives/Parkchester 158,944 7,233 58,971 60,279 27,017 4,181 ** ** 8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,555 ** ** 10. Williamsbridge/Baychester 118,398 13,901 79,270 14,728 8,922 ** ** Toooklyn	2. Morrisania/East Tremont	115,165	4,506	42,606	29,993	36,343	**	**
4 University Heights/Fordham 114/974 ** 49,322 27,051 34,568 2,533* ** 6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge* 107,788 43,587 21,332 11,970 26,676 4,224 ** 6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge* 107,788 43,587 21,332 11,970 26,676 4,224 ** 8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** 8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** 9. Palam Parkway 101,731 43,757 20,242 20,194 13,180 4,358 ** 10.Willamsbridge/Baychester 118,398 13,901 79,270 14,728 8,922 ** ** Brooklyn	3. Highbridge/South Concourse	95,734	**	34,992	21,185	37,277	**	**
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu 123,645 12,500 24,583 33,150 45,888 7,057 ** 6. Riverdalg/Kingsbridge 107,788 43,587 21,332 11,970 26,676 4,224 ** 7. Soundview/Parkchester 158,944 7,233 58,971 60,279 27,017 4,181 ** 8. Throgs Neck/Co-op Giy 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** 19. Pelham Parkway 101,731 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** 10.Williamsbridge/Baychester 118,998 13,901 79,270 14,728 8,922 ** 10.Williamsbridge/Baychester 118,998 13,901 79,270 14,728 8,922 ** 1. Williamsbrug/Greenpoint 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 ** 1. Williamsbrug/Greenpoint 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 19,983 5,098 ** 1. Williamsbrug/Greenpoint 102,991 ** 77,160 29,292 47,145 2,197 ** 1. Baychick 111,610 5,778 27,160 29,292 47,145 2,197 ** 1. Baychick 112,608 7,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,273 18,300 2,311* ** 1. Sanset Park by York/Starrett City 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311* ** 1. Sanset Park by 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311* ** 1. Sanset Park by 128,103 32,166 4,207 29,045 36,555 5,146 ** 1. Bayconh Heights/Prospect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** 1. Bay Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,621* 4,338 5,159 16,629 ** 1. Bersonhurst 146,684 116,613 2,221* 6,608 ** 20,244 ** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Concy Island 113,574 68,206 20,957 10,488 8,301 5,623 ** 14. Raubah 136,544 73,258 5,309 4,072 16,579 7,952 ** 14. Raubah 136,545 0,614 117,246 2,000* 7,733 *8 2,306* Manhattan 155,740 73,528 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 14. Raubah 136,545 0,9148 4,4164 8,931 12,497 14,337 ** 14. Bralands/Carasie 172,017 63,044 5,5874 2,909 23,126 2,673* ** 14. Raubah 136,545 0,9148 4,4164 8,931 12,497 14,337 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 0,086 5,054 8,616 11,151 ** 16. Brownswill/Occan Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,666 ** 17. East Rlatbah 136,945 0,646 117,246 2,000* 7,733 ** 14. Shubah 136,945 0,6146 117,246 2,000* 7,733 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 0,086 5,054 8,616 11,4151 ** 16. Brownswill/Occan 118,157 0,348 5,5971 15,201 15,201 13,771 ** 17. M	4. University Heights/Fordham	114,974	**	49,322	27,051	34,568	2,533*	**
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge 107,788 43,587 21,332 11,970 26,767 4,224 ** 7. Soundview/Parkchester 158,944 7,233 58,971 60,279 27,017 4,181 ** 8. Throng Neck/Co-op City 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** 8. Throng Neck/Co-op City 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** 8. Pelham Parkway 101,731 43,757 20,242 20,194 13,180 4,358 ** 10.Willamsbourg/Greenpoint 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 ** 8. Dooklyn Heights/Fort Greene 92,418 26,450 52,130 8,407 3,721 ** 8. Bedrofd Supresant 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,292 ** 8. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene 92,418 26,450 52,130 8,407 3,721 ** 8. Bedrofd Supresant 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,292 ** 8. Bushwick 111,610 5,778 27,163 29,322 47,145 2,197* ** 6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens 93,690 55,269 9,105 16,642 8,955 5,146 ** 7. Sanaser Park 9,7395 8,582 73,988 7,221 6,276 ** 8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 107,767 4,661 91,221 ** 9. South Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 107,767 4,661 91,221 ** 9. South Crown Heights/ 113,574 0,528 53,009 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Scney Island 113,574 0,735,28 53,009 4,072 16,679 7,952 ** 14. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,009 4,072 16,679 7,952 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 7,333 2,366 6,866 8,368 ** 17. Eart Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,009 4,072 16,579 7,952 ** 18. Brandank1 10,578 27,818 33,366 6,866 8,368 ** 19. Eart Harbush 13,574 6,421 ** 3,396 12,407 ** 19. Barconthylliduge/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 ** 10. Greenwide/Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 ** 10. Greenwide/Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 ** 10. Greenwide/Vill	5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	123,645	12,500	24,583	33,150	45,858	7,057	**
7. Soundview/Parkchester 158,944 7,233 58,971 60,279 27,017 4,181 ** 8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City 98,911 43,291 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** ** 9. Pelham Parkway 101,731 43,757 20,242 20,194 13,180 4,358 ** 10.Willamsburg/Greenpoint 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 ** 1. Willamsburg/Greenpoint 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 ** 2. Brooklyn Eights/For Greene 92,418 26,450 52,130 8,407 3,721 ** ** 3. Bedford Suyvesant 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,929 ** 2,189* 4. Bushwick 111,610 5,778 27,160 29,329 47,145 2,197 ** 5. East New York/Sturrett City 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311 ** 6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens 95,690 55,269 9,105 16,842 8,955 5,146 ** 7. Sunser Park 128,103 32,166 4,207 29,045 36,555 24,128 ** 8. North Crown Heights/ Porspect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** ** 10. Bay Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,261* 4,338 5,159 16,629 ** 11. Bensonhurst 146,684 116,613 2,251* 6,080 ** 20,244 ** 12. Borough Park 135,810 9,630 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Coney Island 113,574 68,206 20,957 10,488 8,301 5,623 ** 14. Farbush 155,740 7,3528 53,609 4,072 16,579 7,952 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 14. Farbush 135,810 9,630 ** 79,816 8,119 5,668 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 14. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,668 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,668 ** 17. East Flatbush 133,621 11,507 ** 3,997 4,505 15,768 ** 18. Farlands/Canarsie 172,013 69,111 84,054 3,366 6,866 8,368 ** 19. Cortex E, Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,181 83,82,09 ** 2. Lower E, Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,181 83,82,09 ** 2. Lower E, Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,768 ** 4. Supper Exs Side 29,321 21,4807 8,958 5,201 15,701 3,771 ** 1. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,677* 4,505 15,768 ** 2. Lower Side 29,331 4,677 7,18 29,325 1	6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	107,788	43,587	21,332	11,970	26,676	4,224	**
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City 98,011 43,201 32,121 17,854 4,553 ** ** 9. Pelham Parkaway 101,731 43,757 20.242 20.194 13,180 4,358 ** 10.Williamsbridge/Baychester 118,398 13,901 79,270 14,728 8,922 ** ** Brooklyn I. Williamsbridge/Greenpoint 122,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 ** 2. Brooklyn Heights/For Greene 92,418 26,450 52,130 8,407 3,721 ** ** 3. Bedrofd Sturyvesant 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,292 ** 2,189* 4. Bushwick 111,610 5,778 27,1098 13,215 8,292 ** 2,189* 4. Bushwick 111,610 5,778 27,1098 13,215 8,292 ** 2,189* 5. East New York/Starrett City 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311* ** 6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens 95,690 55,269 9,105 16,842 8,955 5,146 ** 7. Sunser Park 128,103 32,166 4,207 29,045 36,656 24,128 ** 8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 107,767 4,661 91,221 ** 9,274 ** ** 9. South Crown Heights 107,767 4,661 91,221 ** 9,274 ** ** 10. Bay Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,261* 4,338 5,159 16,629 ** 11. Bersonhurst 146,684 116,613 2,251* 6,080 ** 20,244 ** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Concy Island 113,574 07,3528 53,009 4,072 16,679 7,952 ** 14. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,009 4,072 16,679 7,952 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,623 ** 13. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,009 4,072 16,679 7,952 ** 14. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 13,066 7,718 29,325 18,183 38,209 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 1*4,1176 6,481 11,246 2,009 7,363 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbash 155,740 73,528 13,067 7,718 29,325 18,183 38,209 ** 13. Conces Kide/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 11,501 13,771 ** 14. Greenwich Village/Financial District 08,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 ** 31. Concer Kide/ Canarsie 117,070 5,304 55,574 29,506 15,768 ** 42. Lower E, Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 115,201 13,771 ** 4. Sturyvesant Town/Turle Bay 138,662 111,507 ** 3,997 4,505 15,768 ** 4. Embusht/Corona 112,707 5,304 55,574 29,505 13,216 2,673* ** 1. Astoria 10,771	7. Soundview/Parkchester	158,944	7,233	58,971	60,279	27,017	4,181	**
9. Pelham Parkway 101,731 43,757 20,242 20,194 13,180 4,358 ** Brooklyn 118,398 13,901 79,270 14,728 8,922 ** ** Brooklyn 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 *** Brooklyn 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,862 21,983 5,098 *** Brooklyn 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,292 *** 2,189* 4. Bushvick 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,292 *** 2,189* 5. East New York/Starrett Gity 127,508 7,182 72,163 27,375 18,300 2,311* *** 5. East New York/Starrett Gity 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311* *** 6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens 95,600 55,269 9,105 16,842 8,955 5,216 *** 7. Sunset Park 8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** *** 10. Bay Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,621* 4,338 5,159 16,629 *** 11. Bensonhurst 146,664 116,613 2,251* 6,080 *** 20,244 *** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 *** 13. Concy Island 115,574 68,206 20,957 10,488 8,301 5,623 *** 13. Concy Island 115,574 68,206 20,957 10,488 8,301 5,623 *** 14. Flabush 136,945 6,646 117,246 20,007 7,363 *** 2,336* 14. Flabush 136,945 6,646 117,246 20,007 7,363 *** 2,336* 15. Berenwiselle/Ocean Hill 95,683 *** 79,816 8,119 5,668 *** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 *** 16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 **7 9,816 8,119 5,668 *** 17. East Flabush 136,945 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,363 *** 2,336* 18. Fladuads/Caransie 172,013 69,113 84,054 3,366 6,866 8,308 *** 19. Creenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 *** 10. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 *** 10. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 *** 10. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 *** 10. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 *** 10. Greenwich Village/Ridgewood 142,919 33,620 11,500 13,701 *** 3. Schelsa/Cinton/Midtown 108,974 68,218 4,146 8,931 12,497 14,337 *** 3. Checka/Cinton/Midtown 108,974 68,218 4,146 8,931 12,497 14,337 *** 3. Check	8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	98,911	43,291	32,121	17,854	4,553	**	**
10.Williamsbridge/Baychester       118,398       13,901       79,270       14,728       8,922       **       **         Brooklyn       132,092       67,081       7,882       29,862       21,983       5,098       **         1. Williamsbridg/Greenpoint       132,092       67,081       7,882       29,862       21,983       5,098       **         2. Brooklyn Heights/Foort Greene       92,418       26,450       52,130       8,407       37,211       **       **         4. Bushwick       111,610       5,778       27,160       29,329       47,145       2,197*       **         6. Park Stope/Carroll Gardens       95,600       55,269       9,105       16,842       8,955       5,146       **         7. Sunset Park       128,103       32,166       4,207       29,045       36,556       26,128       **         8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights       107,767       4,661       91,221       **       **       **       **       **         10. Bay Ridge       112,084       83,121       2,621*       4,338       5,159       16,629       **         12. Bronogly Park       135,574       73,398       7,261       6,579       7,952       **	9. Pelham Parkway	101,731	43,757	20,242	20,194	13,180	4,358	**
$\begin{split} & \text{Brooklyn} & \\ & \text{Nulliansburg/Greenpoint} & 132,092 & 67,081 & 7,882 & 29,862 & 21,983 & 5,098 & ** \\ & 2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene & 92,418 & 26,450 & 52,130 & 8,407 & 3,721 & ** & ** \\ & 3. Bedford Suyvesant & 102,991 & ** & 77,1098 & 13,215 & 8,292 & ** & 2,189* \\ & \text{A Bushvick} & 111,610 & 5778 & 7,182 & 72,153 & 27,375 & 18,300 & 2,311* & ** \\ & 5. East New York/Surrett City & 127,508 & 7,182 & 72,153 & 27,375 & 18,300 & 2,311* & ** \\ & 5. Park Slope/Caroll Gardens & 95,690 & 55,269 & 9,105 & 16,842 & 89,55 & 5,146 & ** \\ & 7. Sunset Park & 128,103 & 32,166 & 4,207 & 29,045 & 36,556 & 26,128 & ** \\ & 8. North Crown Heights & 97,395 & 8,582 & 73,398 & 7,261 & 6,276 & ** & ** \\ & 9. South Crown Heights & 1107,67 & 4,661 & 91,221 & ** & 9,274 & ** \\ & 10. Bay Ridge & 112,084 & 83,121 & 2,621* & 4,338 & 5,159 & 16,629 & ** \\ & 11. Bensonhurst & 146,684 & 116,613 & 2,251* & 6,080 & ** & 20,244 & ** \\ & 12. Borough Park & 135,810 & 96,930 & 7,000 & 6,227 & 6,754 & 18,899 & ** \\ & 13. Concy Island & 113,574 & 68,206 & 20,957 & 10,488 & 8,301 & 5,623 & ** \\ & 14. Ratbush & 155,740 & 73,528 & 53,609 & 4,072 & 16,579 & 7,952 & ** \\ & 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend & 145,089 & 114,117 & 6,086 & 5,054 & 8,681 & 11,151 & ** \\ & 16. Brownsrill/Ocean Hill & 95,683 & ** & 79,816 & 8,119 & 5,668 & ** & ** \\ & 7. East Flarbush & 136,945 & 6,646 & 117,246 & 2,000* & 7,363 & ** & 2,336* \\ & 8.74 Marhatra & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	10.Williamsbridge/Baychester	118,398	13,901	79,270	14,728	8,922	**	**
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint 132,092 67,081 7,882 29,840 3,721 ** ** 2,880 3,8407 3,721 ** ** 2,189* 3. Bedford Suryvesant 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,929 ** 2,189* 4. Bushvick 111,610 5,778 27,160 29,329 47,145 2,197* ** 5. East New York/Starret City 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,00 2,31* ** ** 6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens 95,690 55,269 9,105 16,842 8,955 5,146 ** ** 8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,274 ** ** 9,103 Ng/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg/Bg	Brooklyn							
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fore Greene 92,418 26,450 52,130 8,407 3,721 ** ** 2,189* 3. Bedford Stuyvesant 102,991 ** 77,098 13,215 8,929 ** 2,189* 4. Bushvick 111,610 5,778 27,160 29,329 47,145 2,197* ** 5. East New York/Starrett City 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311* ** 6. Park Slope/Carnol Gardens 95,600 55,260 9,105 16,842 8,955 5,146 ** 7. Sunset Park 128,103 32,166 4,207 29,045 36,556 26,128 ** 8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** ** 9. South Crown Heights 107,767 4,661 91,221 ** 9,274 ** ** 10. Bay Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,621* 4,338 5,159 16,629 ** 11. Bensonhurst 146,684 116,613 2,221* 6,800 ** 20,244 ** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Concy Island 113,574 68,206 20,957 10,488 8,301 5,623 ** 14. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,609 4,072 16,679 7,952 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,668 ** ** 17. East Flatbush 136,946 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,353 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbash 136,945 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,353 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbash 136,945 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,353 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbash 213,946 6,417,246 2,000* 7,353 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbash 213,924 6,614 17,246 2,000* 7,353 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbash 213,934 6,464 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 19. Cover E. Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 3. Chelsea/Clinon/Midrown 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 ** 2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 3. Chelsea/Clinon/Midrown 128,573 40,924 6,510 41,730 7,256 ** 2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 3. Chelsea/Clinon/Midrown 128,573 40,924 6,510 41,730 7,256 ** 2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown 125,287 7,4068 16,800 11,422 29,566 2,4475 ** 3. Chelsea/Clinon/Midrown 188,774 7,488 3,0020 3,458 5,985 3,2101 13,771 ** 7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights 122,408 25,953 40,924	1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	132,092	67,081	7,882	29,862	21,983	5,098	**
3. Bedford Suyvesant102,991**77,09813,2158,929**2,189*4. Bushwick111,6105,77827,16327,37518,3002,311***6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens95,69055,2699,10516,8428,9555,146**7. Sunset Park128,10332,1664,20729,04536,55626,128**8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights97,3958,58273,3987,2616,276****9. South Crown Heights107,7674,66191,221**9,274****10. Bay Ridge112,08483,1212,621*4,3385,15916,629**12. Borough Park135,81096,9007,0006,2276,75418,899**13. Coney Island113,57468,20620,95710,4888,3015,623**14. Flatbash155,74073,5283,6094,07216,5797,952**15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend145,089114,176,0865,054&****16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill95,683**79,8168,1195,668****17. East Flatbush136,9456,646117,2462,007*7,363**2,336*18. Bralands/Canarsie172,01369,11484,0453,3666,8668,368**2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown125,28131,6677,71829,32518,13838,209** <t< td=""><td>2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene</td><td>92,418</td><td>26,450</td><td>52,130</td><td>8,407</td><td>3,721</td><td>**</td><td>**</td></t<>	2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	92,418	26,450	52,130	8,407	3,721	**	**
4. Bushvick111,6105,77827,16029,2947,1452,17***5. East New York/Starrett City127,5087,18272,37518,3002,311***6. Park Slope/Carroll Cardens95,69055,2699,10516,8428,9555,146**7. Sunset Park128,10332,1664,20729,04536,55626,128**9. South Crown Heights/Prospect Heights97,3958,58273,3987,2616,276****9. South Crown Heights107,7674,66191,221**9,274****10. Bay Ridge112,08483,1212,621*4,3835,15916,629**11. Bensonhurst146,684116,6132,251*6,080**20,244**12. Borough Park135,74075,52853,6004,07216,5797,952**13. Concy Island113,57468,20620,95710,4888,3015,623**14. Flatbush155,74075,52853,6004,07216,5797,952**15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend145,049114,1176,0865,5448,68111,151**16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill95,683**79,8168,1195,668****16. Intravenk/ Village/Financial District108,51590,3482,152*2,627*2,318*10,896**16. Green Hill95,6834,1468,93112,4974,337** <t< td=""><td>3. Bedford Stuyvesant</td><td>102,991</td><td>**</td><td>77,098</td><td>13,215</td><td>8,929</td><td>**</td><td>2,189*</td></t<>	3. Bedford Stuyvesant	102,991	**	77,098	13,215	8,929	**	2,189*
5. East New York/Starrett City 127,508 7,182 72,153 27,375 18,300 2,311* ** 6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens 95,690 55,269 9,105 16,842 8,955 5,146 ** 7. Sunser Park 128,103 32,166 4,207 29,045 36,556 26,128 ** 8. North Crown Heights /Prospect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** ** 9. South Crown Heights 207,376 4,661 91,221 ** 9,274 ** ** 10. Bary Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,621* 4,338 5,159 16,629 ** 11. Bensonhurst 146,684 116,613 2,251* 6,080 ** 20,244 ** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Concy Island 113,574 68,206 20,957 110,488 8,301 5,623 ** 14. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,609 4,072 16,579 7,952 ** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,668 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbaush 136,945 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,363 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbaush 20,278 12,000 7,363 ** 2,336* 14. Flatbush 136,945 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,363 ** 2,336* 14. Flatbush 136,945 6,646 77,718 29,325 4,3166 ** 17. East Flatbush 136,945 6,646 177,246 2,000* 7,363 ** 2,336* 18. Flatbaush 20,278 131,667 7,718 29,325 11,151 ** 1. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 ** 2. Lower E, Side/Chinatovn 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 15,768 ** 3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtovn 108,974 68,218 4,146 8,931 12,497 14,337 ** 4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay 138,562 111,507 ** 3,997 4,505 15,768 ** 5. Upper West Side 228,931 34,411 (70 18,416 12,305 29,516 16,426 ** 6. Upper East Side 259,321 214,807 8,958 5,201 15,201 13,771 ** 7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights 122,408 25,953 4,0924 6,510 41,730 7,256 ** 10. Washington Heights 122,408 25,953 4,0924 6,510 41,730 7,256 ** 8. Central Harken 107,013 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harken 107,013 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harken 117,070 5,304 55,874 29,690 23,126 2,673* ** 10. Washington Heights/Iamilton Heights 148,074 19,589 17,595 2,671* 90,496 16,471 ** 1. Astoria 157,528 74,068 16,680 11,422 29,566 24,475 ** 2. Sunn	4. Bushwick	111,610	5,778	27,160	29,329	47,145	2,197*	**
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens95,69055,2699,10516,8428,9555,146**7. Sunset Park128,10332,1664,20729,04536,55626,128**8. North Crown Heights107,7674,66191,221**9,274****10. Bay Ridge112,08483,1212,621*4,3385,15916,629**11. Bensonhurst146,684116,6132,221*6,3385,15916,629**12. Borough Park135,81096,9307,0006,2276,75418,899**13. Concy Island113,57468,20620,95710,4888,3015,623**14. Flatbush155,74073,52853,6094,07216,5797,952**15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend145,089114,1176,0865,0548,681111,151**16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill95,683**7,7182,932518,168****17. East Flatbush136,646117,2462,000*7,363**2,336*18. Flatlands/Canarsie172,01369,11184,0543,3666,8668,368***14. Greenwich Village/Financial District108,57590,3482,152*2,627*2,318*10,896**1. Greenwich Village/Financial District108,57590,3482,152*2,01113,771**3. Chelsea/Cliniton/Midtown108,57482,5853,20115,20113,771 <t< td=""><td>5. East New York/Starrett City</td><td>127,508</td><td>7,182</td><td>72,153</td><td>27,375</td><td>18,300</td><td>2,311*</td><td>**</td></t<>	5. East New York/Starrett City	127,508	7,182	72,153	27,375	18,300	2,311*	**
7. Sunset Park 128,103 32,166 4,207 29,045 36,556 26,128 ** 8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights 97,395 8,582 73,398 7,261 6,276 ** ** 9. South Crown Heights 107,767 4,661 91,221 ** 9,274 ** ** 10. Bay Ridge 112,084 83,121 2,621* 4,338 5,159 16,629 ** 11. Bensonhurst 146,684 116,613 2,251* 6,080 ** 20,244 *** 12. Borough Park 135,810 96,930 7,000 6,227 6,754 18,899 ** 13. Concy Island 113,574 68,206 20,957 10,488 8,301 5,623 ** 14. Flatbush 155,740 73,528 53,609 4,072 16,579 7,952 *** 15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend 145,089 114,117 6,086 5,054 8,681 11,151 ** 16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill 95,683 ** 79,816 8,119 5,668 ** ** 17. East Flatbush 136,945 6,646 117,246 2,000* 7,363 ** 2,336* 18. Flatands/Canarsie 172,013 69,111 84,054 3,366 6,886 8,368 ** <b>Manhattan  </b> 1. Greenwich Village/Financial District 108,515 90,348 2,152* 2,627* 2,318* 10,896 *** 2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown 125,281 31,667 7,718 29,325 18,138 38,209 ** 3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown 108,974 68,218 4,146 8,931 12,407 14,337 ** 4. Stuyvesant Town/Turde Bay 138,562 111,507 ** 3,997 4,505 15,768 *** 5. Upper West Side 218,334 141,670 18,416 12,305 29,516 16,426 ** 6. Upper Kast Side 259,321 24,4807 8,958 5,201 15,201 13,771 ** 7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights 122,408 25,953 40,924 6,510 41,730 7,256 *** 8. Central Harlem 107,031 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,031 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,031 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,031 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,031 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,031 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,032 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,032 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,032 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,032 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 107,032 2,145* 91,533 2,792* 10,194 ** ** 9. East Harlem 117,070 5,304 55,874 29,600 23,126 2,673* ** 9. East Harlem 117,070 5,30	6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	95,690	55,269	9,105	16,842	8,955	5,146	**
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights       97,395       8,582       73,398       7,261       6,276       **       **         9. South Crown Heights       107,767       4,661       91,221       **       9,274       **       **         9. Bouth Crown Heights       112,084       83,121       2,621*       4,338       5,159       16,629       **         11. Bensonhurst       146,684       116,613       2,251*       6,080       **       20,244       **         12. Borough Park       135,810       96,930       7,000       6,227       6,754       18,899       **         13. Concy Island       113,574       68,062       2,0957       10,488       8,301       5,623       **         14. Flatbush       155,740       73,528       53,609       4,072       16,579       7,952       **         15. Brownsville/Cean Hill       95,683       **       7,816       8,119       5,668       **       **         16. Brownsville/Cean Hill       95,683       **       7,718       2,900*       7,363       **       2,336*         18. Flathands/Canarsie       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       **	7. Sunset Park	128,103	32,166	4,207	29,045	36,556	26,128	**
9. South Crown Heights107,7674,66191,221**9,274****10. Bay Ridge112,08483,1212,621*4,3385,15916,629**11. Bensonhurst146,684116,6132,251*6,080**20,244**12. Borough Park135,81096,9307,0006,2276,75418,899**13. Concy Island113,57468,20620,95710,4888,3015,623**14. Flatbush155,74073,52853,6094,07216,5797,952**15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend145,089114,1176,0865,0548,68111,151**16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill95,683**79,8168,1195,668****17. East Flatbush136,9456,646117,2462,000*7,363**2,336*18. Flatands/Canarsie172,01369,11184,0543,3666,8668,368**2. Lower E. Side/Chinarown125,228131,6677,71829,32218,13838,209**3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown108,97468,2184,1468,93112,49714,337**4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay138,562111,507**3,9974,50515,768**5. Upper West Side218,334141,67018,41612,30529,51616,426**6. Upper East Side219,321214,8078,5855,20115,20113,771 </td <td>8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights</td> <td>97,395</td> <td>8,582</td> <td>73,398</td> <td>7,261</td> <td>6,276</td> <td>**</td> <td>**</td>	8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	97,395	8,582	73,398	7,261	6,276	**	**
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	9. South Crown Heights	107,767	4,661	91,221	**	9,274	**	**
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10. Bay Ridge	112,084	83,121	2,621*	4,338	5,159	16,629	**
12. Borough Park       135,810       96,930       7,000       6,227       6,754       18,899       ***         13. Coney Island       113,574       68,206       20,957       10,488       8,301       5,623       ***         14. Flatbush       155,740       73,528       53,609       4,072       16,579       7,952       ***         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       114,117       60,86       5,054       8,681       11,151       **         16. Brownsville/Occan Hill       95,683       **       79,816       8,119       5,668       **       2,336*         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       126,945       6,646       117,244       2,000*       7,363       **       2,336*         Manhatta       108,915       90,348       2,152*       2,627*       2,318*       10,896       **         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       31,667       7,718       29,325       18,138       38,209       **         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       **         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       ** <td>11. Bensonhurst</td> <td>146,684</td> <td>116,613</td> <td>2,251*</td> <td>6,080</td> <td>**</td> <td>20,244</td> <td>**</td>	11. Bensonhurst	146,684	116,613	2,251*	6,080	**	20,244	**
13. Coney Island       113,574       68,206       20,957       10,488       8,301       5,623       ***         14. Flatbush       155,740       73,528       53,609       4,072       16,579       7,952       **         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       114,117       6,086       5,054       8,681       11,151       **         16. Brownsville/Occan Hill       95,683       **       79,816       8,119       5,668       **       **         17. East Flatbush       136,945       6,646       117,246       2,000*       7,363       **       2,336*         18. Flathand/Canarsie       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       **         1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       90,348       2,152*       2,627*       2,318*       10,896       **         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       31,667       7,718       29,325       18,138       38,209       **         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       **         4. Suyvesant Town/Turde Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,7	12. Borough Park	135,810	96,930	7,000	6,227	6,754	18,899	**
14. Flatbush       155,740       73,528       53,609       4,072       16,579       7,952       ***         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       114,117       6,086       5,054       8,681       11,151       ***         16. Brownsville/Occan Hill       95,683       **       79,816       8,119       5,668       ***       ***         17. East Flatbush       136,945       6,646       117,246       2,000*       7,363       **       2,336*         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       ***         1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       90,348       2,152*       2,627*       2,318*       10,896       ***         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       102,5281       31,667       7,718       29,325       18,138       38,209       ***         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       ***         4. Suyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       ***         5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       8,958       5,201       15,201	13. Coney Island	113,574	68,206	20,957	10,488	8,301	5,623	**
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       114,117       6,086       5,054       8,681       11,151       ***         16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       **       79,816       8,119       5,668       ***       ***         17. East Flatbush       136,945       6,646       117,246       2,000*       7,363       ***       2,336*         Manhattan       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       **         1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       90,348       2,152*       2,627*       2,318*       10,896       **         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       31,667       7,718       29,325       18,138       38,209       **         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       **         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       ***         5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       18,416       12,305       29,516       16,426       ***         6. Cupper East Side       122,408       25,953       40,924       6,510       41,730	14. Flatbush	155,740	73,528	53,609	4,072	16,579	7,952	**
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       **       79,816       8,119       5,668       **       **         17. East Flatbush       136,945       6,646       117,246       2,000*       7,363       **       2,336*         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       **         Manhattan       . <td>15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend</td> <td>145,089</td> <td>114,117</td> <td>6,086</td> <td>5,054</td> <td>8,681</td> <td>11,151</td> <td>**</td>	15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	145,089	114,117	6,086	5,054	8,681	11,151	**
17. East Flatbush       136,945       6,646       117,246       2,000*       7,363       **       2,336*         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       **         Manhattan	16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	95,683	**	79,816	8,119	5,668	**	**
18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       69,111       84,054       3,366       6,866       8,368       ***         Manhattan       1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       90,348       2,152*       2,627*       2,318*       10,896       ***         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       31,667       7,718       29,325       18,138       38,209       **         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       **         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       **         5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       18,416       12,305       29,516       16,426       **         6. Upper East Side       229,321       214,807       8,58       5,201       15,768       **         9. East Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwooda       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         1. Astoria       157,528       74,068       16,800       11,422       29,566	17. East Flatbush	136,945	6,646	117,246	2,000*	7,363	**	2,336*
Manhattan1. <t< td=""><td>18. Flatlands/Canarsie</td><td>172,013</td><td>69,111</td><td>84,054</td><td>3,366</td><td>6,866</td><td>8,368</td><td>**</td></t<>	18. Flatlands/Canarsie	172,013	69,111	84,054	3,366	6,866	8,368	**
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       90,348       2,152*       2,627*       2,318*       10,896       ***         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       31,667       7,718       29,325       18,138       38,209       ***         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       **         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       **         5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       18,416       12,305       29,516       16,426       **         6. Upper East Side       259,321       214,807       8,958       5,201       15,201       3,771       **         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       25,953       40,924       6,510       41,730       7,256       **         8. Central Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,600       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwooda       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875	Manhattan	,		,	,		,	
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown125,281 $31,667$ $7,718$ $29,325$ $18,138$ $38,209$ **3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown108,974 $68,218$ $4,146$ $8,931$ $12,497$ $14,337$ **4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay138,562 $111,507$ ** $3,997$ $4,505$ $15,768$ **5. Upper West Side $218,334$ $141,670$ $18,416$ $12,305$ $29,516$ $16,426$ **6. Upper East Side $259,321$ $214,807$ $8,958$ $5,201$ $15,201$ $13,771$ **7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights $122,408$ $25,953$ $40,924$ $6,510$ $41,730$ $7,256$ **8. Central Harlem $107,031$ $2,145*$ $91,533$ $2,792*$ $10,194$ ****9. East Harlem $117,070$ $5,304$ $55,874$ $29,690$ $23,126$ $2,673*$ **10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> $238,931$ $34,811$ $23,831$ $18,875$ $159,108$ ****Queens1. Astoria $157,528$ $74,068$ $16,800$ $11,422$ $29,566$ $24,475$ **2. Sunnyside/Woodside $107,488$ $36,020$ $3,458$ $5,985$ $32,519$ $29,506$ **3. Jackson Heights $148,074$ $19,589$ $17,595$ $2,671*$ $90,496$ $16,471$ **4. Elmhurst/Corona $118,715$ $12,696$ $15,651$ $3,415$ $61,480$ $25,473$ **5. Middle Village/Ridgew	1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	108,515	90,348	2,152*	2,627*	2,318*	10,896	**
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       68,218       4,146       8,931       12,497       14,337       **         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       **         5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       18,416       12,305       29,516       16,426       **         6. Upper East Side       259,321       214,807       8,958       5,201       15,201       13,771       **         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       25,953       40,924       6,510       41,730       7,256       **         8. Central Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,690       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwood*       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,506       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,	2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	125.281	31.667	7,718	29.325	18.138	38,209	**
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       111,507       **       3,997       4,505       15,768       **         5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       18,416       12,305       29,516       16,426       **         6. Upper East Side       259,321       214,807       8,958       5,201       15,201       13,771       **         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       25,953       40,924       6,510       41,730       7,256       **         8. Central Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,690       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,566       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473 </td <td>3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown</td> <td>108.974</td> <td>68.218</td> <td>4.146</td> <td>8,931</td> <td>12.497</td> <td>14.337</td> <td>**</td>	3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	108.974	68.218	4.146	8,931	12.497	14.337	**
5. Upper West Side       218,334       141,670       18,416       12,305       29,516       16,426       **         6. Upper East Side       259,321       214,807       8,958       5,201       15,201       13,771       **         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       25,953       40,924       6,510       41,730       7,256       **         8. Central Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,690       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         Queens       1       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,7	4. Stuvvesant Town/Turtle Bay	138.562	111.507	**	3,997	4,505	15.768	**
6. Upper East Side $259,321$ $214,807$ $8,958$ $5,201$ $15,201$ $13,771$ $**$ 7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights $122,408$ $25,953$ $40,924$ $6,510$ $41,730$ $7,256$ $**$ 8. Central Harlem $107,031$ $2,145*$ $91,533$ $2,792*$ $10,194$ $**$ $**$ 9. East Harlem $117,070$ $5,304$ $55,874$ $29,690$ $23,126$ $2,673*$ $**$ 10. Washington Heights/Inwooda $238,931$ $34,811$ $23,831$ $18,875$ $159,108$ $**$ $**$ Queens $11,422$ $29,566$ $24,475$ $**$ $**$ $**$ 2. Sunnyside/Woodside $107,488$ $36,020$ $3,458$ $5,985$ $32,519$ $29,506$ $**$ 3. Jackson Heights $148,074$ $19,589$ $17,595$ $2,671*$ $90,496$ $16,471$ $**$ 4. Elmhurst/Corona $118,715$ $12,696$ $15,651$ $3,415$ $61,480$ $25,473$ $**$ 5. Middle Village/Ridgewood $142,991$ $93,766$ $**$ $16,823$ $22,080$ $9,733$ $**$ 6. Forest Hills/Rego Park $119,328$ $88,585$ $3,101$ $**$ $10,683$ $15,721$ $**$ 7. Flushing/Whitestone $228,058$ $103,070$ $6,426$ $7,944$ $23,113$ $87,147$ $**$ 8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows $146,793$ $60,712$ $22,069$ $7,144$ $20,456$ $36,011$ $**$ 9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven $106,166$ $38,116$	5. Upper West Side	218,334	141,670	18,416	12,305	29,516	16,426	**
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       25,953       40,924       6,510       41,730       7,256       **         8. Central Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,690       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwooda       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         Queens       1       157,528       74,068       16,800       11,422       29,566       24,475       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,506       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,72	6. Upper East Side	259.321	214,807	8,958	5.201	15.201	13,771	**
8. Central Harlem       107,031       2,145*       91,533       2,792*       10,194       **       **         9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,690       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwooda       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         Queens       11. Astoria       157,528       74,068       16,800       11,422       29,566       24,475       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,506       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147	7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	122.408	25,953	40.924	6.510	41.730	7.256	**
9. East Harlem       117,070       5,304       55,874       29,690       23,126       2,673*       **         10. Washington Heights/Inwooda       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         Queens       1       1,4storia       157,528       74,068       16,800       11,422       29,566       24,475       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,506       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456	8. Central Harlem	107.031	2.145*	91,533	2.792*	10.194	**	**
10. Washington Heights/Inwooda       238,931       34,811       23,831       18,875       159,108       **       **         Queens       1       Astoria       157,528       74,068       16,800       11,422       29,566       24,475       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,506       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683 <t< td=""><td>9. East Harlem</td><td>117.070</td><td>5.304</td><td>55.874</td><td>29.690</td><td>23.126</td><td>2.673*</td><td>**</td></t<>	9. East Harlem	117.070	5.304	55.874	29.690	23.126	2.673*	**
Queens       157,528       74,068       16,800       11,422       29,566       24,475       **         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       36,020       3,458       5,985       32,519       29,506       **         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       19,589       17,595       2,671*       90,496       16,471       **         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	238,931	34.811	23.831	18,875	159,108	**	**
1. Astoria157,52874,06816,80011,42229,56624,475**2. Sunnyside/Woodside107,48836,0203,4585,98532,51929,506**3. Jackson Heights148,07419,58917,5952,671*90,49616,471**4. Elmhurst/Corona118,71512,69615,6513,41561,48025,473**5. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99193,766**16,82322,0809,733**6. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32888,5853,101**10,68315,721**7. Flushing/Whitestone228,058103,0706,4267,94423,11387,147**8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows146,79360,71222,0697,14420,45636,011**9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16638,1166,89112,68322,58324,950**	Queens	9	,-	- 9	- ,			
2. Sunnyside/Woodside107,48836,0203,4585,98532,51929,506**3. Jackson Heights148,07419,58917,5952,671*90,49616,471**4. Elmhurst/Corona118,71512,69615,6513,41561,48025,473**5. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99193,766**16,82322,0809,733**6. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32888,5853,101**10,68315,721**7. Flushing/Whitestone228,058103,0706,4267,94423,11387,147**8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows146,79360,71222,0697,14420,45636,011**9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16638,1166,89112,68322,58324,950**	1. Astoria	157.528	74.068	16.800	11.422	29,566	24.475	**
3. Jackson Heights148,07419,58917,5952,671*90,49616,471**4. Elmhurst/Corona118,71512,69615,6513,41561,48025,473**5. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99193,766**16,82322,0809,733**6. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32888,5853,101**10,68315,721**7. Flushing/Whitestone228,058103,0706,4267,94423,11387,147**8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows146,79360,71222,0697,14420,45636,011**9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16638,1166,89112,68322,58324,950**	2. Sunnyside/Woodside	107.488	36.020	3,458	5,985	32,519	29,506	**
4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       12,696       15,651       3,415       61,480       25,473       **         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	3. Jackson Heights	148.074	19.589	17.595	2.671*	90.496	16.471	**
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       93,766       **       16,823       22,080       9,733       **         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	4. Elmhurst/Corona	118.715	12.696	15.651	3.415	61.480	25.473	**
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       88,585       3,101       **       10,683       15,721       **         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	5 Middle Village/Ridgewood	142,991	93 766	**	16 823	22,080	9 7 3 3	**
7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       103,070       6,426       7,944       23,113       87,147       **         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	119.328	88.585	3.101	**	10.683	15.721	**
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       60,712       22,069       7,144       20,456       36,011       **         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	7 Flushing/Whitestone	228,058	103 070	6 426	7 944	23 113	87 147	**
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       38,116       6,891       12,683       22,583       24,950       **	8 Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	146 793	60 712	22.069	7 1 4 4	20,456	36.011	**
7.16w Galdello, woodilavell 100,100 50,110 0,071 12,005 22,505 21,550	9 Kew Gardens/Woodbaven	106 166	38 116	6 891	12 683	22 583	24 950	**
10 Howard Beach/S Ozone Park 106 146 50 654 18 478 6 830 9 910 20 274 **	10 Howard Beach/S Ozone Park	106,146	50,654	18 478	6.830	9 910	20,274	**
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11 Bayside/Little Neck	108,086	70,157	**	3 101	7 423	26,216	**
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	12 Jamaica	100,000	3 860	153 530	7 387	1/ 333	11 646	3 410
12.  particle = 175107  5000  155350  7507  17555  17570  5710	12. Januara 13. Bellerose / Rosedale	160 127	36.034	05.838	4.962	7 005	22 706	**
10, 127  50, 507  75, 500  75, 702  75, 703  122, 700  713  714  800	14 Rockaways	90 516	30,954	30 052	0,826	10 304	6 570	**
Staten Jaland	Staton Jaland	79,510	52,104	59,954	2,000	10,374	0,570	
Julicii Islahu 1 North Shore 1/3.003 80.572 26.062 11.084 10.841 4.522 **	1 North Shore	1/13 0.03	80 542	26.062	11 09/	10.841	1 5 2 2	**
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2 Mid Island	11/ 450	80 710	20,902 **	1 251	6 702	4,555 11 955	**
3. South Shore 141.126 127.977 ** 4179 3.770 4.878 **	3. South Shore	141 126	127.977	**	4,179	3.770	4.878	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution. \*\* Too few individuals to report.

Bronx         10000         100000         100000	Sub-Borough Area	Total	Under 18	18 - 64	65 or Over
Description         Display         Sec. 2017         Sec. 2017         Sec. 2017           1. Mort Harcer/Hunts Point         115,165         45,097         6,007         6,402           2. Morrisanal/Laad Termont         115,165         45,097         6,007         7,780           4. University Heights/Mostahu         112,644         33,573         84,021         6,031           5. Kingshingly Plackhester         115,994         47,008         96,119         118,817           8. Througs Neck/Co-op City         98,911         16,101         64,157         14,643           9. Peltan Plackhester         116,398         34,814         69,469         14,817           10. Williamsburg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Mooklyn Heights/Fort Greece         92,418         23,006         60,066         9,342           3. Bedford Survesant         102,991         35,617         54,062         11,312           4. Burbrick         1116,101         37,287         67,631         6,692           5. Kast New York/Starrer City         172,508         43,316,779         11,441	Brony	Totai	Childer 10	10 01	05 01 0 101
2. Morrisani, Takur Francis, J. 2007         63,007         64,007           3. Highndige South Concourse         93,754         29,878         63,007         64,007           4. University Fugher/Fordham         114,974         43,940         63,551         7,461           5. Kingsholge Heights/Mosholu         123,645         33,573         84,021         6,051           6. Riverdia/ Kingsholge         107,788         27,000         63,961         16,327           7. Soundview/Parkcheter         158,044         47,008         98,119         18,673           9. Pelham Parkway         101,731         23,693         99,161         18,877           10. Williansbourg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene         92,418         23,000         60,662         11,312           4. Busbwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,692         13,312           4. Subwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,662         11,312           4. Busbwick         112,508         45,317         56,662         11,312           4. Busbwick         125,608         45,317         56,662         11,414           6.	1 Mott Haven /Hunts Point	105 486	38.400	56 683	10/03
3. Highbridge/Search Concourse         95,734         29,878         540,77         7,780           4. University Heigher/Fordham         11,474         43,940         63,551         7,7483           5. Kingsbridge Heightn/Mosholu         123,645         33,573         84,021         6,051           6. Riverdike/Kingsbridge         107,788         22,500         63,561         16,327           7. Somarives/Parkehede         158,944         47,008         98,119         16,101         66,157         18,653           8. Theogs NextParket Concourse         101,731         22,603         59,161         18,877           10. Williamsbridge/Kaychester         118,398         34,814         69,469         14,115           7. Milansburg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         7,6933         14,312           3. bedford Suyvesant         102,991         35,617         5,6062         11,312           4. Bashvick         111,610         37,227         7,631         6,692           5. Last New York/Surrett City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           7. Surset Park         114,610         37,228         7,429         9,044,346         14,346           9. South Crown Heights / Prospect Heights	2 Morrisania/Fast Tremont	115 165	45 697	63.067	6 402
4. University Heghes/Forcham         114/974         43/940         63/551         7.483           5. Kingsbridge Heighes/Mosholu         123/645         33.573         84.021         6.0511           7. Sundview/Parkhester         15/844         47.008         98,119         13.817           7. Sundview/Parkhester         15/844         47.008         98,119         13.817           8. Thongs Next/Coop City         98,911         16,101         64,157         14.653           9. Pehann Parkway         101,731         23,693         59,161         18,653           9. Pehann Parkway         101,731         23,693         59,161         18,657           9. Robdyn Heights/Prost Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           2. Brooklyn Heights/Pror Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bediroft Suyvesant         102,991         35,617         50,062         11,312           4. Busbwick         111,610         37,287         67,613         6,042           5. Bast New York/Sharrett City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens         97,395         29,830         59,073         8,472	3 Highbridge/South Concourse	95 734	29.878	58.077	7 780
5. Kingsbridge Heights (Musholu         123,645         33,573         94,021         6,031           6. Riverdulac/Kingsbridge         107,788         27,500         63,961         16,327           7. Sound/vew Parkchester         158,944         47,008         98,119         11,817           8. Throug Neck/Co-op City         98,911         16,101         64,157         18,653           9. Paham Parkway         101,721         23,603         59,161         18,877           10. Williamsbridge/Taychester         118,398         34,814         69,469         14,115           Torooklyn         1         1.011         64,157         76,033         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/For Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bedford Stayresant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           5. Last New Vork/Surrett City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Siope/Caroll Gradenes         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunser Park         128,103         31,607         81,944         14,543           9. South Crown Heights/Prospect Heights         97,572         28,744         47,979	4 University Heights/Fordham	114 974	43 940	63 551	7 483
6. Revelate/Knaphulge         107,788         27,500         6.3961         16.327           7. Sonodvey Parkchster         158,944         47,008         98,119         11.817           8. Thorgs Neck/Co-op City         98,911         16,101         64,157         11.8633           9. Patham Parkway         101,731         23,693         59,161         18,877           9. Willomsbridge/ barchester         118,398         34,814         69,469         14,115           Brooklyn         -         -         -         -         -           1. Williamsburg/ Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/Foro Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bedirod Suryesant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           4. Bushwick         111,610         37,287         67,613         6,692           5. East New York/Surret City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardene         95,690         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         128,013         31,607         81,949         1,4546           8. Noth	5 Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	123 645	33 573	84 021	6.051
7. Soundrives/Parkhearer         158,944         47,098         98,119         18,177           8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City         98,911         16,101         64,157         18,653           9. Peham Parkway         101,731         23,693         59,161         18,657           10. Williamsbridge/Bychester         118,398         34,814         69,469         14,115           11. Williamsbridge/Bychester         123,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene         92,418         25,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bedford Stuyvesant         102,991         35,617         56,002         11,312           4. Bushwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,692           5. East New York/Sarrett City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           10. Orn Toron Heights/Prospect Heights         107,767         28,741         67,779         11,047           10. Bay Kinge         112,048         17,633         72,705         16,359           13. Corey Island         113,574         28,705         61,753         23,117           14. Fabrash         136,945         39,350         55,966         6,183	6 Riverdale/Kingsbridgea	107 788	27 500	63 961	16 327
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City         98,911         16,101         64,157         18,653           9. Pelham Packway         101,731         23,693         59,161         18,877           10. Willamsburg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bedford Staryesant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           4. Bushwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,692           5. East New York/Starret City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         122,083         11,607         81,949         14,546           8. North Crown Heights         07,767         28,741         67,633         76,725         17,726           11. Bersonhurst         146,684         34,030         87,504         25,149         12,847           12. Borough Park         135,810         46,745         72,705         16,359         13,217         22,433           13. Concy Island         113,574         47,0063 <td>7 Soundview/Parkchester</td> <td>158 944</td> <td>47.008</td> <td>98 119</td> <td>13,817</td>	7 Soundview/Parkchester	158 944	47.008	98 119	13,817
9. Pathan Parkeay         101,731         23,693         59,161         18,877           10. Williamsbudge/Baychester         118,398         34,814         69,469         14,115           1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/For Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bedörd Stuyvesant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           4. Bushwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,692           5. East New York/Sarrett City         127,508         43,312         73,866         10,411           6. Park Stope/Carnoll Gardens         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sonate Tark         128,103         31,607         81,949         14,546           8. North Crown Heights         107,767         28,741         6,027         11,471           10. Bay Ridge         112,084         17,603         87,012         16,339           13. Coney Island         113,574         28,705         61,753         23,117           14. Flabush         136,945         33,3506         55,966         6,181           17. East Flabush	8 Throgs Neck/Co-op City	98 911	16 101	64 157	18 653
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester       118,398       34,814       69,469       14,115         Brooklyn	9 Pelham Parkway	101 731	23 693	59 161	18,877
Brooklyn         Brooklyn         Brooklyn         Brooklyn         Brooklyn         Brooklyn           1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint         132,092         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/Foro Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Beddrof Stuyvesant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           4. Bushwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,692           5. East New York/Starrett City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Cardens         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         128,103         31,607         81,949         14,546           8. North Cown Heights         107,677         28,741         67,979         11,047           10. Bay Ridge         112,084         17,633         23,117         16,133           13. Concy Island         113,574         28,703         61,753         23,117           14. Flatbush         155,740         47,063         92,402         16,275           15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend         145,689         33,506         55,996         6,181	10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	118.398	34.814	69.469	14.115
1. Williamsburg/Greepoint         132,022         40,847         76,933         14,312           2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Badford Stuyvesant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           4. Bushwick         111,610         37,287         67,631         6,692           5. East New York/Starret City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens         95,690         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         122,044         17,633         76,725         17,726           9. South Crown Heights/Prospect Heights         97,395         29,803         87,974         21,1047           10. Bay Ridge         112,044         17,633         76,725         17,726           11. Bensoniturst         146,684         34,030         87,594         25,149           13. Corey Island         113,574         28,705         61,753         23,117           14. Flatbush         155,740         47,063         92,402         16,275           15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend         145,083         33,516         85,996         6,181           17.	Brooklyn	- 3			· , -
2. Brooklyn Heightsylver         92,418         23,009         60,066         9,342           3. Bedford Stuyvesant         102,991         35,617         56,062         11,312           4. Bushvick         111,610         37,287         67,651         6,692           5. Fast New York/Starrett City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Cardens         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         128,103         31,607         81,949         14,546           8. North Cown Heights         107,767         28,871         67,979         11,047           10. Bay Ridge         112,084         17,633         76,772         17,726           11. Bensonhurst         146,684         34,030         87,594         25,149           12. Borough Park         135,810         46,745         72,705         16,359           13. Coney Island         113,574         28,705         88,9127         22,243           16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill         95,683         33,506         55,996         6,181           17. East Flatbush         136,945         39,335         86,716         10,895           18. Flatinds/Canarsie	1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	132.092	40.847	76.933	14.312
3. Bedford Stup         102.901         35.617         56.062         11.312           4. Bushwick         111.610         37.287         67.631         6.692           5. East New York/Starrett City         127.508         43.312         73.786         10.411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens         95.690         17.942         70.298         7.449           7. Sunset Park         122.103         31.607         81.949         14.546           8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights         97.395         29.850         59.073         8.472           9. South Crown Heights         107.767         28.741         67.979         11.047           10. Bay Ridge         112.084         17.633         76.725         17.726           11. Bersonhurst         146.684         44.030         87.504         24.02         16.275           13. Concy Island         113.574         28.705         61.753         23.117           14. Flatbush         155.740         47.063         92.402         16.275           15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend         145.089         33.318         80.217         22.243           16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill         95.683         33.355         86.716         10.0895	2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	92.418	23.009	60.066	9.342
4. Baskwick       111,610       37,287       67,631       6,692         5. East New York/Starret City       127,508       43,312       73,786       10,411         6. Park Stope/Carroll Gardens       95,690       17,942       70,298       7,449         7. Sunset Park       128,103       31,607       81,949       14,546         8. North Crown Heights       107,767       28,8741       67,979       11,047         10. Bay Ridge       112,084       17,633       76,725       17,726         11. Bensonhurst       146,684       34,030       87,504       25,149         12. Borough Park       135,810       46,745       72,705       16,359         13. Concy Island       113,574       28,706       61,753       23,117         14. Flatbush       155,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,516       55,996       6,181         7. East Flatbush       136,945       9,335       86,716       10,0895         18. Flatdands/Canarsic       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       -       -       -       16,625       30,418         0. Upper Kast Side	3. Bedford Stuyvesant	102,991	35,617	56,062	11,312
5. East New York/Surrert City         127,508         43,312         73,786         10,411           6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         128,103         31,607         81,949         14,546           8. North Crown Heights         97,395         29,850         59,017         8,472           9. South Crown Heights         107,767         28,741         67,797         11,047           10. Bay Ridge         112,084         17,633         76,725         16,359           11. Bensonhuert         146,684         34,030         87,504         25,149           12. Borough Park         135,741         28,705         61,753         23,117           14. Flatbush         135,744         47,005         61,7153         23,117           16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill         95,683         33,518         89,127         22,243           16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill         95,683         33,506         55,996         6,181           17. East Flatbush         136,945         39,335         86,716         10,895           18. Flatlands/Canarsie         122,201         24,548         10,6221         21,244           Manhattan	4. Bushwick	111,610	37,287	67,631	6,692
6. Park Slope/Carnoll Gardens         95,600         17,942         70,298         7,449           7. Sunset Park         128,103         31,607         81,949         14,546           8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights         97,735         29,850         59,073         8,472           9. South Crown Heights         107,767         28,741         67,979         11,047           10. Bay Ridge         112,084         17,633         76,725         16,359           11. Bensonhurst         146,684         34,030         87,504         25,149           12. Borough Park         135,810         46,745         72,705         16,359           13. Concer Island         113,574         28,705         61,753         23,117           14. Flatbush         155,740         47,063         92,402         16,275           15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend         145,089         33,516         55,996         6,181           17. East Flatbush         136,945         39,335         86,716         10,895           18. Featlands/Canarsie         172,013         44,548         106,221         21,244           Manhattan         1         Greenvich Village/Financial District         108,515         9,563         86,848         12,	5. East New York/Starrett City	127,508	43,312	73,786	10,411
7. Sunset Park       128,103       31,607       81,949       14,546         8. North Crown Heights       97,395       29,850       59,073       8,472         9. South Crown Heights       107,767       28,741       67,979       11,047         10. Bay Ridge       112,084       17,633       76,725       17,726         11. Bensonburst       146,684       34,030       87,504       25,149         12. Borough Park       135,574       28,070       61,753       23,117         14. Flatbush       155,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         17. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsic       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       1       22,123       23,175       83,022       19,084         3. Chelsea/Chinton/Midrown       108,974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,625       30,418	6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	95,690	17,942	70,298	7,449
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights         97,395         29,800         50,073         8,472           9. South Crown Heights         107,767         28,741         67,979         11,047           10. Bay Ridge         112,084         17,633         76,725         17,726           11. Bensonhurst         146,684         34,030         87,504         25,149           12. Borough Park         135,810         46,745         72,705         16,359           13. Concy Island         113,574         28,705         61,753         23,117           14. Flatbush         155,740         47,063         92,402         16,275           15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend         145,089         33,516         55,996         6,181           17. East Flatbush         136,945         39,335         86,716         10,895           16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill         95,683         33,506         55,996         6,181           17. Cast Flatbush         106,221         21,244         Mathattan         -           14. Greenwich Village/Financial District         108,575         9,563         86,484         12,104           2. Lower E, Side/Chinatown         125,281         23,175         83,022         19,0984           3	7. Sunset Park	128,103	31,607	81,949	14,546
9. South Crown Heights107,76728,74167,97911,04710. Bay Ridge112,08417,63376,72517,72611. Bensonhurst146,68434,03087,50425,14912. Borough Park135,57446,74572,70516,55913. Coney Island113,57428,70561,75323,11714. Flarbush155,74047,06392,40216,27515. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend145,08933,71889,12722,24316. Brownsville/Ocean Hill95,68333,50655,9966,18117. East Flarbush136,94539,33586,71610,89518. Flarlands/Canarsie172,01344,548106,22121,244Manhattan111.1.1.1.1. Greenwich Village/ Financial District108,5159,56386,84812,1042. Lower E. Side/Chinatown108,9745,78689,76613,4224. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay138,56211,502105,42821,6325. Upper West Side218,33431,391156,52530,4186. Upper East Side128,93165,994151,32621,611Queers11.1.1.2.1.1. Astoria157,52828,139108,92120,4672. Sunnyside/Woodside107,488,74432,414102,62413,0364. Eithuhurst/Corona118,71524,27784,14610,2925. Middle Village/ Nidgewood142,979 <td< td=""><td>8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights</td><td>97,395</td><td>29,850</td><td>59,073</td><td>8,472</td></td<>	8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	97,395	29,850	59,073	8,472
10. Bay Ridge       112,084       17,633       76,725       17,726         11. Bensonhurst       146,684       34,030       87,504       25,149         12. Borough Park       135,810       46,745       72,705       16,539         13. Concy Island       113,574       28,705       61,753       23,117         14. Flatbush       155,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Occan Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         7. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       -       -       -       11,002       10,851       9,563       86,848       12,104         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       108,574       5,786       89,766       13,422       4       Stuyresant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418       6       12,716       64,860       13,215       8       6,704	9. South Crown Heights	107,767	28,741	67,979	11,047
11. Berasonhurst       146,684       34,030       87,504       25,149         12. Borough Park       135,810       46,745       72,705       16,359         13. Concy Island       113,574       28,705       61,753       23,117         14. Flarbush       155,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Occan Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         17. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       1       0.7creenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       9,563       86,848       12,104         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       108,5974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Sturyresant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       238,931       65,994       151,326       21,613         Queens       107,031       27,196       64,860 <td>10. Bay Ridge</td> <td>112,084</td> <td>17,633</td> <td>76,725</td> <td>17,726</td>	10. Bay Ridge	112,084	17,633	76,725	17,726
12. Borough Park       135,810       46,745       72,705       16,359         13. Concy Island       113,574       28,705       61,753       23,117         14. Flatbush       135,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         17. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsic       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       -       -       -       -       -       -         1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       9,563       86,848       12,104         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       128,281       23,175       83,022       19,084         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Stuyresant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       218,334       315,595       197,160       27,0	11. Bensonhurst	146,684	34,030	87,504	25,149
13. Coneg Island       113,574       28,705       61,753       23,117         14. Flarbush       155,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       33,306       55,996       6,181         17. East Flarbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan	12. Borough Park	135,810	46,745	72,705	16,359
14. Flarbush       155,740       47,063       92,402       16,275         15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         17. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan	13. Coney Island	113,574	28,705	61,753	23,117
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend       145,089       33,718       89,127       22,243         16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         17. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       .	14. Flatbush	155,740	47,063	92,402	16,275
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill       95,683       33,506       55,996       6,181         17. East Flatbush       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       -	15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	145,089	33,718	89,127	22,243
17. East Flatbash       136,945       39,335       86,716       10,895         18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan	16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	95,683	33,506	55,996	6,181
18. Flatlands/Canarsie       172,013       44,548       106,221       21,244         Manhattan       1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       9,563       86,848       12,104         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       23,175       83,022       19,084         3. Chelsea/Chinol/Midtown       108,974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       218,334       12,408       30,534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>4</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,076         1. Astoria       157,528       28,139       108,921       20,667         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       <	17. East Flatbush	136,945	39,335	86,716	10,895
Manhattan1. Greenwich Village/Financial District108,5159,56386,84812,1042. Lower E. Side/Chinatown125,28123,17583,02219,0843. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown108,9745,78689,76613,4224. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay138,56211,502105,42821,6325. Upper West Side218,33431,391156,52530,4186. Upper East Side259,32135,095197,16027,0667. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights122,40830,53478,66013,2158. Central Harlem107,03127,19664,86014,9759. East Harlem117,07035,82168,07413,17510. Washington Heights/Inwood*238,93165,994151,32621,611Queens1. Astoria157,52828,139108,92120,4672. Sunnyside/Woodside107,48822,18572,59312,7113. Jackson Heights148,07432,414102,62413,0364. Elmhurst/Corona118,71524,27784,14610,2925. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99128,50788,74525,7386. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32818,59475,71925,0157. Flushing/Whitestone228,05842,19443,20642,6588. Hillerest/Fresh Meadows146,79332,05992,91520,9199. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16624,93571,7579,47410. Howard Beac	18. Flatlands/Canarsie	172,013	44,548	106,221	21,244
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District       108,515       9,563       86,848       12,104         2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       23,175       83,022       19,084         3. Chelsen/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       259,321       30,0534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1       Astoria       157,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       1143,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507 <td>Manhattan</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Manhattan				
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown       125,281       23,175       83,022       19,084         3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midrown       108,974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       259,321       35,095       197,160       27,066         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       30,534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood*       238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       -       -       -       -       -         1. Astoria       157,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elimhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292 <t< td=""><td>1. Greenwich Village/Financial District</td><td>108,515</td><td>9,563</td><td>86,848</td><td>12,104</td></t<>	1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	108,515	9,563	86,848	12,104
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown       108,974       5,786       89,766       13,422         4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       259,321       35,095       197,160       27,066         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       30,534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood*       238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1       17,770       35,821       68,074       13,175         1. Astoria       157,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738 </td <td>2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown</td> <td>125,281</td> <td>23,175</td> <td>83,022</td> <td>19,084</td>	2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	125,281	23,175	83,022	19,084
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay       138,562       11,502       105,428       21,632         5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       259,321       35,095       197,160       27,066         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       30,534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood*       238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1       17,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206	3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	108,974	5,786	89,766	13,422
5. Upper West Side       218,334       31,391       156,525       30,418         6. Upper East Side       259,321       35,095       197,160       27,066         7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       30,534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens	4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	138,562	11,502	105,428	21,632
6. Upper East Side $259,321$ $35,095$ $197,160$ $27,066$ 7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights $122,408$ $30,534$ $78,660$ $13,215$ 8. Central Harlem $107,031$ $27,196$ $64,860$ $14,975$ 9. East Harlem $117,070$ $35,821$ $68,074$ $13,175$ 10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> $238,931$ $65,994$ $151,326$ $21,611$ Queens1. Astoria $157,528$ $28,139$ $108,921$ $20,467$ 2. Sunnyside/Woodside $107,488$ $22,185$ $72,593$ $12,711$ 3. Jackson Heights $148,074$ $32,414$ $102,624$ $13,036$ 4. Elmhurst/Corona $118,715$ $24,277$ $84,146$ $10,292$ 5. Middle Village/Ridgewood $142,991$ $28,507$ $88,745$ $25,738$ 6. Forest Hills/Rego Park $119,328$ $18,594$ $75,719$ $25,015$ 7. Flushing/Whitestone $228,058$ $42,194$ $143,206$ $42,658$ 8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows $146,793$ $32,959$ $92,915$ $20,919$ 9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven $106,166$ $24,935$ $71,757$ $9,474$ 10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park $106,166$ $24,935$ $71,757$ $9,474$ 10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park $106,146$ $23,044$ $69,854$ $13,248$ 11. Bayside/Little Neck $108,086$ $18,627$ $70,528$ $18,930$ 13. Bellerose/Rosedale $169,127$ $4,616$ $105,055$ $19,456$ 14. Rock	5. Upper West Side	218,334	31,391	156,525	30,418
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights       122,408       30,534       78,660       13,215         8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1       75,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,8	6. Upper East Side	259,321	35,095	197,160	27,066
8. Central Harlem       107,031       27,196       64,860       14,975         9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens	7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	122,408	30,534	78,660	13,215
9. East Harlem       117,070       35,821       68,074       13,175         10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1       Astoria       157,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       11	8. Central Harlem	107,031	27,196	64,860	14,975
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup> 238,931       65,994       151,326       21,611         Queens       1. Astoria       157,528       28,139       108,921       20,467         2. Sunnyside/Woodside       107,488       22,185       72,593       12,711         3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055	9. East Harlem	117,070	35,821	68,074	13,175
Queens1. Astoria157,52828,139108,92120,4672. Sunnyside/Woodside107,48822,18572,59312,7113. Jackson Heights148,07432,414102,62413,0364. Elmhurst/Corona118,71524,27784,14610,2925. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99128,50788,74525,7386. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32818,59475,71925,0157. Flushing/Whitestone228,05842,194143,20642,6588. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows146,79332,95992,91520,9199. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16624,93571,7579,47410. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park106,14623,04469,85413,24811. Bayside/Little Neck108,08618,62770,52818,93012. Jamaica194,16758,269117,02018,87813. Bellerose/Rosedale169,12744,616105,05519,45614. Rockaways99,51631,18854,89013,438Staten Island114,45027,11072,05915,2812. Mid-Island114,45027,11072,05915,2813. South Shore143,09338,09585,75319,246	10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	238,931	65,994	151,326	21,611
1. Astoria157,52828,139108,92120,4672. Sunnyside/Woodside107,48822,18572,59312,7113. Jackson Heights148,07432,414102,62413,0364. Elmhurst/Corona118,71524,27784,14610,2925. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99128,50788,74525,7386. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32818,59475,71925,0157. Flushing/Whitestone228,05842,194143,20642,6588. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows146,79332,95992,91520,9199. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16624,93571,7579,47410. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park106,14623,04469,85413,24811. Bayside/Little Neck108,08618,62770,52818,93012. Jamaica194,16758,269117,02018,87813. Bellerose/Rosedale169,12744,616105,05519,45614. Rockaways99,51631,18854,89013,438Staten Island114,45027,11072,05915,2812. Mid-Island114,45027,11072,05915,2813. South Shore143,09338,09585,75319,2462. Mid-Island114,45027,11072,05915,281	Queens				
2. Sunnyside/Woodside107,48822,18572,59312,7113. Jackson Heights148,07432,414102,62413,0364. Elmhurst/Corona118,71524,27784,14610,2925. Middle Village/Ridgewood142,99128,50788,74525,7386. Forest Hills/Rego Park119,32818,59475,71925,0157. Flushing/Whitestone228,05842,194143,20642,6588. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows146,79332,95992,91520,9199. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven106,16624,93571,7579,47410. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park106,14623,04469,85413,24811. Bayside/Little Neck108,08618,62770,52818,93012. Jamaica194,16758,269117,02018,87813. Bellerose/Rosedale169,12744,616105,05519,45614. Rockaways99,51631,18854,89013,438Staten Island114,45027,11072,05915,2812. Mid-Island114,45027,11072,05915,2813. South Shore1441,12641,41481,40618,306	1. Astoria	157,528	28,139	108,921	20,467
3. Jackson Heights       148,074       32,414       102,624       13,036         4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281	2. Sunnyside/Woodside	107,488	22,185	72,593	12,711
4. Elmhurst/Corona       118,715       24,277       84,146       10,292         5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281	3. Jackson Heights	148,074	32,414	102,624	13,036
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood       142,991       28,507       88,745       25,738         6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281	4. Elmhurst/Corona	118,715	24,277	84,146	10,292
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park       119,328       18,594       75,719       25,015         7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         3. South Shore       141,126       41,414       81,406       18,306	5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	142,991	28,507	88,745	25,738
7. Flushing/Whitestone       228,058       42,194       143,206       42,658         8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146,793       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281	6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	119,328	18,594	75,719	25,015
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows       146, /93       32,959       92,915       20,919         9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       71,757       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         2. Mid-Island       114,126       41,414       81,406       18,306	7. Flushing/Whitestone	228,058	42,194	143,206	42,658
9. Kew Gardens/ Woodhaven       106,166       24,935       /1,/5/       9,474         10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       143,093       38,095       85,753       19,246         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         3. South Shore       141,126       41,414       81,406       18,306	8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	146,793	32,959	92,915	20,919
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park       106,146       23,044       69,854       13,248         11. Bayside/Little Neck       108,086       18,627       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       1. North Shore       143,093       38,095       85,753       19,246         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281	9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	106,166	24,935	/1,/5/	9,474
11. Dayside/ Little Neck       106,086       18,027       70,528       18,930         12. Jamaica       194,167       58,269       117,020       18,878         13. Bellerose/Rosedale       169,127       44,616       105,055       19,456         14. Rockaways       99,516       31,188       54,890       13,438         Staten Island       1       143,093       38,095       85,753       19,246         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         3. South Shore       141,126       41,414       81,406       18,306	10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100,146	23,044	09,854	13,248
12. jamaica     194,167     58,269     117,020     18,878       13. Bellerose/Rosedale     169,127     44,616     105,055     19,456       14. Rockaways     99,516     31,188     54,890     13,438       Staten Island     1     1. North Shore     143,093     38,095     85,753     19,246       2. Mid-Island     114,450     27,110     72,059     15,281       3. South Shore     141,126     41,414     81,406     18,306	11. Dayside/Little Neck	108,086	18,627	/0,528	18,930
15. Belierose/Rosedale     169,12/     44,616     105,055     19,456       14. Rockaways     99,516     31,188     54,890     13,438       Staten Island     1     1. North Shore     143,093     38,095     85,753     19,246       2. Mid-Island     114,450     27,110     72,059     15,281       3. South Shore     141,126     41,414     81,406     18,306	12. Jamaica	194,167	58,269	117,020	18,878
14. ROCKAWAYS     59,516     51,188     54,890     13,438       Staten Island     1     143,093     38,095     85,753     19,246       2. Mid-Island     114,450     27,110     72,059     15,281       3. South Shore     141,126     41,414     81,406     18,306	1.5. Deilerose/ Kosedale	109,127	44,010	105,055	19,450
1. North Shore       143,093       38,095       85,753       19,246         2. Mid-Island       114,450       27,110       72,059       15,281         3. South Shore       141,126       41,414       81,406       18,306	14. ROCKAWAYS	yy,510	31,188	54,890	13,438
1. North Shore     143,093     58,095     85,753     19,246       2. Mid-Island     114,450     27,110     72,059     15,281       3. South Shore     141,126     41,414     81,406     18,306	Juanti Island	142.002	20.005	05 752	10.24/
2. mu-isianu 114,450 27,110 72,059 15,281 3 South Shore 141.126 41.414 81.406 18.206	1. North Shore	145,095	28,095 27 110	80,/00 72,050	19,240 15 201
	2. Mut-Island 3. South Shore	141 126	41 414	81 406	18 306

 Table A.3
 Number of Individuals by Age Group by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

Source: Note: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

			Years of Edu	ication	
Sub-Borough Area	All	Less than 12	12 Years	13-15 Years	16+
Bronx					
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	67,086	34,004	15,841	12,600	4,641
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	69,468	33,369	22,980	9,387	3,732
5. Highbridge/South Concourse	65,856	31,526	19,551	11,116	3,663
4. University Heights/Fordham	71,035	25,410	28,549	11,034	6,042
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	90,072	36,485	26,511	13,341	13,735
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	80,288	17,408	22,473	14,105	26,301
7. Soundview/Parkchester	111,936	38,135	41,888	23,444	8,469
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	82,810	13,135	26,329	23,241	20,105
9. Pelham Parkway 10. Williamahridaa / Bawahaatar	78,038	18,979	26,771	18,123	14,165
Pro al-lwe	83,584	18,985	23,611	24,558	16,431
1 Williamsburg/Greenpoint	01 246	22 470	20.002	12 220	17 463
2 Brooklyn Heights /Fort Greene	91,240 60,400	52,470 10 E19	20,903	12,550	20.842
3 Bedford Stuwyesant	67 274	10,516	14,295	14,755	29,043
4 Bushwick	74 222	22,907	21,4/1	13,290	5 7 2 7
5 East New York/Starrett City	74,322 84.106	33,417 26 E 49	19,492	21 410	0,101
6 Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	84,190 77 747	20,340	12 227	21,419	0,423 25 209
7 Supset Park	06,406	26.002	12,337	10,293	12.846
8 North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	90,490 67.545	50,992 17 535	21 601	15,001	12,040
9 South Crown Heights	70.027	17,555	21,091	10,329	11,969
10 Bay Ridge	9,027	17,085	26,065	10,479	28 784
11 Bensonhurst	112 653	28 316	32 754	20.711	30,872
12. Borough Park	89.065	20,510	30,007	15.457	20,810
13. Coney Island	84 870	22,771	29,109	13 301	20,289
14. Flatbush	108 678	18 542	30,601	26.882	32 652
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	111 370	19,472	36.077	20,002	34 213
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	62 177	22 757	18 901	17 643	2 876*
17. East Flatbush	97.611	16 092	36 717	26 726	18.077
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	127 465	24 661	41 559	31 579	29.665
Manhattan	127,105	21,001	11,555	51,577	29,005
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	98 952	5 363	11.011	10 588	71 991
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	102 106	40.689	19 903	14,896	26.618
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	103,188	13,043	13,857	11,656	64 623
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	127.060	2.193*	10.385	18.621	95.860
5. Upper West Side	186,943	19.874	23.091	26.770	117.208
6. Upper East Side	224.226	4.668	17.344	27.021	175,193
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	91.874	24.936	17.058	17.574	32.306
8. Central Harlem	79.835	21.041	29.273	19.808	9.712
9. East Harlem	81,249	36,707	17,351	15,702	11,489
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	172,937	58,818	44,691	33,449	35,980
Queens		,	,	*	
1. Astoria	129,388	29,162	40,999	26,484	32,744
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	85,303	16,206	22,191	19,010	27,897
3. Jackson Heights	115,660	39,273	39,937	19,283	17,167
4. Elmhurst/Corona	94,438	27,838	28,366	16,849	21,385
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	114,483	22,655	49,632	23,399	18,797
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100,734	11,158	27,170	17,820	44,586
7. Flushing/Whitestone	185,864	28,375	63,104	33,675	60,710
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	113,834	13,844	30,700	30,436	38,854
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	81,231	17,364	31,948	13,829	18,091
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	83,102	15,310	30,817	21,158	15,817
11. Bayside/Little Neck	89,458	13,224	26,142	20,207	29,886
12. Jamaica	135,898	30,669	45,500	35,303	24,426
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	124,511	13,659	43,806	35,252	31,794
14. Rockaways	68,328	15,875	22,189	16,722	13,543
Staten Island					
1. North Shore	104,998	22,552	37,184	17,060	28,201
2. Mid-Island	87,340	13,839	29,765	18,605	25,131
3. South Shore	99,712	6,355	37,766	25,779	29,812

Number of Individuals 18 Years of Age and Over by Level of Educational Attainment by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of individuals is small, interpret with caution

					Couple	Percent
Sub-Borough Area	All	Single	Single w. Child	Couple	w. Child	Secondary <sup>b</sup>
Bronx						
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	62.4	21.9	5.7	10.0	35.2
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	56.0	27.6	6.7	9.7	35.0
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	60.3	19.9	7.5	12.2	37.4
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	55.3	24.1	6.7	13.8	37.7
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	60.8	12.7	11.5	15.0	40.1
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	57.9	12.8	14.9	14.5	26.7
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	62.0	16.7	8.6	12.7	38.5
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	61.6	7.6	21.6	9.2	34.7
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	59.2	11.6	16.9	12.4	30.7
10. Williamsbridge/Bavchester	100.0	58.6	16.6	14.2	10.6	35.6
Brooklyn						
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	61.0	10.3	10.9	17.9	30.2
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	69.2	12.3	11.7	6.9	25.3
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	58.6	21.4	11.4	8.7	33.1
4. Bushwick	100.0	55.7	16.7	10.9	16.8	40.0
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	58.6	17.8	11.2	12.4	39.8
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	64.8	6.5	15.6	13.1	27.2
7. Sunset Park	100.0	53.8	7.9	17.8	20.5	37.9
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Hgts.	100.0	63.0	15.2	10.5	11.3	26.3
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	64.4	14.0	10.6	11.0	39.0
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	58.8	3.7	21.6	15.9	25.3
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	51.2	6.2	21.3	21.2	25.2
12. Borough Park	100.0	46.6	4.4	22.0	27.0	24.6
13. Coney Island	100.0	57.6	10.4	19.8	12.2	30.4
14. Flatbush	100.0	58.6	9.9	15.4	16.1	34.4
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	52.2	4.8	20.5	22.6	30.7
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	59.9	20.0	7.0	13.1	32.8
17. East Flatbush	100.0	58.9	15.0	13.7	12.4	43.4
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	54.5	10.1	18.8	16.6	37.2
Manhattan						
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	73.7	1.8*	18.5	6.0	20.0
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	70.1	9.5	13.1	7.2	36.8
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	79.0	1.4*	15.5	4.0	23.2
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	70.6	2.3	21.4	5.6	14.6
5. Upper West Side	100.0	70.3	5.2	16.2	8.3	22.0
6. Upper East Side	100.0	66.6	2.6	19.6	11.2	19.7
<ol><li>Morningside Heights/Hamilton Hgts.</li></ol>	100.0	64.4	16.0	10.8	8.8	41.5
8. Central Harlem	100.0	71.3	15.6	7.5	5.6	43.6
9. East Harlem	100.0	66.9	18.3	6.8	8.0	39.9
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	66.4	13.9	9.1	10.7	47.6
Queens						
1. Astoria	100.0	65.5	5.4	16.7	12.3	29.7
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	58.0	5.1	19.7	17.3	29.5
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	59.4	7.4	17.1	16.2	41.8
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	55.8	7.4	20.9	16.0	37.2
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	54.7	6.2	20.3	18.8	26.6
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	53.3	2.3*	27.5	16.8	17.5
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	52.5	3.8	24.0	19.7	29.1
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	51.5	5.2	22.9	20.4	27.4
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	54.2	6.6	17.8	21.4	32.9
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	51.5	7.1	22.5	18.9	34.8
11. Bavside/Little Neck	100.0	53.5	2.5*	26.0	18.0	29.0
12. Jamaica	100.0	56.8	12.7	12.2	18.4	38.3
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	50.8	7.8	19.6	21.8	35.9
14. Kockaways	100.0	54.4	14.7	16.8	14.1	28.8
Staten Island						
1. North Shore	100.0	53.1	8.5	19.2	19.3	26.9
2. Mid-Island	100.0	50.5	3.2*	25.4	20.9	31.1
3. South Shore	100.0	40.1	4.1	26.8	29.0	24.6

### Distribution of Single/Couple Types and Percent Who are Secondary by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.5

Source: Notes:

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge b A "secondary single/couple" is a single/couple that does not include the householder. \* Since the number is small, interpret with caution.

Sub-Borough Area	All	USA	Puerto Rico/Non-USA
Bronx			
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	41.1	58.7
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	60.7	39.3
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	40.8	59.2
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	47.1	52.9
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	44.0	56.0
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	59.3	40.7
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	48.4	51.6
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	81.3	18.7
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	59.3	40.7
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	52.7	47.3
Brooklyn			
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	42.3	57.7
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	70.2	29.8
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	80.7	19.3
4. Bushwick	100.0	39.7	60.3
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	55.4	44.6
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	72.2	27.8
7. Sunset Park	100.0	29.8	70.2
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	60.6	39.4
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	31.7	68.3
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	66.5	33.5
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	53.6	46.4
12. Borough Park	100.0	46.5	53.5
13. Coney Island	100.0	40.7	59.3
14. Flatbush	100.0	40.4	59.6
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	46.6	53.4
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	53.9	46.1
17. East Flatbush	100.0	34.6	65.4
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	49.8	50.2
Manhattan			
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	75.2	24.8
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	43.7	56.3
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	68.1	31.9
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	72.4	27.6
5. Upper West Side	100.0	70.5	29.5
6. Upper East Side	100.0	79.6	20.4
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	100.0	58.6	41.4
8. Central Harlem	100.0	81.0	19.0
9. East Harlem	100.0	51.7	48.3
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	28.8	71.2
Queens			
1. Astoria	100.0	44.5	55.5
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	32.5	67.5
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	20.0	80.0
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	19.3	80.7
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	54.3	45.7
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	37.1	62.9
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	45.1	54.9
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	48.0	52.0
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	39.8	60.2
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	56.1	43.9
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	62.2	37.8
12. Jamaica	100.0	59.9	40.1
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	54.0	46.0
14. Rockaways	100.0	68.1	31.9
Staten Island		5011	
1. North Shore	100.0	78.2	21.8
2. Mid-Island	100.0	73.5	26.5
3. South Shore	100.0	87.6	12.4
		5110	

Table A.6	Distribution of Households by Birth Region of Householder (USA/non-USA)
	by Sub-Borough, New York Čity 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

	Number o	of Households	Ownership
Sub-Borough Area	Owner	Renter	Rate (%)
Bronx			
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	3,920	33,682	10.4
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	**	37,048	4.8*
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	**	32,492	5.6*
4. University Heights/Fordham	2,228*	34,564	6.1
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	3,710	38,960	8.7
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridgeª	12,071	33,407	26.5
7. Soundview/Parkchester	10,041	46,775	17.7
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	26,473	14,839	64.1
9. Pelham Parkway	12,863	28,996	30.7
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	16,474	26,682	38.2
Brooklyn			
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	8,581	40,919	17.3
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	13,129	30,637	30.0
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	7,673	29,993	20.4
4. Bushwick	4,949	29,975	14.2
5. East New York/Starrett City	8,203	32,790	20.0
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	8,540	35,452	19.4
2. Sunset Park 9. North Crown Heights / Drosport Heights	11,925	31,500	27.5
0. South Crown Heights	6,940 5 259	34,032	16.9
9. South Crown rieghts	5,258 22,705	34,424	15.5
10. Day Kidge	25,795	27,542	40.4
12 Borough Park	17,900	41,119	40.0
13 Copey Island	14,067	30.676	40.0
14 Flatbush	11,007	42 612	21.6
15 Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	20.698	33 229	38.4
16 Brownsville/Ocean Hill	6 201	28 549	17.8
17. East Flatbush	15 004	28,838	34.2
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	30.843	28,421	52.0
Manhattan	50,015	20,121	52.0
1 Greenwich Village/Financial District	16 728	46 896	26.3
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	7 892	45 699	14 7
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	14,449	51.833	21.8
4. Stuvvesant Town/Turtle Bay	23.982	61.422	28.1
5. Upper West Side	33,770	83,517	28.8
6. Upper East Side	48,112	89,711	34.9
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	5,909	39,032	13.1
8. Central Harlem	3,129	36,707	7.9
9. East Harlem	5,515	37,197	12.9
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	6,416	69,521	8.4
Queens			
1. Astoria	12,666	57,833	18.0
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	15,054	28,894	34.3
3. Jackson Heights	17,363	33,209	34.3
4. Elmhurst/Corona	9,352	34,070	21.5
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	25,045	35,343	41.5
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	19,436	38,170	33.7
7. Flushing/Whitestone	43,250	48,425	47.2
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	21,967	35,762	38.1
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	16,263	23,061	41.4
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	26,932	11,357	70.3
11. Bayside/Little Neck	30,022	14,117	68.0
12. Jamaica	39,925	24,439	62.0
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	40,871	15,659	72.3
14. ROCKAWAYS	14,186	23,068	38.1
Staten Island			
1. North Shore	28,214	27,227	50.9
2. IVIId-Island	27,109	14,007	65.9
5. South Shore	30,458	11,891	/5.4

#### Table A.7 Number of Owner Households, Number of Renter Households, and Homeownership Rate by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. \*\*Too few households to report. Source:

Notes:

Table A.8 1	Distribution of Households b	y Household Type	e by Sub-Borough	, New York Cit	v 1999
-------------	------------------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------	--------

			Single	-		Adults	
Sub-Borough Area	All	Elderly	Adult	w. Child	Elderly	2 or More	w. Child
Brony					,		
1 Mott Haven /Hunts Doint	100.0	18 /	127	24.1	71	15.1	22.8
2 Morrisonia/Fast Tremont	100.0	11.3	12.7	27.3	/.1	13.0	26.8
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	11.5	16.7	18.5	1 3*	18.2	20.0
4. University Heights /Fordham	100.0	7 3	14.3	20.0	4.5	14.2	28.5
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	6.1	24.0	29.0	3.0*	20.8	20.9
6 Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	17.6	24.9	10.5	11 /	20.8	25.5
7 Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	10.5	16.8	17.4	8.4	18.4	28.6
8 Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	16.4	17.8	87	13.8	27.0	16.3
9 Pelham Parlavay	100.0	12.8	21.1	7.4	12.3	21.0	25.2
10 Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	12.0	14.3	16.6	12.5	20.9	23.4
Brooklyn	100.0	12.5	11.5	10.0	12.1	20.7	25.1
1 Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	147	19.6	6.8	69	197	323
2 Brooklyn Heights /Fort Greene	100.0	12.5	36.1	9.6	5.7	21.6	14.6
3 Bedford Stuwesant	100.0	10.2	20.4	18.0	11.5	14.6	25.2
4 Bushwick	100.0	6.9	10.4	14.1	79	20.8	40.0
5 East New York/Starrett City	100.0	6.6	18.1	18.3	82	18.3	29.7
6 Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	10.8	30.1	4 1*	3.6*	29.1	22.3
7 Sunset Park	100.0	11.3	10.9	7.6	11.4	23.0	35.8
8 North Crown Hots/Pros Hots	100.0	14.8	27.4	13.1	3.0*	20.9	20.8
9 South Crown Heights	100.0	11.0	16.6	13.1	85	23.5	26.6
10 Bay Ridge	100.0	18.6	17.7	3.9*	9.8	28.1	21.9
11 Bensonhurst	100.0	17.0	15.3	5.2	12.1	19.2	31.1
12 Borough Park	100.0	12.7	15.0	3.2*	14.6	16.5	37.8
13 Coney Island	100.0	21.2	12.7	7.5	15.7	20.1	22.8
14 Flatbush	100.0	89	18.9	87	11.2	23.6	28.8
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	13.8	11.0	4.6	14.4	21.7	34.5
16 Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	8.9	19.7	17.6	61	17.4	30.3
17 East Flatbush	100.0	6.6	7.0	14.5	11.6	29.0	31.3
18 Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	9.9	10.8	5.8	14.0	24.8	34.8
Manhattan	10010		1010	010	1 110	2110	5 110
1. Greenwich Village/Fin. Dist.	100.0	12.9	44.4	2.0*	4.7	28.1	7.8
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	17.5	27.5	5.0	10.2	22.0	17.7
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	12.5	50.1	**	4.1	26.2	6.7
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	16.9	41.5	2.3*	6.5	26.0	6.8
5. Upper West Side	100.0	14.5	42.0	3.0	6.8	20.6	13.1
6. Upper East Side	100.0	11.7	37.6	2.4	6.9	26.8	14.6
7. Morningside Hgts./Ham. Hgts.	100.0	11.3	16.3	11.6	9.2	25.9	25.7
8. Central Harlem	100.0	18.2	23.7	12.2	9.8	14.9	21.3
9. East Harlem	100.0	15.9	20.4	15.1	7.2	15.9	25.4
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	12.0	15.8	12.1	9.0	21.4	29.7
Queens							
1. Astoria	100.0	14.2	20.5	4.9	7.8	32.8	19.9
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	11.6	19.9	3.0*	7.4	29.7	28.3
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	8.2	11.5	4.3	9.6	32.1	34.3
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	7.3	12.5	5.3	9.9	33.4	31.6
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	16.3	10.5	4.5	13.9	25.9	28.9
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	14.6	21.0	1.9*	14.1	27.0	21.3
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	14.8	11.3	2.3	15.4	25.7	30.5
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	11.9	14.0	4.1	11.4	27.9	30.7
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	9.8	13.4	5.0*	6.9	29.4	35.5
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	10.5	9.0	4.7*	15.5	26.4	33.9
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	12.3	11.4	**	16.1	31.3	26.8
12. Jamaica	100.0	10.8	11.4	9.4	10.0	18.4	39.9
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	8.0	9.1	5.1	13.6	23.8	40.4
14. Rockaways	100.0	14.7	16.9	13.2	13.5	15.4	26.3
Staten Island							
1. North Shore	100.0	12.5	18.1	6.1	11.4	20.6	31.3
2. Mid-Island	100.0	10.1	9.0	3.5*	15.5	30.4	31.5
3. South Shore	100.0	6.8	10.2	3.4*	15.0	24.1	40.6

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. \*\* Too few households to report.

				Puerto	Non-Puerto		Native
Sub-Borough Area	All	White	Black	Rican	Rican Hispanic	Asian	American
Bronx					-		
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	**	22.5	52.1	22.7	**	**
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	5.3	38.5	32.8	22.1	**	**
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	**	38.0	26.9	31.9	**	**
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	**	41.7	25.6	27.9	**	**
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	14.8	22.2	30.8	26.8	4.3*	**
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	51.5	17.3	11.2	16.9	3.2*	**
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	6.3	35.5	41.3	13.8	2.2*	**
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	45.7	33.4	16.0	4.2*	**	**
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	47.9	16.4	20.3	11.9	3.6*	**
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	15.8	63.6	11.7	7.6	**	**
Brooklyn							
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	537	8.0	21.4	13.9	2.6*	**
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	36.3	48.8	9.5	3.1*	**	**
3. Bedford Stuvyesant	100.0	**	76.8	13.4	5.0*	**	2.8*
4. Bushwick	100.0	83	25.4	28.4	35.7	**	**
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	8.5	59.0	20.0	11.6	**	**
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	61.9	11.6	14.8	6.6	47	**
7. Sunset Park	100.0	31.9	3.0*	25.9	22.1	16.2	**
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	10.7	74.6	61	5.7	**	**
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	4.0*	84.0	**	9.0	**	**
10 Bay Ridge	100.0	80.4	**	13	3.4*	10.8	**
11 Bensonhurst	100.0	83.1	**	4.2	**	10.0	**
12 Borough Park	100.0	76.4	4.4	5.0	**	12.0	**
13 Coney Island	100.0	70.4	12.7	7.0	4.6	12.0	**
14 Flatbush	100.0	47.6	35.0	7.7 7.7*	4.0 8.5	5.3	**
15 Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	83.0	3.8	2.7	3.7	6.1	**
16 Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	**	94.3	2.0	6.0	**	**
17 East Flatbush	100.0	4.0	86.2	**	5.5	**	**
18 Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	47.4	43.7	2.3*	3.6	3.0*	**
Manhattan	100.0	<b>-</b> 7/ <b>.</b> -	+J.7	2.5	5.0	5.0	
1 Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	84.2	2.6*	1.6*	2.6*	85	**
2 Lower F. Side/Chinatown	100.0	37.1	5.0	20.6	2.0	26.4	**
3 Chelses/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	67.3	5.0	20.0	0.9	20.4	**
4 Stuwesant Town /Turtle Bay	100.0	07.5	J.I 1.6*	2.7	9.0 1.7*	10.0	**
5 Upper West Side	100.0	03.2 72.1	6.2	2.7	1.7	6.2	**
6 Upper Fast Side	100.0	/2.1	0.3	4.4	10.0	2.0	**
7 Morningside Heights /Hamilton Heights	100.0	07.7	26.5	1.0 E 4	4.2	5.0	**
8 Central Harlem	100.0	20.7	30.5	2.4	20.0	5.5	**
9 East Harlem	100.0	0.7	80.5 45 5	2.8**	/.0 1 E E	2.1*	**
10 Washington Heights /Inwood	100.0	0.7	45.5	20.5	15.5	3.1 <sup></sup>	**
Oucope	100.0	24.4	11./	9.1	55.8	-11-	
Queens	100.0	55.0	0.0	( )	16.0	10 5	**
2 Supposide/Weedside	100.0	55.2	9.2	0.5	16.0	12.5	**
2. Sulliyside/ woodside	100.0	46.5	<i>3.8</i> <sup>+</sup>	4.5*	22.5	23.1	**
5. Jackson riegnis	100.0	20.3	11.4	3.1*	54.2	10.5	**
4. Elimitust/Corona 5. Middle Villege/Didgement	100.0	13.2	13.4	3.9*	48.6	20.9	**
6. Equat Hills / Page Dark	100.0	72.9	**	10.1	11.1	5.2	**
0. Porest mills/ Rego Park 7. Elushing /Whitestone	100.0	/5./	5.0*	**	8.8	11.0	**
/. Flushing/ Whitestone	100.0	53.5	4.1	3.1	9.0	29.9	**
0. Functest/ Fresh Meadows	100.0	48.6	16.1	5.0	13.3	16.7	**
7. New Gardens/ Woodhaven	100.0	43.2	7.7	11.4	20.0	16.8	**
10. Floward Deach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	55.6	15.8	6.3	8.0	14.2	**
11. Dayside/ Little INECK	100.0	72.0	**	2.3*	5.9	18.7	**
12. jamaica	100.0	2.4*	80.4	3.4	7.2	5.0	1.6*

Table A.9	Distribution of Households b	v Race	Ethnicity	by Sub-Bord	ough, New	York City 1999
		, <b>,</b>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. \*\*Too few households to report. Source: Notes:

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

100.0

29.6

43.0

68.0

81.8

90.6

53.1

36.8

18.3

\*\*

\*\*

2.3\*

7.9

4.9

3.6\*

4.1\*

10.5

4.6\*

3.1\*

8.6

3.0\*

3.8 7.7

5.6

3.9\*

\*\*

\*\*

\*\*

\*\*

\*\*

\*\*

13. Bellerose/Rosedale

14. Rockaways

Staten Island 1. North Shore 2. Mid-Island

3. South Shore

	Median Household Income				
Sub-Borough Area	Owners	Renters	Both		
Bronx					
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	\$39,689	\$10,000	\$12,000		
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	62,000	12,132	12,780		
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	18,000	15,000	15,400		
4. University Heights/Fordham	27,000	14,610	15,000		
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	53,454	20,000	24,000		
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	33,820	26,904	27,928		
7. Soundview/Parkchester	45,600	18,000	20,000		
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	45,000	30,000	39,880		
9. Pelham Parkway	39,000	23,400	28,000		
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	43,000	22,000	30,000		
Brooklyn					
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	\$35,000	\$23,600	\$25,000		
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	50,000	25,400	30,000		
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	36,600	13,728	17,000		
4. Bushwick	43,000	15,855	18,800		
5. East New York/Starrett City	68,000	18,000	24,154		
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	85,000	35,000	40,000		
7. Sunset Park	38,308	20,000	25,000		
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	35,000	21,000	22,176		
9. South Crown Heights	52,000	26,915	28,000		
10. Bay Ridge	54,000	29,960	35,000		
11. Bensonhurst	38,000	30,000	31,000		
12. Borough Park	40,000	28,000	31,000		
13. Coney Island	37,000	11,500	20,000		
14. Flatbush	65,454	26,000	29,500		
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	59,600	24,000	33,000		
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	45,800	16,616	20,025		
17. East Flatbush	64,000	26,420	32,920		
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	50,000	32,000	39,000		
Manhattan					
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	\$97,000	\$50,000	\$60,000		
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	38,600	20,000	22,000		
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	68,420	40,000	43,000		
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	85,000	60,000	65,000		
5. Upper West Side	75,000	39,000	45,000		
6. Upper East Side	91,000	55,000	63,000		
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	49,000	20,100	23,000		
8. Central Harlem	30,000	17,000	17,200		
9. East Harlem	25,000	14,000	15,327		
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	46,000	21,600	22,960		
Queens					
1. Astoria	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000		
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	48,559	29,000	33,200		
3. Jackson Heights	39,000	30,000	32,400		
4. Elmhurst/Corona	50,000	30,000	33,000		
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	39,000	30,000	33,500		
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	49,000	34,000	35,000		
7. Flushing/Whitestone	50,000	32,000	39,000		
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	65,000	30,000	41,800		
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	59,136	30,000	39,000		
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	48,000	30,000	40,000		
11. Bayside/Little Neck	56,640	34,200	49,680		
12. Jamaica	55,000	24,800	41,000		
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	56,000	41,500	52,550		
14. Rockaways	60,000	16,500	27,200		
Staten Island					
1. North Shore	\$57,000	\$30,000	\$40,000		
2. Mid-Island	70,000	35,000	50,000		
3. South Shore	65,300	35,000	58,360		

 Table A.10
 Median Household Income by Tenure by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Note: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

Sub-Borough Area	All	< \$10,000	\$10-24,999	\$25-39,999	\$40-59,999	\$60,000+
Bronx						
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	45.8	25.9	15.6	6.8	5.9
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	43.1	27.0	14.8	8.6	6.5
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	34.5	35.5	16.5	10.3	3.3*
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	36.4	30.1	15.1	13.4	5.0*
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	24.9	28.3	23.6	13.2	10.0
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	18.4	27.1	18.8	13.2	22.4
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	29.7	28.5	16.9	11.8	13.1
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	10.1	16.8	23.2	25.0	24.9
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	19.1	25.9	20.8	17.1	17.2
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	19.1	26.6	15.6	21.6	17.1
Brooklyn						
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	23.2	25.4	21.7	17.1	12.7
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	23.0	16.4	16.2	14.6	29.8
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	35.2	28.1	12.6	13.4	10.8
4. Bushwick	100.0	27.7	29.8	21.7	10.9	9.9
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	26.7	23.7	17.3	10.9	21.5
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	16.6	17.1	13.6	16.6	36.0
7. Sunset Park	100.0	20.4	28.4	21.2	14.6	15.5
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	22.7	34.5	19.4	14.2	9.2
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	15.6	25.4	23.6	20.4	14.9
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	12.5	22.3	17.9	16.0	31.4
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	17.0	21.7	23.6	15.1	22.6
12. Borough Park	100.0	15.5	26.3	17.6	18.4	22.1
13. Coney Island	100.0	34.3	22.0	17.5	9.2	17.0
14. Flatbush	100.0	13.1	28.3	17.8	15.3	25.5
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	15.6	23.4	17.2	14.5	29.3
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	28.7	29.4	15.2	17.0	9.6
17. East Flatbush	100.0	9.0	26.2	22.3	17.7	24.8
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	8.2	18.5	23.9	17.5	31.9
Manhattan						
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	9.4	11.3	13.2	15.5	50.5
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	25.5	27.1	17.7	13.0	16.7
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	13.5	15.6	15.4	17.6	38.0
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	6.5	12.2	9.8	16.2	55.3
5. Upper West Side	100.0	12.3	15.8	15.6	14.7	41.5
6. Upper East Side	100.0	5.5	12.7	9.6	19.6	52.6
<ol><li>Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights</li></ol>	100.0	25.0	25.9	11.3	18.8	19.0
8. Central Harlem	100.0	33.4	29.5	17.5	12.2	7.4
9. East Harlem	100.0	35.7	34.7	16.6	7.1	5.9
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	22.3	30.4	18.4	14.7	14.2
Queens						
1. Astoria	100.0	20.7	21.3	19.4	15.8	22.7
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	13.7	25.4	15.8	16.3	28.7
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	9.0	28.6	20.9	22.1	19.3
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	10.3	23.9	23.9	19.0	22.8
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	14.5	22.6	20.7	18.3	24.1
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	15.0	20.2	18.4	17.3	29.2
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	11.9	19.6	19.0	19.0	30.6
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	10.0	18.9	18.8	14.6	37.6
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	10.4	22.1	17.5	21.0	29.0
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	12.0	16.0	20.4	16.3	35.3
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	6.8	16.5	15.7	21.1	39.9
12. Jamaica	100.0	10.2	20.3	16.3	20.9	32.3
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	3.5*	20.2	13.2	22.2	41.0
14. Rockaways	100.0	25.7	22.5	12.5	15.2	24.1
Staten Island						
1. North Shore	100.0	12.2	187	16.6	194	33.2
2. Mid-Island	100.0	11.0	13.4	13.8	18.0	43.7
3. South Shore	100.0	7.5	11.1	14.0	18.5	48.9

Table A 11	Distribution	of Households by	v Household Income	Group by Sub-Borough	New York City 1999
$\mathbf{I}$ able $\mathbf{A}$ .	Distribution	of Fronsenoids D	v mousenoiu meome	GIOUD DV SUD-DOLOUSI	LINEW LUIK CITV 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution.

	Percent Below	Percent Receiving
Sub-Borough Area	Poverty Level	Public Assistance
1 Mott Haven /Hunta Doint		
2. Morrisonia / Fast Tremont	49.1	50.7
2. Highbridge/South Concourse	47.9	54.1
4 University Heights/Fordham	36.1	38.4
5 Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	43.5	47.0
6 Riverdale/Kingsbridgea	33.2	33.6
7 Soundview/Parkchester	16.3	14.5
8 Throws Neck/Co-op City	34.4	34.7
9. Pelham Parkway	9.6	4.9*
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	22.0	20.6
Brooklyn	19.4	18.3
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	28.1	20.1
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	21.5	21.9
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	38.1	32.7
4. Bushwick	34.8	33.6
5. East New York/Starrett City	32.6	34.7
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	15.9	12.5
7. Sunset Park	23.9	23.2
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	25.5	24.8
9. South Crown Heights	16.8	20.8
10. Bay Ridge	11.2	8.6
11. Bensonhurst	15.0	12.9
12. Borough Park	19.8	17.0
13. Coney Island	33.0	29.2
14. Flatbush	17.1	17.0
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	16.7	16.8
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	33.3	32.9
17. East Flatbush	11.0	15.7
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	8.5	11.1
Manhattan		
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	8.2	3.2*
2. Club (Cline (Mills)	26.8	22.3
5. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	11.9	7.4
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtie Day	5.5	**
5. Upper West Side	11.2	7.6
7. Morningsida Heights /Hamilton Heights	5.2	2.1
8 Central Harlem	29.2	25.6
9. East Harlem	33.2	26.3
10 Washington Heights/Inwooda	39.6	38.8
Queens	27.7	27.0
1. Astoria	22 7	44 7
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	22.7	11./
3. Jackson Heights	15.3	5.5*
4. Elmhurst/Corona	12.1	11.2
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	13.0	14.0
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	11.4	5.1
7. Flushing/Whitestone	12.2	5.2
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	10.0	5.2 7 3
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	12.5	10.2
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	12.5	**
11. Bayside/Little Neck	5.0	**
12. Jamaica	12.1	15.6
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	5.6	2.0*
14. Rockaways	27.3	24.5
Staten Island	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
1. North Shore	11.0	87
2. Mid-Island	11.8	8.9
3. South Shore	8.7	**

### Percent of Households in Poverty and Percent of Households Receiving Public Assistance by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.12

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. \*\* Too few households to report. Source: Notes:

Table A.13	Distribution of Renter	Occupied Units b	y Regulatory	Status by Sub-B	orough, New York C	ity 1999
------------	------------------------	------------------	--------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------

	All				Other	Un-
Sub-Borough Area	(%)	Public	Stabilized	Controlled	Regulated <sup>b</sup>	Regulated
Bronx						
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	34.6	36.4	**	14.2	14.3
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	22.4	46.6	**	21.6	9.4
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	5.7*	78.6	**	8.3	5.8*
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	5.9	63.0	**	17.1	14.0
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	**	88.0	**	**	10.2
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	**	77.4	4.7*	5.5*	12.4
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	12.3	42.3	**	15.1	29.4
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	12.7*	27.1	**	7.3*	51.6
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	9.0	54.2	**	6.2*	28.8
10.Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	7.7	39.0	**	8.7	43.1
Brooklyn						
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	8.6	54.7	3.7*	3.4*	29.6
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	25.1	35.5	3.7*	6.4*	29.3
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	24.9	21.4	**	13.1	37.5
4. Bushwick	100.0	13.6	54.9	4.0*	3.8*	23.7
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	23.7	10.8	**	21.2	44.3
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	9.5	55.9	5.6*	**	26.8
7. Sunset Park	100.0	**	48.8	3.2*	5.6*	42.4
8. North Crown Hgts./Prospect Hgts.	100.0	9.6	53.9	3.0*	13.1	20.4
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	**	69.6	3.9*	4.5*	19.8
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	**	45.3	**	5.1*	46.2
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	**	47.8	2.9*	**	47.0
12. Borough Park	100.0	**	31.9	**	**	67.4
13. Coney Island	100.0	19.7	42.2	**	13.2	24.3
14. Flatbush	100.0	**	82.9	**	**	17.1
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	6.8	53.3	**	**	37.0
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	20.6	26.7	**	16.8	35.3
17. East Flatbush	100.0	**	48.2	**	5.4*	41.3
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	15.7	17.4	**	**	66.3
Manhattan						
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	**	61.3	4.4	8.8	25.5
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	27.3	52.6	3.0*	13.1	4.0*
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	4.8	63.8	5.2	8.6	17.6
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	**	71.6	2.8*	3.8	20.5
5. Upper West Side	100.0	9.6	62.9	7.5	5.8	14.2
6. Upper East Side	100.0	1.6*	66.3	4.8	4.4	22.9
/. Morningside Hgts./Hamilton Hgts.	100.0	8.0	57.2	6.4	17.1	11.3
8. Central Harlem	100.0	20.0	56.9	**	19.0	3.2*
9. East Harlem	100.0	43.1	30.4	**	22.9	3.1*
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	2.1*	83.7	4.0	4.7	5.6
Queens						
1. Astoria	100.0	16.1	43.4	6.6	**	32.6
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	**	61.6	5.1*	**	33.3
5. Jackson Heights	100.0	**	46.1	**	**	51.4
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	**	56.5	**	**	42.2
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	**	35.1	4.1*	**	60.3
5. Forest Hills/ Rego Park	100.0	**	74.8	**	**	24.7
7. Flushing/ Whitestone	100.0	**	58.4	**	**	39.9
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	7.1	49.1	**	9.4	34.4
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	**	40.5	**	**	55.6
10. rioward beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	**	**	**	**	95.1
11. Dayside/Little Neck	100.0	**	34.0	**	**	66.0
12. Jamaica	100.0	6.6*	35.2	**	6.5*	51.1
13. Dellerose/Kosedale	100.0	**	19.5	**	**	80.5
14. KOCKAWAYS	100.0	15.9	33.0	**	30.0	21.1
Staten Island	100.0		<b>.</b>			
1. INORE SHORE	100.0	14.2	26.4	**	**	57.9
	100.0	10.6*	16.1	**	**	/3.3
3. South Shore	100.0	**	9.1*	**	**	82.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge b "Other Regulated includes HUD subsidized, Mitchell Lama rentals, Article 4, Loft Board and *in rem* units. \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution. \*\*Too few units to report.

		Number of Bedrooms			
Sub-Borough Area	All	None	One	Two	Three +
Bronx					
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	**	28.6	38.9	31.2
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	4.9	30.7	36.0	28.4
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	8.9	47.5	30.0	13.6
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	**	42.2	36.8	20.1
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	7.0	50.9	29.4	12.7
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	3.2*	43.3	39.3	14.2
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	3.5	38.4	34.1	24.0
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	**	32.4	36.0	30.3
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	6.2	41.3	34.8	17.7
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	**	31.5	33.1	34.5
Brooklyn					
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	2.9*	38.6	37.8	20.7
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	11.4	35.0	33.5	20.2
3. Bedford Stuvvesant	100.0	5.4	27.9	35.9	30.8
4. Bushwick	100.0	**	17.4	58.4	22.5
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	**	22.0	40.1	36.0
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	7.2	40.4	37.6	14.8
7. Sunset Park	100.0	**	30.8	45.0	21.9
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	5.7	36.1	38.5	19.7
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	8.0	37.9	35.8	18.2
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	3.3*	31.3	40.8	24.6
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	3.0*	34.4	40.1	22.5
12. Borough Park	100.0	2.5*	24.3	36.3	37.0
13. Coney Island	100.0	4.4	39.0	39.9	16.6
14. Flatbush	100.0	8.6	43.5	24.8	23.1
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	4.3	35.4	32.7	27.5
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	**	28.5	43.2	26.3
17. East Flatbush	100.0	**	18.3	43.3	36.6
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	**	13.0	37.7	48.2
Manhattan					
1 Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	25.9	46.6	20.5	7 1
2 Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	14.1	45.0	30.5	10.5
3 Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	29.2	49.6	17.3	3.9
4 Stuvyesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	21.8	54.1	20.6	3.6
5. Upper West Side	100.0	20.4	43.1	23.9	12.5
6. Upper East Side	100.0	16.3	41.5	31.5	10.7
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	100.0	4.5	29.6	42.8	23.0
8. Central Harlem	100.0	4.3*	40.3	34.5	21.0
9. East Harlem	100.0	3.6*	30.0	41.9	24.6
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	3.5	37.0	41.7	17.8
Queens					
1 Actoria	100.0	2.3*	30.6	137	14.5
2 Suppyside/Woodside	100.0	2.9	47.6	36.4	13.1
3 Jackson Heights	100.0	2.5	36.2	29.9	31.2
4 Elmburst/Corona	100.0	10.2	32.7	36.2	20.9
5 Middle Village/Bidgewood	100.0	**	15.7	50.2	32.5
6 Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	82	47.1	33.2	11.5
7 Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	2.4	35.1	31.4	31.2
8 Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	5.6	31.2	35.9	27.3
9 Kew Gardens/Woodbaven	100.0	2.8*	32.0	33.1	32.1
10 Howard Beach/S Ozone Park	100.0	**	15.5	25.9	58.6
11 Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	3.1*	18.8	31.4	46.8
12. Jamaica	100.0	4.0	18.0	32.3	45.7
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	2 3*	99	26.3	61.5
14. Rockaways	100.0	86	25.2	30.7	35.5
Staten Island	100.0	5.0		50.1	
1 North Shore	100.0	O /*	21.0	22 7	42.0
2 Mid Island	100.0	∠.4 <sup></sup> **	∠1.0 12.7	23./ 24.9	42.9 61 2
2. IVIU-ISIAIU 3. South Shore	100.0	**	14.7	24.0 12.0	01.Z
5. South Shore	100.0	(**)*	14.2	13.0	/1.0

### Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Size of Unit by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.14

 Source:
 U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

 Notes:
 a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

 \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

 \*\*Too few units to report

	Old Law/				1 or 2	
Sub-Borough Area	All	New Law	Post 1929	Dwellings <sup>b</sup>	Family	
Bronx				0	-	
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	39.9	50.0	4.0*	6.2	
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	57.4	36.3	**	5.1	
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	67.0	29.7	**	**	
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	42.6	43.8	4.4*	9.2	
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	65.0	25.7	4.0*	5.4	
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge	100.0	34.6	53.8	**	11.6	
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	34.9	42.7	2.6*	19.8	
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	12.3	47.7	**	38.2	
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	25.6	38.6	7.0	28.8	
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	25.2	22.7	4.0*	48.1	
Brooklyn						
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	60.8	17.1	7.3	14.8	
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	24.8	42.6	19.3	13.3	
3. Bedford Stuvyesant	100.0	23.8	28.5	21.0	26.8	
4 Bushwick	100.0	70.3	12.9	4 3*	12.5	
5 East New York/Starrett City	100.0	17.7	40.5	4.0*	37.8	
6 Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	57.5	11.5	18.2	12.8	
7 Supset Park	100.0	46.6	6.6	8.2	38.6	
8 North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	51.1	20.8	14 5	13.7	
9 South Crown Heights	100.0	50.1	28.9	5.9	15.7	
10 Bay Ridge	100.0	31.3	24.0	2.7*	41.9	
11 Bensonhurst	100.0	35.0	18.3	11.5	35.2	
12 Borough Park	100.0	22.7	15.7	9.1	52.5	
13 Coney Island	100.0	15.7	59.6	6.4	18.3	
14 Elathush	100.0	40.0	35.3	**	23.2	
15 Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	13.0	45.4	44	37.2	
16 Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	31.7	34.8	**	33.4	
17 East Elathush	100.0	35.7	11.8	**	50.3	
18 Elatlands/Canarcie	100.0	**	21.7	**	77.0	
Manhattan	100.0		21.7		77.0	
1 Croopwich Villago/Financial District	100.0	387	35.2	21.3	47	
2. Lower E. Side /Chinetown	100.0	50.7	33.Z	21.3	4./ **	
2. Chalass /Clinton /Midtown	100.0	32.9	43.0	5.5 <sup>+</sup> 10.7	**	
4. Sturrogant Town /Turtle Bay	100.0	25.0	43.3	10.1	**	
4. Stuyvesant Town/ Turtle Day	100.0	23.9	24.0	21.9	**	
6. Upper West Side	100.0	33.3	34.9	51.0	**	
7 Morningside Heights /Hamilton Heights	100.0	72.8	49.4	0.2	**	
2. Control Harlore	100.0	72.0	22.4	2.0	**	
0. East Hadam	100.0	22.0	55.4 62.7	10.0	**	
9. East Flateni 10. Weshington Heights /Lowes d	100.0	32.0 77.4	05.7	3.3	**	
Our server	100.0	//.4	21.7			
Queens	100.0	45 (	27.4	5.0	01.7	
1. Astoria	100.0	45.0	27.4	5.2	21.7	
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	29.5	45.8	** 4 E	25.1	
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	22.9	33.3	4.5	39.3	
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	**	63.5	10.4	25.2	
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	26.9	9.2	2.9*	61.0	
6. Forest Hills/ Rego Park	100.0	**	87.9	**	10.9	
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	5.6	54.7	**	39.3	
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	**	55.2	**	42.4	
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	23.2	21.7	3.9*	51.3	
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	**	14.2	**	82.1	
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	**	27.4	**	/2.6	
12. Jamaica	100.0	2.7*	27.3	**	69.3	
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	**	8.3	**	89.8	
14. Kockaways	100.0	**	57.7	6.6	35.7	
Staten Island						
1. North Shore	100.0	2.8*	19.6	**	77.3	
2. Mid-Island	100.0	**	16.0	**	83.5	
3. South Shore	100.0	**	4.7	**	95.3	

Table A.15	Distribution of Occupied and Vacant Available Units by Structure Class
	by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

 

 Source:
 U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

 Notes:
 a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

 b
 "Other Multiple Dwelling" includes apartments/hotels built before 1929, commercial buildings altered to apartments, tenements used for single room occupancy, 1-2-family houses converted to rooming houses, and miscellaneous class B

 structures.
\* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.
\*\* Too few units to report.

			Median Estimated
Sub-Borough Area	Conventional	Coop/Condo <sup>b</sup>	Value <sup>c</sup>
Bronx		1	
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	84.0	**	\$200,000
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	80.9*	**	160,000*
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	**	81.8*	**
4. University Heights/Fordham	88.7*	**	150,000
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	66.2	33.8*	180,000
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	32.1	67.9	85,000
7. Soundview/Parkchester	76.2	23.8	160,000
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	41.6	58.4	200,000
9. Pelham Parkway	/ 3.4	26.6	183,000
10. williamsbridge/ baychester	87.5	12.7	190,000
Brooklyn	== 0	211	100.000
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	75.9	24.1	190,000
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	34.8 100.0	65.2 **	125,000
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	**	180,000
5. East New York /Starrett City	07.3	**	165,000
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	69.7	30.3	360,000
7 Sunset Park	78.8	21.2	200,000
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	63.1	36.9	175.000
9. South Crown Heights	84.9	**	175,000
10. Bay Ridge	68.1	31.9	220,000
11. Bensonhurst	92.0	8.0*	270,000
12. Borough Park	79.1	20.9	250,000
13. Coney Island	36.5	63.5	200,000
14. Flatbush	78.9	21.1	200,000
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	72.7	27.3	200,000
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	88.5	**	150,000
17. East Flatbush	98.6	**	181,000
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	91.5	8.5	200,000
Manhattan			
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	13.8	86.2	250,000
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	**	100.0	68,000
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	7.4*	92.6	200,000
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	**	98.3	300,000
5. Upper West Side	**	97.5	400,000
7. Morningsida Heights /Hamilton Heights	**	99.5	400,000
8 Central Harlem	36.3*	63.7*	200,000
9 East Harlem	**	89.3	30,000*
10 Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	**	100.0	100.000
Queens			,
1 Astoria	85.0	15.0*	250,000
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	47.1	52.9	145.000
3. Jackson Heights	63.9	36.1	180.000
4. Elmhurst/Corona	70.0	30.0	200,000
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	97.2	**	200,000
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	25.5	74.5	100,000
7. Flushing/Whitestone	58.1	41.9	200,000
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	67.8	32.2	200,000
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	89.1	10.9*	170,000
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	85.4	14.6	180,000
11. Bayside/Little Neck	72.3	27.7	200,000
12. Jamaica	84.3	15.7	160,000
13. Bellerose/ Kosedale	91.7	8.3	1/5,000
14. ROCKAWAYS	57.5	4 <i>2.</i> /	200,000
Staten Island	05.4	A 4.1.	475.000
1. North Shore	95.6	4.4*	1/5,000
2. IVIIG-ISIAND 2. South Shore	95.1	4.9*	200,000
5. South Shore	94.0	0.0	200,000

Percent of Owner Units by Form of Ownership and Median Homeowner Estimated Home Value by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.16

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge. b Includes Mitchell Lama units c Excludes Mitchell Lama units \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution. \*\*Too few units to report. Source: Notes:

			Gross Rent/
Sub-Borough Area	Contract Rent	Gross Rent	Income Ratio
Bronx			
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	\$375	\$421	35.1
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	475	534	35.0
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	526	614	38.3
4. University Heights/Fordham	550	622	37.9
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	560	630	33.9
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridgea	600	680	30.6
7. Soundview/Parkchester	577	610	35.3
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	600	659	25.5
9. Pelham Parkway	570	639	28.9
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	650	700	31.1
Brooklyn			
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	\$530	\$596	31.3
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	639	660	27.7
3. Bedford Stuvyesant	495	515	32.9
4. Bushwick	500	565	34.0
5. East New York/Starrett City	600	673	33.8
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	660	720	24.9
7. Sunset Park	650	698	34.1
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	550	612	33.0
9. South Crown Heights	600	655	28.3
10. Bay Ridge	691	761	29.2
11. Bensonhurst	670	740	30.1
12. Borough Park	700	774	32.0
13. Coney Island	581	635	38.5
14. Flatbush	650	705	31.2
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	625	690	35.3
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	495	538	30.8
17. East Flatbush	650	704	31.4
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	700	775	28.2
Manhattan			
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	\$1,040	\$1,090	24.9
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	450	482	28.8
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	1000	1050	27.9
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	1100	1100	27.2
5. Upper West Side	800	850	23.9
6. Upper East Side	1170	1199	26.1
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	606	650	31.9
8. Central Harlem	412	460	27.9
9. East Harlem	414	446	31.9
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	600	660	31.0
Queens			
1. Astoria	\$675	\$730	25.2
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	680	740	31.3
3. Jackson Heights	740	795	32.5
4. Elmhurst/Corona	690	740	28.9
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	600	690	25.8
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	752	800	27.4
7. Flushing/Whitestone	750	816	29.4
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	700	740	28.2
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	725	785	31.8
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	750	820	30.0
11. Bayside/Little Neck	750	820	25.7
12. Jamaica	619	700	29.4
15. Bellerose/Kosedale	/50	840	22.6
14. KOCKAWAYS	550	581	28.9
Staten Island			
1. North Shore	\$600	\$690	25.6
2. Mtd-Island	650	775	23.7
3. South Shore	650	750	31.2

#### Table A.17 Median Contract Rent, Median Gross Rent and Median Gross Rent/Income Ratio by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

Source:U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.Note:a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

		Less than				
Sub-Borough Area	Total	\$400	\$400-\$599	\$600-\$799	\$800-\$999	\$1,000+
Bronx						
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	52.9	25.0	16.3	4.3*	**
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	37.7	39.2	14.2	5.6	3.2*
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	24.2	44.0	23.6	5.3*	**
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	19.9	45.3	23.3	9.3	**
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	16.9	39.9	35.1	7.7	**
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	6.3	38.9	27.8	16.5	10.5
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	20.1	34.6	28.5	15.0	**
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	14.0	27.2	31.4	17.5	9.8*
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	13.5	41.3	26.3	16.3	**
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	14.6	25.8	36.9	18.5	4.2*
Brooklyn						
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	19.7	35.0	25.8	10.7	8.8
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	30.6	14.3	19.7	14.4	21.0
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	33.3	35.0	26.2	4.8*	**
4. Bushwick	100.0	20.6	47.1	26.8	**	**
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	24.4	19.3	32.2	20.2	3.9*
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	16.3	21.0	22.9	11.4	28.5
7. Sunset Park	100.0	7.2	30.7	43.3	13.9	4.9*
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	23.2	35.0	30.0	8.3	3.6*
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	8.4	41.6	38.1	11.3	**
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	7.9	17.6	47.8	20.6	6.1*
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	**	26.4	50.2	18.4	4.2*
12. Borough Park	100.0	**	22.7	45.2	20.2	8.8
13. Coney Island	100.0	20.2	31.6	35.8	9.5	**
14. Flatbush	100.0	**	29.4	49.6	13.5	5.7
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	7.5	33.4	41.5	12.8	4.7*
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	35.7	29.4	22.1	9.8	**
17. East Flatbush	100.0	5.9*	32.0	45.7	13.0	3.5*
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	12.3	18.0	28.8	31.8	9.1
Manhattan						
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	7.7	14.5	13.5	10.3	54.0
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	44.0	19.7	10.9	8.0	17.4
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	14.1	16.2	10.4	8.8	50.5
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	2.3*	7.4	8.4	20.8	61.2
5. Upper West Side	100.0	17.6	17.8	13.6	14.3	36.8
6. Upper East Side	100.0	5.0	7.8	10.3	15.0	62.0
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	100.0	24.0	23.3	21.1	16.4	15.2
8. Central Harlem	100.0	45.4	33.7	16.3	**	**
9. East Harlem	100.0	46.0	21.9	20.1	5.4*	6.6
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	13.4	35.8	35.3	10.7	4.8
Queens						
1. Astoria	100.0	22.8	15.4	34.9	22.4	4.5
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	3.9*	24.8	42.5	18.0	10.8
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	4.2*	18.2	33.9	28.0	15.8
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	4.1*	22.9	42.7	22.2	8.1
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	7.1	27.0	49.1	10.5	6.3
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	4.2*	15.9	35.3	24.3	20.3
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	**	14.4	38.8	29.3	16.0
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	9.5	27.1	29.1	16.4	17.9
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	**	15.8	47.6	30.1	**
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	**	9.8*	46.1	32.3	11.8*
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	**	26.7	25.9	25.3	20.8
12. Jamaica	100.0	13.5	22.8	40.9	18.0	4.7*
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	**	13.7	42.9	22.6	19.6
14. Rockaways	100.0	28.0	31.5	27.0	11.6	**
Staten Island						
1. North Shore	100.0	12.1	31.1	41 1	13.4	**
2. Mid-Island	100.0	13.6*	13.3*	39.3	22.2	11 7*
3. South Shore	100.0	**	29.6	33.7	11 4*	20.7
5. 50util biloite	100.0		27.0	55.1	11.T	40.I

#### Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Contract Rent Level by Sub-Borough, Table A.18 New York City 1999

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution. \*\* Too few units to report.

Sub-Borough Area	Total	Less than \$400	\$400-\$599	\$600-\$799	\$800-\$999	\$1,000+
Bronx						
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	45.5	24.9	19.5	6.1	4.1*
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	30.7	33.5	24.0	7.3	4.4*
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	19.7	28.3	36.5	10.0	5.5*
4. University Heights/Fordham	100.0	16.9	26.7	38.7	15.1	**
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	15.2	26.7	44.2	11.7	**
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	5.7*	28.4	32.9	19.9	13.1
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	16.9	30.5	31.9	16.0	4.7
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	12.8*	21.0	33.0	18.7	14.6
9. Pelham Parkway	100.0	12.3	28.0	34.9	21.6	**
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	13.3	16.8	37.6	23.6	8.7
Brooklyn						
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	16.9	33.6	25.7	13.6	10.3
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	100.0	29.3	11.9	21.3	15.1	22.3
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	100.0	29.7	34.5	26.3	7.2	**
4. Bushwick	100.0	17.5	40.5	33.8	4.7*	3.5*
5. East New York/Starrett City	100.0	23.2	17.1	23.5	27.3	8.9
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	13.7	20.8	20.0	13.1	32.4
7. Sunset Park	100.0	5.4*	22.1	46.0	20.9	5.5*
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	100.0	20.4	23.6	35.0	16.2	4.8*
9. South Crown Heights	100.0	6.9	22.7	51.2	14.8	4.3*
10. Bay Ridge	100.0	6.5*	15.4	37.5	27.4	13.2
11. Bensonhurst	100.0	**	12.5	53.4	25.5	7.7
12. Borough Park	100.0	**	11.9	39.9	32.2	14.5
13. Coney Island	100.0	19.0	26.7	34.2	14.7	5.5*
14. Flatbush	100.0	**	17.2	49.2	24.5	8.2
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	7.0	23.7	40.1	19.2	10.0
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	33.8	23.5	24.5	14.5	3.7*
17. East Flatbush	100.0	4.6*	21.6	40.9	27.4	5.4*
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	11.7	13.1	28.8	31.0	15.5
Manhattan						
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	4.3*	15.1	12.9	12.1	55.6
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	100.0	40.7	19.9	13.9	6.2	19.2
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	13.0	16.6	10.0	7.6	52.9
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	1.7*	6.2	9.1	19.2	63.8
5. Upper West Side	100.0	16.3	15.2	15.7	13.0	39.8
6. Upper East Side	100.0	4.6	7.3	9.3	14.2	64.7
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	100.0	18.5	24.1	23.6	16.4	17.3
8. Central Harlem	100.0	39.2	33.7	22.0	**	4.1*
9. East Harlem	100.0	43.7	23.2	17.0	9.6	6.6
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	11.3	25.6	43.3	13.8	6.0
Queens						
1. Astoria	100.0	20.8	11.3	33.4	26.2	8.2
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	**	18.5	39.8	26.4	12.0
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	**	9.2	38.3	29.9	19.7
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	4.1*	15.5	43.2	23.8	13.4
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	5.7*	21.2	47.0	17.8	8.4
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	3.7*	11.8	34.5	25.3	24.7
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	**	10.1	34.9	31.8	22.1
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	8.4	23.3	27.5	17.5	23.4
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	**	9.0	44.7	34.2	10.5
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	**	9.8*	33.9	36.0	20.2
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	**	20.7	25.2	25.6	27.3
12. Jamaica	100.0	11.8	20.3	33.3	24.3	10.4
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	**	10.6*	32.3	29.0	28.1
14. Rockaways	100.0	26.5	27.6	30.1	10.2	5.5*
Staten Island						
1. North Shore	100.0	10.7	21.9	40.8	21.1	5.6*
2. Mid-Island	100.0	12.2*	8.5*	38.0	20.1	21.2
3. South Shore	100.0	**	16.6*	34.1	14.1*	30.6

Table A.19 Distribution of Renter Occupied Units by Gross Rent Level by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

 Source:
 U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

 Notes:
 a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

 \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

 \*\* Too few units to report.
Sub Borough Area	One or More Building Defects	Boarded-Up Windows
Bronx	Duliding Delects	on Same Street
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	29.3	17.7
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	12.7	5.7
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	26.3	8.8
4. University Heights/Fordham	9.4	4.3*
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	15.1	5.4
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridgeª	7.3	9.7
7. Soundview/Parkchester	18.2	6.8
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	15.7	**
9. Pelham Parkway	9.7	3.8*
10.Williamsbridge/Baychester	11.3	**
Brooklyn		
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	12.7	7.1
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	**	22.4
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	16.0	37.9
4. Bushwick	26.0	36.4
5. East New York/Starrett City	8.5	18.0
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	15.0	6.6
7. Sunset Park	20.3	18.4
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	25.3	35.5
9. South Crown Heights	10.7	4.8*
10. Bay Ridge	6.8*	**
11. Bensonhurst	6.0	**
12. Borough Park	9.4	**
13. Coney Island	17.5	6.3*
14. Flatbush	13.8	4.6*
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	7.9	**
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	20.5	23.3
17. East Flatbush	17.5	5.8*
18. Flatlands/ Canarsie	13.5	6.4*
Manhattan	0.0	4 456
2. Lerren E. Side / Chineterren	9.9	4.4*
2. Lower E. Side/ Chinatown 2. Chalana / Chinatana / Mi Januar	15.7	/.9
4. Stympoopt Town /Towtle Boy	9.0	11.8
4. Stuyvesant Town/ Turne Day 5. Upper West Side	2.4	0.2
6. Upper Fast Side	3.4	0.5
7 Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	4.2	4.4
8 Central Harlem	0.0	14.3
9 East Harlem	10.2	31.7
10 Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	10.1	83
Oueens	10.1	0.5
1. Astoria	8.0	**
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	10.7	**
3. Jackson Heights	7 9	**
4. Elmhurst/Corona	3.5*	**
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	**	3.6*
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	**	**
7. Flushing/Whitestone	6.0	**
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	9.2	**
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	9.0*	**
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	**	**
11. Bayside/Little Neck	12.4*	**
12. Jamaica	5.8*	13.5
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	**	**
14. Rockaways	8.1*	5.5*
Staten Island		
1. North Shore	7.9*	4.1*
2. Mid-Island	**	**
3. South Shore	**	**

Table A.20	Incidence of Building Defects and Units on Same Street as Building with Broken/Boarded-Up
	Windows in Renter Occupied Units by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

 Source:
 U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey.

 Notes:
 a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge

 \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution.

 \*\* Too few units to report.

# Table A.21

Table A.21	ble A.21         Percent of Renter Occupied Units with None, Three or More, and Five or More Maintenance Deficiencies by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999					
		Number of	f Maintenance Deficiencies			
Sub-Borough An	rea	None	3 or more			

Sub-Borough Area	None	3 or more	5 or more
Bronx			
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	33.6	30.0	9.3
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	23.0	18.8	5 5*
3 Highbridge/South Concourse	28.5	32.8	5.8*
1 University Heights /Fordham	20.5	31.1	10.5
5 Vinceshridge Heights/Polulian	22.2	10.9	**
Di un la (Einel di la 2	35.0	19.6	**
6. Riverdale/ Kingsbridge"	42.8	25.4	10.4
/. Soundview/ Parkchester	36.4	30.8	10.4
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	58.5	12.1*	**
9. Pelham Parkway	51.5	23.4	**
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	57.8	16.2	8.7*
Brooklvn			
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	48.2	11.8	**
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	41.6	18.7	**
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	34.8	33.2	11.9
4. Bushwick	36.5	21.9	7.5
5. East New York/Starrett City	37.6	21.1	8.4
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	42.1	17.0	4.7*
7. Sunset Park	33.6	23.4	6.5*
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	33.4	32.8	9.2
9. South Crown Heights	28.2	29.9	5.5*
10 Bay Ridge	65.4	7.8*	**
11 Bensonhurst	53.7	83	**
12 Borough Park	52.2	13.5	4.8*
13. Copey Island	40.0	15.2	4.7*
14. Elathyah	20.8	15.2	<b>4.</b> /*
15. Shartahard Day/Carranged	29.0	27. <del>4</del> 6.2*	3.0
16. Sneepsnead Day/Gravesend	32.7	0.5*	7.2*
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	37.9	24.7	/.3*
17. East Flatbush	33.4	34.9	10.7
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	50.1	15.8	**
Manhattan			
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	43.2	14.8	**
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	30.0	24.7	4.8*
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	44.1	20.1	4.2*
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	56.8	9.2	**
5. Upper West Side	57.9	9.4	**
6. Upper East Side	60.5	7.9	1.5*
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	48.8	20.0	3.9*
8. Central Harlem	30.9	34.1	12.5
9. East Harlem	24.6	30.9	12.9
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	27.2	29.5	5.7
Oueens		2710	0.17
1 Astoria	47.6	11.5	4.2
2 Suppyside/Woodside	46.4	14.7	**
2. Jackson Heights	41.2	11.7	**
A Electronic Connect	41.2	11.2	**
4. Emmurst/Corona	60.4	10.0	**
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	01.1	6.1*	- Araba
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	/0.5	6.9*	**
7. Flushing/Whitestone	66.5	10.6	**
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	49.1	11.3	**
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	71.6	6.8*	**
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	79.5	**	**
11. Bayside/Little Neck	54.8	**	**
12. Jamaica	45.8	20.6	**
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	65.7	8.7*	**
14. Rockaways	38.1	15.6	**
Staten Island			
1. North Shore	60.3	13.4	**
2. Mid-Island	67.9	**	**
3. South Shore	86.0	**	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of units is small, interpret with caution. \*\* Too few units to report.

Sub-Borough	Crowded	Severely Crowded
Bronx		·
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	6.6	**
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	15.5	4.1*
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	17.9	8.9
4. University Heights/Fordham	13.9	3.9*
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	15.6	6.1
6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge <sup>a</sup>	11.9	**
7. Soundview/Parkchester	11.6	4.0*
8. Throgs Neck/Co-op City	**	**
9. Pelham Parkway	8.3	5.1*
10. Williamsbridge/Baychester	8.0	**
Brooklyn		
1. Williamsburg/Greenpoint	8.9	**
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene	7.3	**
3. Bedford Stuyvesant	7.7	**
4. Bushwick	14.7	**
5. East New York/Starrett City	10.3	**
6. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	4.2*	**
7. Sunset Park	19.1	6.1*
8. North Crown Heights/Prospect Heights	9.8	**
9. South Crown Heights	16.9	5.6*
10. Bay Ridge	5.1*	**
11. Bensonhurst	9.8	2.4*
12. Borough Park	15.6	**
13. Coney Island	11.0	**
14. Flatbush	16.9	6.1
15. Sheepshead Bay/Gravesend	9.7	**
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	11.7	**
17. East Flatbush	11.3	4.8*
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	9.9	**
Manhattan		
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	7.4	5.4
2. Lower E. Side/Chinatown	10.2	5.3
3. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	3.9	2.7*
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	4.9	4.3
5. Upper West Side	7.1	4.3
6. Upper East Side	4.6	2.5
7. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights	8.9	**
8. Central Harlem	8.1	**
9. East Harlem	12.4	2.7*
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	17.8	5.8
Queens		
1. Astoria	11.7	4.0
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	20.1	6.9*
3. Jackson Heights	23.1	6.4
4. Elmhurst/Corona	22.5	10.7
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	4.8*	**
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	11.7	5.0*
7. Flushing/Whitestone	14.5	5.0
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	17.1	9.4
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	14.3	6.5*
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	**	**
11. Bayside/Little Neck	9.8*	**
12. Jamaica	13.6	**
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	10.4*	**
14. Rockaways	11.4	4.6*
Staten Island		
1. North Shore	6.7*	**
2. Mid-Island	**	**
3. South Shore	**	**

#### Percent of Renter Households that are Crowded or Severely Crowded by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999 Table A.22

Source: Notes:

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. \*\* Too few households to report.

Table A.23	Percent of All Households Rating Condition of Residential Buildings in Neighborhood as Good or
	Excellent, Fair, or Poor by Sub-Borough, New York City 1999

Sub-Borough Area	All	Good or Excellent	Fair	Poor
Bronx				
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point	100.0	58.3	35.3	6.4
2. Morrisania/East Tremont	100.0	41.5	48.5	10.0
3. Highbridge/South Concourse	100.0	53.0	37.2	9.8
4 University Heights /Fordham	100.0	52.8	38.5	87
5. Kingsbridge Heights/Mosholu	100.0	55.2	38.5	63
6. Riverdale/Kinosbridge <sup>a</sup>	100.0	80.0	19.0	**
7. Soundview/Parkchester	100.0	53.6	36.4	10.0
8 Throgs Neck/Co-op City	100.0	92.4	6.5	**
9 Pelham Parkway	100.0	76.2	19.6	4 2*
10 Williamsbridge/Baychester	100.0	81.4	16.7	**
Brooklyn	100.0	01.1	10.7	
1 Williamsburg/Greenpoint	100.0	69.4	28.9	**
2 Brooklyn Heights /Fort Greene	100.0	76.6	10.0	1.5*
3 Bedford Stuwesant	100.0	10.0	37.1	13.5
4 Bushwick	100.0	45.7	42.4	11.0
5 East New Vork/Starrett City	100.0	53.1	34.3	12.6
6 Park Slope/Carroll Gardens	100.0	20.8	16.4	2.0
7 Supper Dark	100.0	61.6	32.5	5.0
8 North Crown Heights / Prospect	100.0	52.8	34.4	12.0
0. South Crown Heights	100.0	52.8	34.4	12.9
10 Pay Didge	100.0	02.3	50.4	/.1
10. Day Nidge	100.0	92.2	/.0	**
12. Remember Demb	100.0	85.9	15.5	**
12. Dorough Park	100.0	82.1	16.2	**
14. Elselesele	100.0	/2.1	25.5	4.4* 5.0
14. Flatbush 15. Shaawahaa I Bara/Charasana I	100.0	69.5	25.6	5.0
15. Sneepsnead Bay/Gravesend	100.0	8/.4	12.6	** 12.0
16. Brownsville/Ocean Hill	100.0	38.8	47.2	13.9
1. East Flatbush	100.0	65.6	29.7	4./*
18. Flatlands/Canarsie	100.0	85.6	14.4	**
Manhattan	100.0	00 5	10 5	بادياد
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District	100.0	89.5	10.5	**
2. Club (Cline (Asile	100.0	57.5	34.3	8.1
5. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown	100.0	86.1	12.8	**
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay	100.0	91.0	8.6	**
5. Upper West Side	100.0	93.4	6.6	**
6. Upper East Side	100.0	94.0	5.6	**
/. Morningside Heights/Hamilton	100.0	61.2	30.5	8.2
8. Central Harlem	100.0	40.7	42.2	17.1
9. East Harlem	100.0	49.0	36.3	14.6
10. Washington Heights/Inwood <sup>a</sup>	100.0	58.3	32.5	9.2
Oueens	100.0	75.0	20.4	2.0
1. Astoria	100.0	/5.8	20.4	3.9
2. Sunnyside/Woodside	100.0	73.4	19.3	7.3
3. Jackson Heights	100.0	67.9	30.0	**
4. Elmhurst/Corona	100.0	65.0	32.6	2.4*
5. Middle Village/Ridgewood	100.0	84.3	13.7	2.0*
6. Forest Hills/Rego Park	100.0	83.6	14.8	**
7. Flushing/Whitestone	100.0	87.5	12.0	**
8. Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows	100.0	86.7	12.5	**
9. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven	100.0	77.5	21.9	**
10. Howard Beach/S. Ozone Park	100.0	85.2	13.6	**
11. Bayside/Little Neck	100.0	95.2	4.8*	**
12. Jamaica	100.0	73.9	20.5	5.6
13. Bellerose/Rosedale	100.0	88.5	10.8	**
14. Rockaways	100.0	72.0	20.7	7.3
Staten Island				
1. North Shore	100.0	80.3	15.9	3.8*
2. Mid-Island	100.0	93.6	5.9*	**
3. South Shore	100.0	96.6	3.4*	**

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Notes: a Marble Hill in Bronx Sub-borough 6, Riverdale/Kingsbridge \* Since the number of households is small, interpret with caution. \*\*Too few households to report.

# **CENSUS TRACTS INCLUDED IN EACH SUB-BOROUGH AREA**

#### MANHATTAN

1. <u>Greenv</u>	vich Village/I	Financial Dist	trict				
100 500 599 700 900	1300 1501 1502 2100 3100	3300 3900 4100 4300 4500	4700 4900 5100 5300 5501	5502 5700 5900 6100 6300	6500 6700 6900 7100	7300 7500 7700 7900	31701 31702 31900
2. Lower	East Side/Ch	<u>ninatown</u>					
201 202 600 800	1001 1002 1200 1401	1402 1600 1800 2000	2201 2202 2400 2500	2601 2602 2700 2800	2900 3001 3002 3200	3400 3601 3602 3800	4000 4200
3. Chelses	a/Clinton/Mic	<u>ltown</u>					
5200 5400 5600 5800 7400	7600 8100 8300 8400 8700	8900 9100 9300 9400 9500	9600 9700 9900 10100 10200	10300 10400 10900 11100 11201	11202 11300 11500 11700 11900	12100 12500 12700 12900 13100	13300 13500 13700 13900
4. <u>Stuyve</u>	sant Town/T	urtle Bay					
4401 4402 4897	5000 6000 6200	6497 6498 6600	6800 7000 7200	7800 8000 8200	8600 8800 9000	9200 9800 10000	10601 10800 11203
5. <u>Upper</u>	West Side						
14300 14500 14700 14900	15100 15300 15500 15700	15900 16100 16300 16500	16700 16900 17100 17300	17500 17700 17900 18100	18300 18500 18700	18900 19100	31500
6. <u>Upper</u> ]	<u>East Side</u>						
10602 11000 11401 11402 11600	11800 12000 12200 12400 12600	12800 13000 13200 13400 13600	13800 14000 14200 14401 14402	14601 14602 14801 14802	15001 15002 15200	15400 15601 15801	16001 23800
7. <u>Mornin</u>	gside Height	s/Hamilton H	leights				
19300 19500 19701	19900 20101 20300	20500 20701 20901	21100 21301 21701	21997 22101 22397	22398 22500 22701	22900 23101 23300	23501 23700

# 8. Central Harlem

18600 19000 19702 20000	20102 20600 20702 20800	20902 21200 21302 21400	21600 21702 21800 22000	22102 22200 22400 22600	22702 22800 23000 23102	23200 23400 23502	23600 24302
9. <u>East Ha</u>	arlem						
15602 15802 16002 16200	16400 16600 16800 17000	17201 17202 17401 17402	17800 18000 18200 18400	18800 19200 19400	19600 19800 20200	20400 21000	24000
10. <u>Washi</u>	ngton Heigh	ts/Inwood					
23900 24100 24301 24500 24700	24900 25100 25300 25500 26100	26300 26500 26700 26900 27100	27300 27500 27700 27900 28100	28300 28500 28700 28900 29100	29300 29500 29700	30100 30300 30700	31100 31300
THE BRO	NX						
1. Mott H	laven/Hunts	Point					
500 1100 1500 1700 2300 2500	2701 2702 3100 3300 3500 3700	3900 4100 4300 4700 4900 6500	6700 6900 7100 7300 7500 7700	7900 8100 8300 8500 8700 8900	9100 9700 9900 10500 11501 11502	11900 12102 12701 12702	12901 12902 13100
2. Morris	ania/ East Tr	emont					
5800 6000 12101 12300 12500 13300	13500 13700 13900 14100 14500 14700	14900 15100 15300 15500 15700 16100	16300 16500 16700 16900 22000 33400	35900 36100 36300 36501 36502 36700	36901 36902 37100 37300 37501 37502	37503 37700 38500 38700 38900	39100 39300 39700
3. Highbr	idge/South C	Concourse					
5700 5901 5902 6100	14300 17100 17300 17500	17700 17900 18100 18300	18700 18900 19300 19500	19700 19900 20100 21100	21302 21702 21900	22100 22300	22500
4. Univers	sity Heights/	Fordham					
5301 5302 20500 21301	21501 21502 21701 22701	22702 22703 22901 22902	23100 23301 23302 23501	23502 23701 23900 24100	24300 24500 24700 24900	25100 25700 37900	38100 38300
5. Kingsbi	ridge Height	s/Mosholu			-		
23702 25300 25500 26100	26300 26500 26900 27102	39901 39902 40100 40302	40500 40701 40702 41100	41300 41500 41900	42100 42300 42500	42901 42902	43100

# 6. Riverdale/Kingsbridge

26700 27101 27300 27700	27900 28100 28300 28500	28700 28900 29300 29500	29700 30100 30700 31700	31900 32300 32900 33300	33900 34100 34300	34500 35100 40301	40900 30900*
7. Sound	view/Parkch	ester					
200 400 1600 2000 2400 2800	3600 3800 4001 4002 4400 4600	4800 5000 5200 5400 5600 6200	6400 6600 6800 7000 7200 7400	7800 8400 8600 8800 9200 9400	9800 10200 19600 20200 20400	20601 20602 20800 21000 21200	21400 21601 21602 21800
8. <u>Throgs</u>	Neck/Co-or	o City					
11000 11800 13000 13200	13800 14400 15400 15600	15800 16000 16200 16400	16600 18400 19400 26400	26601 26602 27400	27600 30000 30200	46201 46202	50400 51600
9. Pelham	<u>Parkway</u>						
19800 22401 22402 22800 23000 23200	23400 23600 24000 24200 24400 24400 24600	24800 25000 25200 25400 25600 25800	28400 28600 28800 29600 31000 31200	31400 31600 31800 32000 32200 32400	32800 33000 33200 33600 33800 34000	34200 34400 34600 35000	35200 35400 36600
10. <u>Willian</u>	nsbridge/Bay	chester					
35600 35800 36400 36800 37000 37200	37400 37600 37800 38000 38200 38600	38800 39000 39200 39400 39600 39800	40400 40600 40800 41000 41400 41800	42000 42200 42400 42600 42800 43000	43200 43500 43600 43800 44000 44200	44600 44800 44901 44902 45101 45102	45400 45800 46000 48400 50200
BROOKL	YN						
1. <u>William</u>	sburg/Green	point					
45597 45598 46500 47300 47700 48100	49100 49500 49700 49900 50100 50300	50500 50900 51100 51300 51500 51700	51900 52300 52500 52700 52900 53300	53500 53700 53900 54500 54700 54900	55100 55300 55500 55700 55900 56300	56500 56700 56900 57100 57300 57300	57700 57900 58900 59100 59300
2. <u>Brookl</u>	yn Heights/F	ort Greene					
100 301 302 500 700 900	1100 1300 2100 2300 2500 2700	2901 2902 3100 3300 3500 3700	3900 4100 4300 6900 7100 12700	17900 18100 18300 18501 18502 18700	18900 19100 19300 19500 19700	19900 20100 22700 22900	23100 23500 54300

\* Manhattan Census tract 30900 (Marble Hill) is included in this sub-borough area of the Bronx in the public use data tape provided by the Census Bureau.

# 3. Bedford Stuyvesant

23300 23700 23900 24100 24300	24500 24900 25100 25300 25500	25700 25901 25902 26100 26300	26500 26700 26900 27300 27500	27700 27900 28100 28300 28502	28700 28900 29100 29300 29500	37500 37700 37900 38300	38500 38700 50700 53100
4. <u>Bushwic</u>	<u>2k</u>						
28501 38900 39100 39300 39500	39700 39900 40100 40300 40500	40700 40900 41100 41300 41500	41700 41900 42100 42300 42500	42700 42900 43100 43300 43500	43700 43900 44100 44300	44500 44700 45300 48300	48700 48900 49300
5. East Ne	ew York/Star	rett City					
105800 107000 107800 109800 110000 110200 110600	111000 111200 111400 111800 112000 112400 114000	114201 114202 114600 114800 115000 115200 116000	116200 116400 116600 116800 117000 117201 117202	117400 117601 117602 117800 118000 118201 118202	118400 118600 118800 119097 119200 119400	119600 120000 120297 120298 120800	121000 121400 122000
6. <u>Park Slo</u>	pe/Carroll G	ardens					
4500 4700 4900 5100 5500	5700 5900 6300 6500 6700	7500 7700 8500 11700 12100	12300 12500 12901 12902 13100	13300 13500 13700 13900 14100	14300 14900 15100 15300	15500 15700 15900	16500 16700 17700
7. <u>Sunset</u>	<u>Park</u>						
200 1800 2000 2200 7200	7400 7600 7800 8000 8200	8400 8600 8800 9000 9200	9400 9600 9800 10000 10100	10200 10400 10600 10800 11000	11200 11800 12000 12200 14500	14700 16900 17100 17300 17500	50000 50201 50202 50400
8. <u>North C</u>	Crown Height	ts/Prospect H	<u>leights</u>				
16100 16300 20300 20500 20700	21500 21700 21900 22100 22300	22500 24700 27101 27102 29700	29900 30700 30900 31100 31300	31500 31701 31702 33700 33900	34100 34300 34500 34700	34900 35100 35300 35700	35900 38100
9. <u>South C</u>	rown Height:	5					
21300 31900 32100 32300	32500 32700 32900 33100	33300 33500 35500 79600	79800 80000 80200 80400	80600 81000 81200	82000 82200 87401	87402 87600	87800 88000
10. <u>Bay Ri</u>	idge						
3000 3200 3400 3600 3800 4000 4200	4600 4800 5000 5201 5202 5400 5601	5602 5800 6000 6200 6400 6600 6800	7000 12400 12801 12802 13000 13200 13400	13600 13800 14000 14200 14400 14600 14800	15000 15400 15600 15800 16000 16200	16400 19400 19600 19800 20000 20200	20400 20600 20800 21000 21200

# 11. Bensonhurst

16800	18200	25200	26600	28000	29400	40200	42600
17000	18400	25400	26800	28200	29600	40400	42800
17200	18600	25600	27000	28400	29800	40600	43000
17400	18800	25800	27200	28600	30000	40800	43200
17600	19000	26000	27400	28800	30200	41000	43400
17800	24800	26200	27600	29000	30400	41200	43600
18000	25000	26400	27800	29200	40000	42400	
12. Borou	<u>gh Park</u>						
11400	22000	23200	24400	44600	46400	47800	49200
11600	22200	23400	24600	44800	46800	48400	49400
19200	22400	23600	43800	45000	47000	48600	49600
21400	22600	23800	44000	45200	47200	48800	49800
21600	22800	24000	44200	45400	47400	49000	
21800	23000	24200	44400	46202	47600		
13. <u>Coney</u>	Island						
30600	32600	34000	35000	36001	36600	38200	61001
30800	32800	34200	35200	36002	37000	38600	61097
31400	33000	34801	35400	36200	37400	39800	
32000	33600	34802	35600	36400			
14. Flatbus	<u>sh</u>						
45600	48200	51600	52800	54000	75200	76400	77400
45800	50600	51800	53000	54200	75400	76600	78600
46001	50800	52000	53200	54400	75600	77000	78800
46002	51000	52200	53400	54698	75898	77200	
46201	51200	52400	53600	/4800	76000		
48000	51400	52000	23800	/3000	78200		
15. Sheeps	head Bay/Gr	ravesend					
38800	41600	55400	56800	58200	59402	61200	62600
39000	41800	55600	57000	58400	59600	61400	62898
39200	42000	55800	57200	58600	59800	61697	63200
39400	42200	56000	57400	58800	60097	61698	63800
39600	54800	56200	57800	59000	60098	61800	64200
41401	55200	56600	58000	59200	60800	62200	
41402	33200	50000	38000	55401	00800		
16. <u>Browns</u>	ville/Ocean l	Hill					
30100	36502	89200	90200	91200	92200	113200	115400
30300	36700	89400	90400	91400	112200	113400	115600
36100	36900	89600	90600	91600	112600	113600	115800
36300	37100	89800	90800	91800	112800	113800	
36501	3/300	90000	91000	92000	113000		
17. <u>East Fla</u>	<u>atbush</u>						
78000	81400	83000	84200	85600	86800	88800	93600
78200	81600	83200	84600	85800	87000	89000	93800
78400	81800	83400	84800	86000	87200	92800	94000
79000	82400	83600	85000	86200	88200	93000	94200
79200	82600	83800	85200	86400	88400	93400	
79400	82800	84000	85400	86600	88600		

# 18. Flatlands/Canarsie

63600 64000 64400 64600 64800 65000 65200 65400 65600 65800 66000	66200 66298 66698 67000 67200 67400 67600 67800 68000 68200 68200 68600	68800 69000 69200 69600 70000 70201 70202 70203 70600 72000	72200 72400 72600 72800 73000 73200 73400 73600 73600 73800 74000 74200	74400 74600 77600 77800 84400 94401 94402 95000 95400 95600 95600 95800	96000 96200 96600 96800 97000 97400 98200 98400 98600 98800	99000 99200 99400 99600 99800 100400 100600 100800 101000 101200 101400	101600 101800 102000 102200 102400 102600 102800 103400
QUEENS							
1. Astoria							
100* 2500 2700 2900 3100 3500 3700 3900	4100 4300 4500 4700 4900 5100 5300 5500	5700 5900 6100 6300 6500 6700 6900 7100	7300 7500 7700 8100 8300 8700 9100	9500 9700 9900 10100 10300 10500 10700 11100	11300 11500 11700 11900 12100 12300 13500 13700	14100 14300 14500 14700 14900 15100 15300 15500	15700 15900 16100 16300 29900 31700
2. <u>Sunnysi</u>	<u>de/Woodside</u>						
100 700 1900 16900 17100	17900 18100 18300 18500 18700	18900 19100 19700 20501 20502	21900 22900 23500 24300 24500	24700 24900 25100 25300 25500	25700 25900 26100 26300 26500	29300 29500 29700 47900	48300 48500 48900
3. Jackson	<u>Heights</u>						
27300 27500 27700 27900 28100	28300 28500 28700 28900 29100	30901 30902 32700 32900 33100	33700 33900 34700 35100 35300	35500 36100 36300 36500 36700	36900 37100 37300 37500 37700	37900 38100 40100 40300	40500 40700 40900
4. <u>Elmhurs</u>	<u>t/Corona</u>						
26700 26900 27100 38300	39900 41100 41300 41500	42700 43700 43900 44300	45500 45700 45900 46100	46300 46500 46700 46900	47100 47300 47500	48100 49900	68300
5. <u>Middle</u>	Village/Ridg	ewood					
49301 49302 49500 49700 50500 50700 51100 51300 51500	51700 52100 52500 52700 52900 53500 53500 53900 54500 54700	54900 55100 55300 55500 55700 55900 56100 56500 56700	57700 57900 58100 58300 58500 58700 58900 59100 59300	59500 59900 60100 60300 61300 61300 61900 62101 62102	62300 62500 62700 63301 63302 63500 63700 63900	65500 65701 65702 65900 66100 66300 66500 66500 66700 66900	67101 67102 67700 67900

\* Bronx Census tract 100 (Rikers Island) is included in this sub-borough area of Queens. No residential units are included, however.

6. Forest I	Hills/Rego Pa	<u>urk</u>					
64500 68700 69300 69500	69701 69702 70300 70700	70900 71100 71301 71302	71700 71900 72100 72500	72700 72900 73100 73300	73500 73700 73900 74100	74300 74500 74700 75700	76997 76998 76902 77100
7. Flushing	g/Whitestone						
79700 79900 80301 80302 83700 84500 85100 85300	85500 85700 86100 86300 86500 86500 86700 87100	87500 88900 90700 91900 92500 92900 93900 94500	94700 97300 98100 98700 99100 99701 99702 99900	101700 102900 103300 103900 104700 105900 114100 114700	115100 115500 115700 115900 116100 116300 116700 117100	117500 118500 118700 118900 119100 119300 119500 119900	120100 120300 120500 120700 121100 121500
8. Hillcres	t/Fresh Mead	<u>lows</u>					
21400 22001 22002 23000 23200	23600 44800 45000 45200 45400	45698 45800 46400 46600 47200	47600 47800 49200 77901 77902	77903 77904 77905 79300 80900	122300 122701 122702 124100 124700	125700 126500 126798 127300 127500	128300 133300 133900 134100 134700
9. <u>Kew Ga</u>	rdens/Wood	haven					
200 400 600 800 1000 1200 1400 1600	1800 2000 2200 2400 2600 2800 3000 3200	3400 3600 3800 4001 4200 5200 10800 11000	11200 11400 11600 12000 12200 12200 12400 12601	12602 12800 13000 13200 13400 13600	13800 14000 14201 14202 14400 14800	15000 15200 15400 15600 21600	64101 64102 77397 77398 77500
10. <u>Howard</u>	d Beach/Sout	h Ozone Par	<u>·k</u>				
4002 4401 4402 5000 5400	5800 6200 8600 8800 9400	9600 9800 10000 10200 10400	10600 15800 16400 16600 16800	17000 17200 17400 17600 17800	18000 81400 81800 83800	84000 84601 84602 86400	87800 88400 89200
11. <u>Bayside</u>	/Little Neck						
108101 108102 108300 109100 109700 109900	111300 112300 112900 113300 113900 118100	129101 129102 131900 136700 137700 138501	138502 139900 140300 140901 140902 141701	141702 142900 143500 144100 144700 145101	145102 145900 146300 146700 147100	147900 148300 150701 150702	152901 152902
12. Jamaica	<u>a</u>						
18200 18401 18402 18600 18800 19000 19200 19401 19402 19600 19800	20200 20400 20600 21200 23800 24000 24400 24400 24600 24800 24800 25000	25200 25800 26200 26400 26600 27000 27200 27200 27400 27600 27800	28000 28200 28400 29200 33000 33401 33402 <b>352</b> 00 36600 36800	37600 38400 39400 39800 40000 40200 40400 41000 41400 42000 42200	42400 42600 43200 43400 44000 44200 44601 44602 46000 46200 46800	47000 48000 48200 48400 50000 50201 50202 50400 50600 50800 51000	51800 52000 52200 52400 52600 52800 53000 76800 78800 79000 79200

# 13. Bellerose/Rosedale

30400 32000 32800 35800 49600 51200 51600 53200 53400	53600 53800 54000 54200 54800 55200 55400 55600 55600 55800	56000 56200 56400 56600 56800 57800 58000 58800 58800 59000	59200 59400 59600 59800 60000 60200 60400 60600 60800	61000 61200 61400 61601 61602 61800 62000 62400 62600	63000 63200 63800 64600 65000 65400 65600 66000 66498	68000 68200 69000 71698 76600 130100 155100 156700	157101 157102 157901 157902 157903 161700 162100
14. Rockav	<u>ways</u>						
91601 91602 91699	91800 92200 92800	93400 93800 94201	94202 94203 95200	96200 96400 97200	99200 99800 100800	101000 103200 107201	107202
STATEN I	SLAND						
1. <u>North S</u>	hore						
300 600 700 800 900 1100 1500	1700 2001 2100 2700 2900 3300 3600	3900 4000 4700 5900 6500 7500 7700	8100 8900 9100 9700 10500 12100 12500	13301 13302 14100 14700 15100 16901 18701	18901 19700 20100 20700 21300 21900 22300	23100 23900 24700 25100 30300 31901	31902 32300 32399
2. Mid-Isl	and						
1800 2002 5000 6400	7000 7400 9601 9602	11201 11202 11401 11402	12200 12804 13400 16902	17300 17700 17900 18500	18702 18902 27301 27302	27701 27702 27900	29101 29102
3. <u>South Sl</u>	hore						
12803 13201 13202	13800 14601 14602	15400 15601 15602	15603 17002 17003	17004 17600 19600	20801 20802 22600	23600 24400	24800

# **B** 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Glossary

The following definitions were prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census to describe characteristics of individuals, households and housing units available from the 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. Some data items described in this report were created by combining or recoding HVS data items listed below.

<u>Additional Heating Required.</u> Additional heating refers to households that reported using additional sources of heat to supplement their regular system, because the regular system, though functioning, did not provide enough heat during the winter prior to the time of interview. Additional sources of heat, such as kitchen stoves, fireplaces, or portable heaters, may have been used only in the mornings or on extra cold days. Electric blankets, heating pads, or hot water bottles are not considered additional sources of heat.

<u>Age.</u> Age classification is based on the age reported as of that person's last birthday. Children under 1 year of age are classified as 1 year old.

Asking Rent. See Monthly Asking Rent.

<u>Average Hours Worked in 1998.</u> This item refers to the number of hours per week in 1998 typically spent at work. Hours spent at work include any kind of leave for which the subject is paid as usual.

<u>Bedrooms.</u> The number of bedrooms in the housing unit is the count of rooms used mainly for sleeping, even if also used for other purposes. Rooms reserved for sleeping, such as guest rooms, even though used infrequently, are counted as bedrooms. On the other hand, rooms used mainly for other purposes, even though used also for sleeping, such as a living room with a sleep sofa, are not considered bedrooms. A housing unit consisting of only one room, such as a one-room efficiency apartment, is classified by definition as having no bedroom.

<u>Broken Plaster or Peeling Paint</u>. The data refer to whether or not the household reported broken plaster or peeling paint on the interior ceilings or walls of their unit. If the condition existed, additional data show whether the area(s) are larger than 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> inches by 11 inches.

<u>Buildings with Broken or Boarded-Up Windows.</u> There are two items on the NYCHVS questionnaire regarding broken/boarded-up windows; data are provided separately for each. One of the items is an observation item marked by the field representative. This item concerns buildings with broken or boarded up windows on the same street (both sides within the same block) as the sample unit. The second item is asked of the household respondent and concerns buildings with broken or boarded-up windows in the neighborhood, which would encompass the area the respondent considers his/her neighborhood.

<u>Condition.</u> The following items on building condition were determined by observation by the field representative as he/she approached the building containing the sample unit and walked inside. More than one problem may have been observed for each condition item. The category "Unable to Observe" includes situations in which interviewing may have taken place at night, and the field representative could not see well enough to observe a particular condition.

- 1. External Walls
  - Missing bricks, siding, or other outside wall material includes units in buildings with defects that can only be corrected by extensive repairs such as siding, shingles, boards, brick, concrete, and stucco. Data exclude units in buildings with materials missing temporarily due to repair/construction.
  - Sloping or bulging outside walls includes units in buildings with indications of continuous neglect or serious damage to the structure. Data exclude units in buildings with slanting downspouts, sagging shutters, or uneven terrain.
  - Major cracks in outside walls includes units in buildings with major open holes or cracks that could allow wind or water to enter the building.
  - Loose or hanging cornice, roofing, or other material includes buildings with loose trim or roofing material defects. A cornice is a horizontal molding along the top of a wall or building.
- 2. Windows
  - Broken or missing windows include units in buildings with missing or broken window panes.
  - Rotted/loose window frames/sashes include units in buildings with loose/missing putty, rotted wood, and gaps or cracks where water could penetrate.
  - Boarded-up windows include units in buildings with windows covered with wood, metal, etc. to protect against weather or entry.
- 3. Stairways (interior and exterior)
  - Loose, broken, or missing stair railings include units in buildings with any railings that are not secured tightly enough to use with complete confidence.
  - Loose, broken, or missing steps include units in buildings with any loose, broken, or missing steps.
  - No interior steps or stairways include units in buildings without interior stairways, but which may have exterior steps/stairways.
  - No exterior steps or stairways include units in buildings without exterior steps/stairways, but which may have interior steps/stairways.

- 4. Floors
  - Sagging or sloping floors include units in buildings with sagging/sloping floors due to excessive wear, age, or possible structural damage.
  - Slanted or shifted doorsills or door frames include units in buildings with slanted or shifting doorsills or frames that may be separating from the door.
  - Deep wear in floor causing depressions includes units in buildings with defects that are due to advanced age or excessive use causing depressions in the floor.
  - Holes or missing flooring includes units in buildings with defects that may be due to rotten or broken wood, faulty masonry, or rodent damage.
- 5. Overall Condition of Building
  - Building condition is classified as sound, deteriorating, or dilapidated. In the tabulations, deteriorating and sound are combined into the category "not dilapidated," based on the presence of observed defects. Sound buildings have no defects or slight defects only, such as cracked window panes or missing paint. Deteriorating buildings show a lack of proper upkeep that cannot be corrected by normal maintenance. One or more intermediate defects, such as rotted or loose window frames or broken or missing interior stair risers, would cause a building to be classified as "deteriorating." Dilapidated buildings do not provide safe and adequate shelter to the occupants. A structure was rated dilapidated if it showed one or more critical defects or a combination of intermediate defects or inadequate original construction.

<u>Condominium</u>. A condominium is a building or development with individually owned apartments or houses. The owner has his/her own deed, and very likely, his/her own mortgage on the unit. The owner also holds a common or joint ownership in all common areas and facilities that serve the project -- land, roofs, hallways, entrance elevators, etc. The condominium status question is separate from the tenure question; therefore, condominium units can be classified as both owner-occupied (or vacant-for-sale) or renter-occupied (or vacant-for-rent).

<u>Condominium/Cooperative Conversion</u>. The data are based on whether the householder lived in the unit and paid cash rent at the same time the building became a cooperative or condominium. If the householder reported yes to living in the unit and paying cash rent at the time of the conversion, data are available on whether or not the conversion was done through a non-eviction plan.

Non-eviction Plan Conversion. Rental apartments can be converted to condominiums or cooperatives through either an "eviction" plan or a "non-eviction" plan. A "non-eviction" plan allows persons who occupied an apartment at the time it became a condominium or cooperative to continue to occupy and rent the apartment without purchasing it. Tenants may not be evicted if they do not buy their unit. Data for this item are limited to renter occupied condominiums and cooperatives.

Contract Rent. See Monthly Contract Rent.

<u>Control Status (Rent Regulation Status)</u>. Control status definitions were prepared by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research. They can be found in Appendix C.

<u>Cooperative</u>. A cooperative is a building or development that is owned by its shareholders and is organized as a corporation. It may also be called a stock cooperative or co-op. Ownership of shares in the corporation entitles each shareholder to hold the lease for one or more apartments (houses). If the person or persons owning the cooperative shares also occupies the unit, the cooperative unit is considered owner-occupied. The cooperative status question is separate from the tenure question; therefore, cooperative units can also be classified as renter-occupied (or vacant-for-rent) or owner-occupied (or vacant-for-sale).

<u>Cracks/Holes in Interior Walls or Ceilings.</u> This item is based on the respondent's report of cracks or holes in interior walls or ceilings of the unit. Cracks may have been due to any of the following reasons: damage by rats or mice, rotten wood, faulty masonry, or normal building settling. Included are cracks or holes that do not go all the way through to the next room, housing unit, or to the outdoors. Hairline cracks (cracks appearing in the walls or ceiling that aren't large enough to insert a finger nail file into) and small holes caused by nails or thumbtacks are not included.

<u>Down payment.</u> Money paid in advance or at the time of settlement or closing as partial or full payment of the purchase price is the down payment. Down payment can also be thought of as the buyer's interest or initial equity in the apartment (house). In the case of Mitchell-Lama cooperatives, the purchase price and the down payment may be identical. The down payment data are limited to units acquired in 1994 or later, and do not include closing costs.

<u>Duration of Vacancy</u>. The time periods shown represent the time the last occupants vacated the unit to the day of the first attempt at interviewing. For newly constructed units, the time refers to the date that the unit is ready for occupancy. A unit is considered vacant until occupied, regardless of the date on a lease, rental payment, or property settlement.

Education Level. Educational level applies only to progress in "regular" school. Such schools include graded public, private, and parochial elementary and high schools (both junior and senior high), colleges, universities, and professional schools, whether day schools or night schools. Thus, regular schooling is that which may advance a person toward an elementary school certificate, high school diploma, or a college, university, or professional school degree.

Schooling in other than regular schools is counted only if the credits obtained are regarded as transferable to a school in the regular school system. For education received in an ungraded or foreign school, the equivalent grade level in the American school system is estimated. Data are limited to persons 15 years or older.

Employment. See Labor Force Status.

<u>Exterminator Service</u>. Exterminator service is a service provided by a company or individual using chemicals or sprays to control rodents or pests. Data were collected on the frequency of the service described below:

- (1) Regularly Service is provided on any regular interval such as weekly or monthly.
- (2) Only when needed Service is provided on an "as needed basis."
- (3) Irregularly Service is seldom provided for rodent infestation, or the respondent knows there is service but not how often.
- (4) Not at all Service is never provided.
- (5) Don't know Respondent does not know if service is provided.

Fire and Liability Insurance. Data are available for the following:

- (1) Whether the property is covered by fire and liability insurance, and if the premium is paid separately.
- (2) The annual cost of the insurance for 1998 if it was paid separately from the mortgage or cooperative/condominium maintenance fee.
- (3) Whether the fire and liability insurance covers personal possessions.

<u>Floor of Unit.</u> This item shows which story in a building the sample unit is situated on. For units that occupy multiple stories, the lowest floor occupied was used. For homes that include a basement and a main floor, the main or first floor was used.

Gross Rent. See Monthly Gross Rent.

<u>Heating Equipment Breakdown</u>. Breakdowns or failures in heating systems refer to households that reported a heating equipment breakdown that lasted six consecutive hours or longer during the winter prior to the time of the survey. Heating equipment is considered unusable if it cannot be used for the purposes intended; the breakdown may be caused by broken pipes, electrical or gas parts out of order, or downed power lines.

<u>Holes in Floors.</u> This item is based on respondent's report of holes in floors. It refers to holes inside the unit that may have been due to any of the following reasons: damage by rats or mice, rotten wood, faulty masonry, or normal building settling. The holes need not go through the floor to be included. Excluded are very small holes caused by nails or similar objects.

Hours Worked Last Week. This item refers to the actual number of hours worked (including overtime), not the usual or required hours. Excluded from the number of hours worked are lunch breaks and sick or vacation leave. If two jobs were worked, the total number of hours worked at both jobs is included.

<u>Household Composition</u>. Three main categories are presented. Each category consists of these components: with no other household members, with no children under 18, and with other adults and children under 18.

<u>Married Couple.</u> Each household in this category consists of the householder and spouse plus another person, if any, all of whom may or may not be related to the householder.

<u>Female Householder</u>. This category includes households with female householders with no spouse present. These householders may be widowed, divorced, separated, or never married. Other related or unrelated people may also live in the household.

<u>Male Householder</u>. This category includes households with male householders with no spouse present. These householders may be widowed, divorced, separated, or never married. Other related or unrelated people may also live in the household.

Household Members Under Age 6 and Under Age 18. These items include all members of the household (other than the householder and his/her spouse) regardless of their relationship to the householder, who fall into these age groups.

<u>Householder (Reference Person)</u>. The householder (reference person) is the household member or one of the household members who owns or rents the sample unit. If no household member owns or rents the sample unit, the first person listed is designated as the householder (reference person). The term reference person is used in the questionnaire but is replaced by the term householder in the final data presentations.

<u>Households Below Specific Income Level.</u> The specified income level statistics presented are derived from an updated poverty level index used in the March Current Population Survey supplement. This index is based on a definition originated by the Social Security Administration in 1964 and subsequently modified by a Federal Interagency Committee in 1969. This index, as applied to the NYCHVS, provides a range of income cutoffs or "poverty thresholds" adjusted to take into account such factors as size of family unit, age of householder, and number of children. These thresholds are shown on the chart at the end of this glossary.

<u>Housing Unit.</u> A housing unit is a house, an apartment, a group of rooms, or a single room occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants do not live and eat with any other persons in the structure, and that have direct access from the outside of the building or through a common hall. For vacant units, the criteria of separateness and direct access are applied to the intended occupants.

<u>Immigration Status</u>. Indicates whether a householder not born in the USA came here as an immigrant, and if so - when; or if the householder was born in the USA outside New York City, when he/she moved to New York City.

<u>Income of Households</u>. Household income is the income of all members of the household 15 years or older regardless of whether they are related to the householder or not. The data represent income for the calendar year 1998 and are the sum of the amounts for each of the following sources:

- (1) Wage and salary income includes total income from wages, salary, tips, bonuses, commissions and leave before all deductions.
- (2) Net income from own farm or nonfarm business, proprietorship, or partnership includes the total money receipts for goods sold or services rendered minus business expenses. Business expenses include rent, utilities, employee pay, business taxes, cost of goods, and depreciation on buildings/equipment, etc. Salary is not an expense; it is part of income from the business.
- (3) Interest or dividends, net rental or royalty income, or income from estates and trusts includes the following items:
  - Interest money received or credited to a savings account, bonds, or savings certificates. Interest accruing to retirement accounts that cannot be withdrawn in the near future is excluded.
  - Dividends payments made by corporations and mutual funds to shareholders.
  - Net rental income includes income from tenants/roomers/boarders and is rent received less expenses of paying for and maintaining the property.
  - Net royalty income gross income from mineral, gas, or oil rights, patents, trademarks, literary works, formulas, etc. less deductions. Deductions against gross royalties are made for depletion, depreciation, office expenses, interest, taxes, and similar items.
  - Estates and trusts periodic payment received from these entities.
- (4) Social Security or railroad retirement income includes Social Security and railroad retirement payments. Some persons receiving these payments have Medicare deducted. However, for this survey, the Medicare deduction is counted as income and included in this item. If recipients are under age 15, the allotment is reported for the person to whom the check is sent (if the person is age 15 or over).
- (5) Income from government programs includes the following:
  - Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments received from a program run by the Social Security Administration for low income, elderly, or disabled persons.
     Payment may come from the federal government, state, or local welfare office. It is not Social Security income.
  - Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (formerly AFDC) payments received through a welfare program administered by the state or local government to families with dependent children.
  - Safety Net payments received through a program that is a form of public assistance for low income households with no dependent children (Formerly known as Home Relief).

- Shelter Allowance payment that helps to defray all or part of the cost for shelter. It may be paid directly to the recipient or to the landlord. Amount is reported for the person to whom issued.
- (6) Income from retirement, survivor, or disability pensions (but not Social Security) includes the following:
  - Private pensions payments received from a former employer, labor union, etc. A survivor is also eligible as a beneficiary.
  - Government employee pensions monthly payments to former employees and ssurvivors paid by federal, state, or local agencies, or the Armed Forces.
  - Disability pensions payments resulting from some severe or permanent injury, illness, or disability. The payment can be from a government agency or private organization.
  - Annuities periodic payments as a return on an investment such as life insurance.
  - IRA and Keogh Plans payments from retirement accounts received by persons aged 59<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> years old or older, or by disabled persons.
- (7) Income from veteran's payments, unemployment compensation, child support, alimony, or regular contribution from other sources includes the following:
  - Veteran's payments periodic payments to disabled veterans, survivors of deceased veterans, living expense stipends paid during education/training, and annual refunds paid on GI life insurance policies.
  - Unemployment compensation payments from state unemployment insurance funds, railroad unemployment benefits, labor union strike funds, and supplemental payments from companies to help replace wages during work layoffs. It also includes supplemental payments to persons who had exhausted their state payments.

Also included are payments for training, transportation, and/or subsistence by persons undergoing classroom training provided through the Job Training Partnership Act through state or local governments.

- Child support payment for support of children not living with one parent as a result of divorce or legal separation. Payment may also be made through a court system.
- Alimony payment received after a divorce or legal separation.
- Other sources financial assistance from private charitable organizations such as the Red Cross or a church, any contributions from persons not living in the household, scholarships or fellowships received by students for which no work or service is required, and anything else not mentioned.

Income of Persons. The data reflect total income from all sources for all persons 15 years old or older during calendar year 1998. See Income of Households for a description of the various income sources.

Income of Primary Individuals. The data represent total income from all sources during calendar year 1998 for householders who live alone. See Income of Households for a description of each income source.

Industry Code. See Type of Industry and Occupation Code.

<u>Kitchen Facilities</u>. A housing unit has complete kitchen facilities if it has a sink with piped water, a range or cookstove, and a refrigerator. All facilities must be located in the unit although they do not need to be in the same room. Kitchen facilities are for exclusive use if they are only used by the occupants of the unit. In the case of vacant units, the same criteria was used in determining complete kitchen facilities are to the intended occupants. Kitchen facilities are considered to be functioning if they work at all, even if imperfectly.

<u>Labor Force Status.</u> All persons 15 years and older are classified into one of two major labor force groups. The groups are described below:

- (1) <u>In Labor Force.</u> Persons are classified as in the labor force if they are employed, unemployed, or in the Armed Forces the week prior to interview.
  - (a) <u>Employed/Armed Forces.</u> Employed persons comprise (1) all individuals who, during the week prior to interview, did any work at all as paid employees or in their own business or profession, or who worked as unpaid workers for 15 hours or more a week in a business operated by a member of the family and (2) all those who had jobs but were not working because of illness, bad weather, vacation, or labor-management dispute, or because they were taking time off for personal reasons, whether or not they were seeking other jobs. Each employed person was counted only once. Those persons who held more than one job were counted in the job at which they worked the greatest number of hours during the week prior to interview. If they worked an equal number of hours at more than one job, they were counted at the job they held the longest.
  - (b) <u>Unemployed</u>. Unemployed persons are those individuals who, during the week prior to interview, had no employment but were available for work, and (1) had engaged in any specific job seeking activity within the past 4 weeks such as registering at a public or private employment office, meeting with prospective employers, checking with friends or relatives, placing or answering advertisements, writing letters of application, or being on a union or professional register; (2) were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off; or (3) were waiting to report to a new wage or salary job within 30 days.

- (2) <u>Not in Labor Force</u>. The category "not in the labor force" includes the following:
  - Persons who reported doing unpaid work in a family business for less than 15 hours a week.
  - Persons who reported being temporarily absent (for any reason other than a layoff) from working in a family business without pay.
  - Persons who reported not working the week prior to interview, and one of the following situations existed:
    - a. The person responded "no" to being temporarily absent from a job.
    - b. The person responded "no" to looking for work for the last four weeks, or the person did not report whether he/she was looking for work.

<u>Length of Lease</u>. A lease is defined as a contract granting use or occupation during a specified period in exchange for rent. The length of lease is from the time the lease originated, not from the time of the interview. The data are limited to households paying cash rent.

Looking for Work During the Last Four Weeks. The data represent whether or not individuals who did not work last week or were not on temporary absence or layoff tried to get a job or start a business during the last weeks prior to interview. Examples of seeking work include: placing or answering advertisements for help, writing letters/resumes, consulting an employment agency, exploring the possibilities of starting a business or practice, and checking with a union or other workers organization.

Maintenance Deficiencies. See Number of 1987 and 1999 Maintenance Deficiencies.

<u>Monthly Asking Rent.</u> The asking rent for vacant for-rent housing units is the rent asked for the unit at the time of interview which may differ from the rent paid at the time the unit was occupied. The asking rent may or may not include utilities.

Monthly Condominium or Cooperative Maintenance Fees. This question applies only to owner occupied condominiums or cooperatives. Some or all of the following may be included in condominiums or cooperative maintenance fees: real estate taxes; fire insurance; other hazard insurance; payments on the underlying building mortgage; salaries of maintenance employees; heating expenses; utilities; and reserves for major repairs, maintenance, etc.

Monthly Contract Rent. Monthly contract rent is the rent agreed to or contracted for, even if furnishings, utilities, or services are included. Rental units occupied without payment of cash rent are classified as either "no cash rent," or "occupied rent free."

<u>Monthly Gross Rent.</u> Monthly gross rent is the monthly contract rent plus the monthly cost of utilities, (electricity, gas, and water and sewer) and other fuels (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) if these items are paid by the renter in addition to rent. Use of this measure eliminates differentials that result from varying practices with respect to the inclusion of utilities and fuels as part of the rent payment.

Monthly Mortgage or Loan Payment. This is the amount paid to the lender or lenders for the mortgage(s) or loan(s) outstanding on the apartment (house). It includes payments for principal and interest, real estate taxes, fire and liability insurance, and mortgage insurance, if they are part of the mortgage payment.

Monthly Out-of-Pocket Rent. The total amount of rent NOT paid by a government housing subsidy program. For public assistance recipients, this includes funds from the basic grant (non-shelter allowance). "Out-of-pocket" also includes payments or help with rent from outside, non-government program sources such as per diem reimbursement, or help from parents, friends, or a church.

Mortgage Status. This item refers to whether there is a mortgage or similar loan outstanding on the apartment (house), or whether it is owned free and clear. A mortgage or similar debt refers to all forms of debt where the property is pledged as security for payment of debt, including home equity loans. A home equity loan is a mortgage in which a line of credit is established allowing the owner to borrow against equity in the unit. It may be placed on a property that already has a first or second mortgage, or it may be placed on a property that is owned free and clear. Owners of cooperatives technically do not have mortgages, but the loans they have taken to finance the purchase of shares in the cooperative are considered "similar loans" for the purpose of this survey.

Most Recent Place Lived 6 Months or More. Data are presented for the place that the householder lived continuously for at least six months before moving to his/her current residence.

<u>Neighborhood Rating</u>. The data presented are based on the respondent's overall opinion of the physical condition of the residential structures in his/her neighborhood.

Non-relative. A non-relative of the householder is any person in the household that is not related to the householder (reference person) by blood, marriage, or adoption. Roomers, boarders, lodgers, partners, resident employees, wards, and foster children are included in this category.

<u>Number of 1987 and 1999 Maintenance Deficiencies.</u> The data for these items consist of a count of all households answering affirmatively to the specific maintenance deficiency items collected in 1987 and 1999. To be counted in one of the five 1987 deficiency categories, all of the following items had to be reported: heating equipment breakdown (one or more times), additional heating required, rodent infestation, cracks/holes in the walls, ceilings or floors, and broken plaster/peeling paint larger than 8½ x 11 inches. Beginning in 1991, the list was expanded to include toilet breakdowns and water leaks from outside the unit. Data are presented separately for the 5 deficiency items on the 1987 survey and the 7 deficiency items on the 1999 survey.

<u>Number of Persons</u>. All persons occupying the housing unit are counted. These persons include not only occupants related to the householder but also any lodgers, roomers, boarders, partners, wards, foster children, resident employees, and any others who share the housing unit of the householder.

Number of Stories in Building. This item refers to the number of floors in the building. Basement apartments are counted as a floor only if occupied.

<u>Number of Units in Building</u>. In determining the number of housing units in a building, all units (both occupied and vacant) are counted. A building is classified as a separate building if it has either open space on all sides or is separated from other structures by dividing walls that extend from ground to roof. Data from this item represent the number of housing units located in buildings of a specified size, not the number of residential buildings.

Number of Weeks Worked in 1998. This refers to the number of weeks worked during the last year in which the subject spent one or more hours at work. This number should include weeks spent on paid leave; such as paid sick leave, paid vacation, or military service. Weeks spent on unpaid leave or layoff are not included.

Occupancy Status Before Acquisition. The data are limited to owner occupied units and refer to the status prior to the householder's acquisition of the apartment (house). The categories are as follows:

- Owned and Occupied by Another Household The unit was purchased from the previous owner.
- Rented by Reference Person The unit was rented by the reference person before the purchase occurred.
- Rented by Another Household The unit was occupied and rented by another household before it was purchased.
- Never Previously Occupied The unit was newly constructed or gut rehabilitated and the current occupants are the first occupants.
- Don't Know The respondent does not know the previous situation of the unit.

Occupation Codes. See Type of Industry and Occupation Code.

Owner in Building. The owner need not live in the sample unit to be considered as living in the building.

Ownership Status. The categories for homeowner units (occupied and vacant) are:

<u>Homeowner (Conventional)</u>. Privately owned houses or buildings which are NOT part of a cooperative or condominium building or development. This category includes owner-occupied single-family houses, living quarters which are part of commercial or industrial buildings, and all other types of owner-occupied units which are not in cooperatives and condominiums.

<u>Mitchell-Lama Coop.</u> The units were constructed under the New York State or New York City Mitchell-Lama cooperative program. The purpose of the program is to enable moderate and middle-income families to secure decent affordable housing through limited equity cooperative ownership.

The mechanisms employed to keep both the initial down payment and monthly carrying charges within the means of middle-income families, to which the program is restricted, are: tax

exemption, state or city provided low interest mortgages, and limited developer profit. In certain instances, federal subsidies are combined with the state and local measures to achieve the program's objectives.

<u>Private Coop/Condo.</u> Privately owned cooperative or condominium units which were not constructed under the New York State or New York City Mitchell-Lama program. A portion of the units in this category may have benefitted from some other type of government assistance (e.g. J-51, 421A).

<u>Passenger Elevator in Building</u>. This item refers to the presence of an elevator in the building in working and nonworking order. Excluded are elevators used only for freight. In the tabulations, data are shown by the number of housing units in structures with two or more stories which have one or more passenger elevators on the same floor as the sample unit.

<u>Persons from Homeless Situation.</u> This item refers to whether a person has come from a homeless situation before moving into his/her current residence. This may be a shelter, a transitional center, or a "homeless" hotel. A person is not considered to be homeless if they are able to afford shelter, live with someone to save money, a child living with parents, or staying with friends while looking for a place to live. The data are limited to persons coming from a homeless situation within the past 5 years. This item also asks whether those persons were in a temporary residence for financial reasons, or for other reasons such as substance abuse, emotional or mental problems, or personal preference.

<u>Persons Per Room.</u> Persons per room is computed for each occupied housing unit by dividing the number of persons in the unit by the number of rooms in the unit. The data refer, therefore, to the number of housing units having the specified ratio of persons per room. See <u>Rooms</u> for a description of what constitutes a room.

<u>Place of Birth.</u> This item refers to where the householder and his/her parents were born. The householder was asked to select from the following categories: New York City; U.S., outside New York City; Puerto Rico; Dominican Republic; Caribbean (other than Puerto Rico or Dominican Republic); Mexico; Central America, South America; Europe; Russia/Successor States to the Soviet Union (Ukraine, Georgia, etc.); China, Hong Kong, Taiwan; Korea; India; Pakistan, Bangladesh; Philippines; Southeast Asia (Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam); Other Asia; Africa; and all other countries.

<u>Plumbing Facilities.</u> A housing unit has complete plumbing facilities if it has hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet, and a bathtub or shower. All facilities need not be located in the same room, but they all must be in the unit. Complete plumbing facilities are for exclusive use if they are used only by the occupants of the unit. For vacant units, the same criteria were used in determining complete plumbing facilities and their exclusive use, but the criteria were applied to the intended occupants.

Poverty Level. See Households Below Specific Income Level.

<u>Presence of Mice and Rats.</u> The data refer to whether the household reported seeing mice or rats or signs/traces of their presence inside the house or building during the last three months. Signs/traces of mice and rats include droppings, holes in the wall, or torn food containers.

Primary Individual. A householder who lives alone.

<u>Primary Reason for Not Looking for Work.</u> Data are limited to individuals 15 years or older. Data are presented for the main reason individuals (who did not look for work during the last four weeks) are not seeking work based on the following categories:

- (1) Believes no work is available in line of work or area.
- (2) Could not find any work.
- (3) Lacks necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience.
- (4) Employers think too young or too old.
- (5) Other personal handicap in finding a job.
- (6) Can't arrange child care.
- (7) Family responsibilities.
- (8) In school or other training.
- (9) Ill health or physical disability
- (10) Retired.
- (11) Other.
- (12) Don't know.

<u>Public Assistance or Welfare Payments.</u> This item refers to anyone in the household, regardless of their age or relationship to the householder, who receives public assistance payments from such sources as: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families or Family Assistance (formerly AFDC); Safety Net (formerly Home Relief); Supplemental Security Income; etc. A brief description of these sources is presented in part 5 of the Income of Households definition.

<u>Purchase Price</u>. The purchase price refers to the price of the house and lot or apartment at the time the property was acquired. Closing costs are excluded from the purchase price. The data are limited to households that acquired their units in 1994 or later.

<u>Race.</u> The concept of race as used by the Census Bureau does not denote a clear-cut scientific definition of biological stock. Race was determined for each person in the household on the basis of a question that asked for the respondent's identification of a person's race with one of the following categories:

- (1) White
- (2) Black or African American
- (3) American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut
- (4) Chinese
- (5) Filipino
- (6) Korean

- (7) Vietnamese
- (8) Asian Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi
- (9) Other Asian
- (10) Other race not listed above.

Beginning with the 1993 NYCHVS, all persons who reported their race as "other" were allocated to one of the major race categories, as were persons not reporting race. Thus, caution should be used when comparing data on race from the 1991 and earlier surveys with data on race for 1993, 1996, and 1999. For a further explanation of these differences see the section, Relationship to Previous NYCHVS surveys in Chapter 1.

<u>Real Estate Taxes.</u> Two questions were asked pertaining to real estate taxes. Excluded are payments on delinquent taxes due from prior years. Data are available for the following:

- (1) Whether the real estate taxes are paid separately.
- (2) The amount of real estate taxes paid in 1998.

<u>Reason Householder Moved From Previous Residence.</u> These data are shown for units where the householder moved into the sample unit in 1996 or later. The categories refer to reasons causing the move from the previous residence. The reasons are described below:

#### EMPLOYMENT

Job Transfer/New Job - Householder moved due to taking a new job or was transferred to area by employer.

Retirement - Householder moved after retirement.

Looking for Work - Householder moved because it seemed to be a good area to find a job.

<u>Commuting Reasons</u> - Householder moved because this unit is closer to place of employment or the commute is more efficient or improved than previous residence.

To Attend School - Householder moved to attend school in another area.

Other Financial/Employment Reason - Householder moved for some other job related reason.

#### FAMILY

<u>Needed Larger House or Apartment</u> - Householder moved because more space was needed.

Widowed - Householder moved because husband/wife passed away.

Separated/Divorced - Householder moved due to separation or divorce.

Newly Married - Householder moved because of marriage.

Moved to Be With or Closer to Relatives - Householder moved to live with or closer to other relatives.

<u>Family Decreased</u> - Householder moved because family size shrunk, such as grown children leaving home.

Wanted to Establish Separate Household - Householder moved to be "on one's own."

Other Family Reasons - Householder moved due to another family reason.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD

<u>Neighborhood Overcrowded</u> - Householder moved because previous neighborhood was too crowded.

<u>Change in Racial or Ethnic Composition of Neighborhood</u> - Householder moved because people of different ethnic groups moved into previous neighborhood.

<u>Wanted This Neighborhood/Better Neighborhood Services</u> - Householder moved because there are better services and/or facilities in this neighborhood, or wanted this particular neighborhood.

<u>Crime or Safety Concerns</u> - Householder moved because this neighborhood has less crime, or former neighborhood had too much crime.

Other Neighborhood Reason - Householder moved due to other neighborhood reason.

#### HOUSING

Wanted to Own Residence - Householder wanted to own unit.

Wanted to Rent Residence - Householder wanted to rent unit.

<u>Wanted Less Expensive Residence/Difficulty Paying Rent or Mortgage -</u> Householder moved because previous residence was too costly.

<u>Wanted Better Quality Residence</u> - Householder moved because this is a higher quality residence. This may be due to better structural quality or better services such as maintenance or security.

Evicted - Householder moved because of eviction from previous residence.

<u>Poor Building Condition/Services</u> - Householder moved because previous residence was not properly maintained, or in poor structural condition.

<u>Harassment by Landlord</u> - Householder moved because landlord at previous residence damaged the unit/building, threatened, or took other actions to get the resident to move out.

<u>Needed Housing Accessible for Persons with Mobility Impairments</u> - The householder moved to this unit because he/she or another household member required housing that was accessible for persons with physical disabilities that impaired mobility. (New category in 1996.)

Other Housing Reason - Householder moved because of some other problem with previous residence or amenities of current residence.

#### OTHER

Displaced by Urban Renewal, Highway Construction, or Other Public Activity -Householder moved because of government action such as road construction.

<u>Displaced by Private Action (Other than Eviction)</u> - Householder moved because of private action (other than eviction) such as conversion of a building to cooperative or condominium units.

Schools - Householder moved because there are better schools in this neighborhood.

Natural Disaster/Fire - Householder moved because last residence was damaged by fire or a natural disaster.

<u>Any Other</u> - Householder moved for any other reason not listed above.

<u>Reasons Vacant Unit Not Available.</u> Data are presented for the reason that the vacant unit is not available for sale or for rent according to the following categories:

- Rented, not yet occupied If money rent has been paid or a lease signed, but the renter has not moved in, the vacant unit is included in this category.
- Sold, not yet occupied If the unit has recently been sold, but the new owner has not yet moved in, the vacant unit is included in this category.
- Unit or building is undergoing renovation Includes vacant units which are being renovated, or the building is being renovated.
- Unit or building is awaiting renovation Also includes vacant units held off the market until other units in the building can be vacated so that the whole building can be renovated.
- Being converted to nonresidential purposes Vacant units that will be converted to nonresidential use are included in this category.

- A legal dispute involving the unit Includes vacant units wherein the terms of a will, a lawsuit, settlement of an estate, or some other legal matter places the unit in limbo.
- Being converted or awaiting conversion to condominium or cooperative -Includes vacant units that are not available for rent or sale because they are in the process of being converted to a condo/coop.
- Held for occasional, seasonal, or recreational use Includes vacant units which are held for weekend or other occasional use throughout the year. Units belonging to a corporation for occasional use by an employee are also included in this category.
- The owner cannot rent or sell at this time due to personal problems Includes vacant units that are unavailable for occupancy because of some personal problem of the owner such as age or illness.
- Being held pending sale of building Includes vacant units that are being held until the entire building is sold.
- Being held for planned demolition Includes vacant units in a building that the owner plans to demolish once the unit is vacated.
- Held for other reasons Includes vacant units that are unavailable for reasons not included in any of the above categories.

#### Reference Person. See Householder.

<u>Relationship</u>. Relationships are determined by how each household member is related to the householder. Persons are classified as relatives of the householder if they are related to him/her by blood, marriage, or adoption. Unrelated household members could include a roomer/boarder, foster child, unmarried partner, housemate/roommate, or other nonrelative.

<u>Rent.</u> See Monthly Asking Rent, Monthly Contract Rent, Monthly Gross Rent, or Monthly Out-of-Pocket Rent.

<u>Rent as Percent of Income</u>. This is the percentage of a household's average monthly income represented by the monthly rental expense. Contract Rent as a percent of Income uses the monthly contract rent as the numerator. Gross Rent as a percent of Income uses the monthly gross rent as the numerator. Calculations are not done for households that do not pay rent, have no income, or report a net income loss.

<u>Rent Regulation Status (see Control Status).</u> The final rent regulation status definitions were prepared by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research. They were the basis of the regulatory status categories used in this document and can be found in Appendix C. <u>Rent Regulation Status (Respondent Reported)</u>. This is the rent regulation status as reported by the respondent. Status is categorized as follows: 1) under rent control, 2) rent stabilization, 3) neither, and 4) respondent doesn't know. The response to this question is NOT used in determining rent regulation status (see definition of Rent Regulation Status).

<u>Rent Subsidy</u>. This refers to whether the Federal, state, or local government pays part of the householder's rent either to a member of the household or directly to the landlord under the following programs:

- Under the Federal Section 8 certificate or voucher program, the government pays part of the rent for low income families and individuals. The tenants pay approximately 30 percent of their household income for rent, and the Section 8 program pays the difference between the tenant's payment and a fair market rent.
- The Public Assistance Grant is made up of the Basic Grant and Shelter Allowance. The Shelter Allowance is meant to be used for the payment of rent. If the rent is higher than the Shelter Allowance, the tenant must pay the remainder of the rent with the Basic Grant.
- A Senior Citizen Rent Increase Exemption (SCRIE) is for people aged 62 and above living in rent controlled, rent stabilized, or Mitchell-Lama units. For tenants with incomes below a threshold amount, the city pays the difference in monthly rent resulting from increases that raise rent to more than one-third of income.
- Any other federal, state, or city housing subsidy program.

<u>Rooms.</u> Rooms counted include whole rooms used for living purposes, such as living rooms, dining rooms, bedrooms, kitchens, finished attic or basement rooms, recreation rooms, permanently enclosed porches that are suitable for year-round use, and lodger's rooms. Also included are rooms used for offices by a person living in the unit.

A partially divided room, such as a dinette next to a kitchen or living room, is a separate room only if there is a partition from floor to ceiling, but not if the partition consists only of shelves or cabinets.

Not included in the count of rooms are bathrooms, halls, foyers or vestibules, balconies, closets, alcoves, pantries, strip or pullman kitchens, laundry or furnace rooms, unfinished attics or basements, other unfinished space used for storage, open porches, trailers used only as bedrooms, and offices used only by persons not living in the unit.

If a room is used by occupants of more than one unit, the room is included with the unit from which it is most easily reached.

<u>Senior Citizen Carrying Charge Increase Exemption.</u> Data are limited to households with persons age 62 or over living in cooperatives. The City of New York will pay the difference between one-third of income and an increase in the carrying charge above that amount in households where the householder

or spouse is age 62 or over with incomes less than a threshold amount. This program is intended for residents of Mitchell-Lama cooperatives.

<u>Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Unit.</u> A rental unit consisting of one or two rooms, which does not provide its occupants with exclusive use of a complete kitchen and/or complete bath. For example, the SRO may have a shared bath, or a partially-equipped kitchen.

<u>Spanish/Hispanic Origin</u>. This classification refers to whether each person occupying the housing unit is of Spanish or Hispanic origin. The following categories are identified as Spanish/Hispanic: Puerto Rican, Dominican, Cuban, South/Central American, Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano, and Other Spanish/Hispanic.

SRO Flag. This flag designates units that were found on the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) sample frame.

<u>Structure Classification</u>. New York City structure class definitions are prepared by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research.

The New York State Multiple Dwelling Law (MDL) assigns a structure class designation to all "multiple dwellings," that is, all buildings that have three or more residential dwelling units. A "class A" multiple dwelling is used, as a rule, for permanent residence purposes. A "class B" multiple dwelling is used, as a rule, transiently, as the more or less temporary home of individuals or families who are lodged without meals. In addition, the Multiple Dwelling Law distinguishes between: a) "tenements," which are pre-1929 residential structures built originally as residential buildings, b) "post-1929 multiple dwellings" which are residential structures built after 1929, c) "converted dwellings" which are multiple dwellings that have been converted from structures that were originally 1-2 family dwellings, and d) "altered dwellings" which are multiple dwellings that have been altered from structures that were used for commercial or other non-residential purposes.

The structure class categories used for the 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey are based on the Multiple Dwelling Law and are defined as follows:

Old Law Tenement (built before 1901) - A "class A" multiple dwelling constructed before 1901 and subject to the regulations of the Tenement House Acts of 1867 and 1879. These buildings were usually designed to fit the maximum number of rooms on the standard 25' x 100' lot, with "railroad flat" floor plans, having rooms lined up like cars on a train. These plans offered little light or ventilation for interior rooms. Most of the buildings were six stories or less, with four apartments per floor. There were minimum standards regarding ventilation, fire escapes, sanitation, and basement units.

<u>New Law Tenement (built 1901-1929)</u> - A "class A" multiple dwelling constructed between 1901 and 1929 and subject to new standards for ventilation, sanitation, and fire safety contained in the Tenement House Act of 1901. Distinguished from the Old Law Tenement in terms of reduction of hazardous conditions and improved access to light and air. Typically, these structures were larger than Old Law Tenements, built on lots at least 40 feet wide, with courtyards or double sized air shafts to meet the enhanced ventilation standards.

<u>Multiple Dwelling Built After 1929 (including public housing)</u> - A "class A" multiple dwelling constructed after 1929 and subject to the regulations of the Multiple Dwelling Law of 1929. This law codified standards for high rise apartments, whether for tenements or luxury buildings. This law made "mechanical ventilation" an acceptable substitute for windows in corridors and baths, increased height and bulk limits, and legitimated the double-loaded corridor, in which a series of apartments open onto an interior hallway with no windows.

<u>Apartment Hotel Built Before 1929</u> - A "class A" multiple dwelling constructed before 1929 that has hotel-type amenities such as a front desk, maid service, or linen service.

<u>One-two Family Dwelling Converted to Apartments</u> - A "class A" multiple dwelling that was converted from a dwelling that previously had fewer than three residential units.

<u>Non-residential Building Altered to Apartments</u> - A "class A" multiple dwelling that was altered from a non-residential building that previously had no residential units.

<u>Tenement Building Used for Single Room Occupancy</u> - A "class A" multiple dwelling with units that are being used for single room occupancy pursuant to section 248 of the Multiple Dwelling Law. Section 248 specifies the conditions under which "class A" multiple dwellings may be used for single room occupancy. Single room occupancy is the occupancy by one or two persons of a single room, or of two or more rooms which are joined together, separated from all other rooms within an apartment in a multiple dwelling, so that the occupant(s) reside separately and independently of the other occupant(s) of the same apartment. When a "class A" multiple dwelling is used wholly or in part for a single room occupancy, it remains a "class A" multiple dwelling.

<u>One-two Family Dwelling Converted to Rooming House</u> - A "class B" multiple dwelling that was converted from a dwelling that previously had fewer than three residential units. A rooming house is a multiple dwelling, other than a hotel, having fewer than thirty sleeping rooms and in which persons either individually or as families are housed for hire or otherwise with or without meals.

<u>Miscellaneous Class B Structure</u> - This includes all other "class B" multiple dwellings such as old law and new law residential apartment buildings converted for single room occupancy, but not pursuant to section 248 of the Multiple Dwelling Law; lodging houses; rooming houses; hotels; and commercial buildings altered for residential single room occupancy use. A lodging house is a multiple dwelling, other than a hotel, a rooming house, or a furnished rooming house, in which persons are housed for hire for a single night, or for less than a week at one time, or any part of which is let for any person to sleep in for any term less than a week. An inn with fewer that thirty sleeping rooms is a rooming house. A hotel is an inn having thirty or more sleeping rooms.

<u>One-two Family House.</u> A "private dwelling" in any building or structure designed and occupied exclusively for residence purposes by not more that two families. A building designed and occupied exclusively by one family is a "single-family private dwelling". One designed for and occupied exclusively by two families is a "two-family private dwelling". Private dwellings also include a series of one-family or two-family dwelling units, each of which faces or is accessible to a legal street or public thoroughfare.

<u>Sub-borough Areas.</u> Sub-borough areas are groups of census tracts containing at least 100,000 population. The tract composition of each area was determined by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development and was based on Census Bureau requirements that no sub-borough area can be identified with less than 100,000 population. The boundaries of sub-borough areas may often approximate community district boundaries. However, sub-borough areas are not the same as community districts.

<u>Temporarily Absent or on Layoff.</u> Data on temporarily absent are presented for persons who reported not working the week prior to interview. Data are shown separately for persons reporting an official layoff or furlough and those reporting absence because of vacation, temporary illness, or involvement in a labor dispute, etc.

<u>Tenure</u>. A housing unit is owner-occupied if the owner or co-owner lives in the unit, even if it is mortgaged at the time of the interview. A cooperative or condominium unit is owner-occupied only if the owner or co-owner lives in it at the time of our visit. All other occupied housing units are classified as renter-occupied including housing units rented for cash rent and those occupied without payment of cash rent.

<u>Toilet Breakdowns.</u> Based on respondent's report of whether there was a time in the three month period preceding the survey when all the toilets in the apartment (house) were not working for six consecutive hours.

<u>Type of Business/Industry Activity</u>. Data are presented that reflect the main business/industry activity conducted by a firm. The categories are as follows:

- Manufacturing the making, processing, or assembly of products.
- Wholesale trade the buying of goods from a manufacturer and the selling to large users such as retail stores, hotel chains, hospitals, etc.
- Retail trade the selling of products directly to consumers; all restaurants and taverns are also included here.
- Other includes construction firms, government agencies, and service industries. Examples of service industries are hotels, repair shops, laundries, hair salons, advertising agencies, and stock brokerages.

<u>Type of Heating Fuel.</u> Four types of heating fuels were reported. Electricity is generally supplied by means of above or underground electric power lines. Utility gas is piped through underground pipes from a central system to serve the neighborhood. Fuel oil is heating oil, normally supplied by truck to a storage tank for use by the heating system. Other fuels include coal, kerosene, wood, etc.

<u>Type of Industry and Occupation Code.</u> Codes for type of industry and occupation are based on 1990 census definitions at the three digit level.

<u>Type of Schedule</u>. These codes are assigned during clerical editing of the questionnaires and may be used in computer editing to assign tenure and vacancy status if these items are not reported. (This item appears on the Microdata File only.)

Type of Worker. Type of worker consists of the following categories:

- 1. Private Wage and Salary Worker FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission. This classification also includes compensation by tips, piece rates, or pay "in kind," if received from a non-governmental source, regardless of whether the source is a large corporation or a single individual.
- 2. Private Wage and Salary Worker NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax exempt, or charitable organization. This category includes:
  - Employees of churches, unions, YMCAs, political parties, professional associations, non-profit hospitals, and similar organizations.
  - Persons who work for condominium and cooperative associations, other cooperative businesses, mutual and fraternal insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and credit unions.
  - Employees of foreign governments, the United Nations, or other formal international organizations controlled by foreign governments.
- 3. Government Worker federal

Government Worker - state, local (city, borough, etc.) - these categories include:

- Employees of public schools, government-owned bus lines, and governmentowned utilities (by level of government).
- Persons elected to paid offices.
- Civilian and active duty members of the Armed Forces.
- 4. Self-employed in own incorporated/unincorporated business or professional practice.
  - Own business, incorporated, refers to people who own all or most of the stock in a privately held corporation, and consider themselves self-employed.
  - Own businesses, unincorporated, refers to work for profit or fees in the person's own business, shop, office, etc. It does **not** include managers or other executives hired to run a business, salespersons on commission, or corporate officers. This category includes sole proprietorships and partnerships, but the company cannot be incorporated.
- 5. Working without pay in a family business.

Persons who received no monetary compensation for their work in a family business are included in this category. In addition, persons who receive room and board as pay for work in a family business are also included here.

<u>Utilities and Fuels.</u> Data on amounts paid for the utility items (electricity, gas, water, and sewer) and the fuel items (oil, coal, kerosene, wood, etc.) are shown if they are used and paid separately from the rent or any condominium or maintenance fees. Amounts for electricity and gas are monthly; water and sewer, and other fuel costs are yearly.

The gas, water and sewer utility items, and fuel items used in the monthly gross rent tabulation are all two-part questions: 1) Is the item paid separately (from the rent or any condominium or maintenance fees), and 2) If it is paid separately, what is the cost (amount). However, information on electricity is asked in a three part question: 1) Is electricity paid separately (from the rent or any condominium or maintenance fees), 2) if it is paid separately, what is the cost (amount), and 3) if it is combined with the gas payment and respondent cannot give separate estimates of gas and electricity costs.

Vacancy Status. Data on the status of vacant units are presented in the following categories:

- Vacant for rent Includes vacant units that are for rent only; both for rent or for sale; unsold vacant units offered for rent in condominium or cooperative buildings; individually owned units offered for rent during an extended absence by the owner; and vacant units in a building offered for sale and the sample unit is offered for rent.
- Vacant for sale Includes only vacant units for sale to the general public.
- Not available for rent or for sale Includes units not available for rent or for sale. See "Reason Vacant Unit Not Available" for a description of the reasons.

<u>Value</u>. Value is the respondent's estimate of how much the apartment or house/lot would sell for if it were for sale. Any nonresidential portions of the property are excluded from the estimate.

<u>Water Leakage.</u> The data refer to units where water has leaked into the unit other than from the unit's fixtures backing up or overflowing. Units with situations such as leaks through the ceilings or roof, or closed windows are included here.

<u>Wheelchair Accessibility</u>. A series of items were added in 1996 to determine if the building and sample unit were wheelchair-accessible. The field representative determined by observation or measurement if the street entry and inner lobby (width at least 32"), elevator (door width 36", cab depth 51"), and unit entrance (width 32") were accessible. Additionally, each respondent living in a building with an elevator was asked if the elevator could be reached without using steps, and, all respondents were asked whether the unit could be reached from the sidewalk outside, without using any steps.

<u>Worked Last Week.</u> Last week refers to the full calendar week, Sunday through Saturday before the interview. The following activities are counted as work: paid work; work for meals; lodging, supplies, etc.; work for piece rates, commissions, or tips; work in the person's own business or professional practice; work without pay in a family business; active military duty; and any part-time job such as babysitting. Work excludes work around a person's own house, unpaid babysitting, volunteer work, and school work.
Worker's Occupation Code. Codes for type of occupation are based on the 1990 census definitions at the three-digit level.

<u>Year Acquired.</u> The year the apartment (house) was acquired is the year the householder acquired the apartment (house) outright or began making payments on the mortgage or similar loan. The year the apartment (house) was acquired is not the year the mortgage or similar loan was paid off.

<u>Year Building Built.</u> Data on year built were obtained from records provided by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development. Each sample unit was clerically coded based on this information.

<u>Year Last Worked</u>. The data represent the most recent year in which the person did any work at all, not necessarily the year the person last worked full-time.

<u>Year Moved In.</u> Data are presented for the year in which the householder moved into the sample unit; that is, the date of the latest move. If the householder moved out of the unit but returned later, the data refer to the date he/she moved back.

<u>Year Moved to New York City</u>. If householder was born outside New York City, reports the year he or she moved to New York City.

Year Moved to U.S. If householder was born outside the U.S. reports the year he or she moved to the U.S.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Currer	Nine persons or more	Eight persons	Seven persons	Six persons	Five persons	Four persons	Three persons	Householder 65 years and over	Householder under 65 years	Two persons	65 years and over	Under 65 years	One person (unrelated individual)		Size of Family Unit		
nt Population Su	33,339	28,166	25,257	22,228	19,680	16,660	13,003	9,862	10,972	10,634	7,818	8,480	8,316	Threshold	Average	Weighted	
urvey.	36,100	30,010	26,833	23,320	20,275	16,813	12,750	9,800	10,915		7,818	8,480		None			
	36,275	30,275	27,000	23,413	20,570	17,088	13,120	11,193	11,235					One			
	35,793	29,730	26,423	22,930	19,940	16,530	13,133							Two		Related Ch	
	35,388	29,253	26,020	22,468	19,453	16,588								Three			
	34,723	28,575	25,270	21,780	19,155									Four		uldren Under	
	33,808	27,715	24,395	21,373										Five		18 Years	
	32,980	26,820	23,435											Six			
	32,775	26,593												Seven			
	31,513													More	Eight or		

# Poverty Thresholds in 1998, by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

## Definitions of<br/>Rent Regulation StatusPrepared by New York City Department of Housing Preservation<br/>and Development<br/>Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research

The 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Surveys (HVSs) use a sample taken from a sample frame based on the 1990 Census (for information on the sample, see Appendix D). The five HVSs from 1975 to 1987 all used the same sample taken from a sample frame drawn from the 1970 Census. For these earlier surveys rent regulation status was initially determined in 1975 from the written records of the then New York City Department of Rent and Housing Maintenance, and changes in the status of units that were no longer available from official records were updated through a special coding procedure as follows. Units that had been listed as controlled were recoded as pre-1947 stabilized if the tenants moved in on or after July 1, 1971 and the building had fewer than six units. Units in buildings with six or more units built between 1947 and 1974 were coded as post-1947 stabilized. Units in buildings constructed after 1974 which received 421-a tax benefits or J-51 conversion tax benefits were also coded as post-1947 stabilized. Units in buildings constructed after 1974 which free than six units were coded as "other". Units in buildings converted to cooperatives or condominiums in which the tenants stated that they had moved in after the date of conversion were recoded from controlled or stabilized to "other".

Because of the new sample used in 1991, 1993, 1996, and 1999 and changes in both the administration and the content of rent regulation laws since 1975, the following two-phase coding procedure was used for the 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 HVSs in determining rent regulation status. This procedure allowed the U.S. Census Bureau to assign a regulation status to privately owned units (not public housing, in rem, or Mitchell-Lama) which were not government assisted (not federally subsidized or under Article 4 of the New York State Private Housing Finance Law [PHFL] or whose rents were not regulated by the New York City Loft Board. The first phase was the determination of the regulation status of sample units based on the computerized rent registration database of the New York State Division of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR). With the passage of the Omnibus Housing Act of 1983, administration of rent regulation in New York City became the responsibility of DHCR. In April 1984, owners of rent controlled units were required to register these units and provide information on their tenantry and unit characteristics to DHCR. Owners of rent stabilized units have been required to file similar registrations annually. These records should accurately reflect the control status of all regulated units. A review of the DHCR database from 1984 through 1989 indicated, however, that because a significant number of owners failed to register their stabilized units in every year, relying solely on the latest data available would lead to the undercount of a substantial number of stabilized units. Therefore, New York City's Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD's) Division of Housing Policy Analysis and Statistical Research merged the DHCR files and created a data file consisting of all apartment records from 1984 through 1989 (the last year available prior to the 1991 HVS coding procedure). The Census Bureau selected the regulation status for the most recent year listed for each sample unit. Even after this procedure, it was clear that these records could not be the sole complete source of information on regulation status.

Thus, the second phase of the coding procedure used the DHCR regulation status as a base (for those units which appear in the DHCR file) and used supplementary information to improve on DHCR's accuracy. This is helpful for units registered as controlled in 1984 which have changed tenancy since 1984 but for which no change in registration was filed (especially important for units in buildings with fewer than 6 units which are no longer regulated in any way) and units in buildings that are cooperatives or condominiums which were regulated at the time of a prior registration but which have had a change in tenancy since conversion. Although owners are required to register exempt units, it is likely that some owners do not, so that relying solely on DHCR status might incorrectly classify these exempt units as regulated. In addition, this coding procedure was used to differentiate between pre- and post-1947 stabilized units since this information does not appear on the DHCR files.

Rental units which do not appear in DHCR files also were assigned regulation statuses by applying the major definitional criteria covered in the Local Emergency Rent Control Act of 1962, the 1969 Rent Stabilization Law, the 1974 Emergency Tenant Protection Act, and the Omnibus Housing Act of 1983. These criteria include age of building, size of building, move-in date of the current tenant, whether the building receives a 421-a or a J-51 tax reduction benefit and whether the building is a cooperative or condominium. This procedure may tend to overestimate somewhat the total number of regulated units in the city but reliance solely on DHCR records would significantly underestimate regulated units in the city.

Below are the descriptions of rent control and rent stabilization, followed by descriptions of non-rent control and rent stabilization categories covered in the 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 HVSs.

#### Controlled

Controlled units are subject to the provisions of the Rent Control Law and Regulations which have jurisdiction over occupied private rental units. All increases in rent are set and must be approved by DHCR. The following units were classified as controlled: units in buildings with three or more units constructed before February 1, 1947, where the tenant moved in before July 1, 1971 or units substantially rehabilitated prior to January 1, 1976 under the provisions of J-51, which were initially occupied by the current tenant prior to January 1, 1976; units in buildings with one or two units constructed before February 1, 1976; units in buildings with one or two units constructed before February 1, 1976; units in buildings with one or two units constructed before February 1, 1947 which were initially occupied by the current tenant prior to April 1953. Some of these controlled units may be in buildings converted to cooperatives or condominiums. In addition, units in buildings built under the Municipal Loan Program, Article 8 of the PHFL, are also controlled. Municipal loan units were not covered in the second phase of the 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 HVS's coding procedure and might be inaccurately coded as stabilized or "other" for this survey. However, the coding errors for these units should be few because the DHCR file covered the majority of regulated rental units and only those units not properly registered with the DHCR would be miscoded.

Under law, all rent controlled apartments that are voluntarily vacated after June 30, 1971 are no longer subject to the jurisdiction of the Rent Control Law. If the unit is in a building with fewer than six units, it becomes decontrolled; if the unit is in a building with six units or more, it becomes rent stabilized.

The estimates from this Survey may undercount somewhat the full rent controlled inventory for two reasons: (1) some units, which upon vacancy, may have qualified for stabilization but in fact did not join or may have been expelled from the stabilization system, and as a result, may have remained under the

jurisdiction of the Rent Control Law; and (2) in some cases the householder may have moved in after 1971, but the apartment has remained rent controlled either because the rent controlled tenant has been joined by another person or family members who have used their succession rights to rent controlled status. For purposes of this survey, however, these units are considered eligible for stabilization and are classified as "Stabilized."

#### **Stabilized**

The stabilized category is divided into two parts: units built pre-1947 and units built post-1947.

#### Pre-1947 Stabilized

The following units were classified as pre-1947 stabilized units: units in buildings with six or more units constructed before February 1, 1947 where the current tenant moved in on or after July 1, 1971; units decontrolled prior to July 1, 1971 under the luxury decontrol provisions of city rent regulations unless the current tenant moved in after the effective date of a cooperative or condominium conversion (if any). However, if an owner failed to register a luxury decontrolled unit as stabilized, it would likely be inaccurately coded as rent controlled.

Also units in buildings rehabilitated with loans issued under Articles 14 or 15 of the PHFL regardless of the size of the building should be rent stabilized. Units in buildings in Article 14 of the rehabilitation mortgage insurance program by New York City Rehabilitation Mortgage Insurance Corporation (REMIC) built before 1947 with 6 or more units properly would be coded as stabilized even if the owner failed to register correctly. Units in buildings with 3 to 5 units are also stabilized. This would have caused coding errors, since the second-phase coding procedure classifies units in buildings with 3 to 5 units whose tenants moved in after July 1, 1971 as "other". However, according to REMIC, there were no REMIC buildings with 3 to 5 units as of September 1990. Thus, there are no coding errors with respect to size. The same situation occurs with units rehabilitated under Article 15 and again, since buildings in the program always have more than 5 units, no special coding is needed.

Units in buildings rehabilitated under the 312 program (Section 607 of the PHFL) with more than 2 units should be rent stabilized. This causes a problem for coding units in buildings with 3 to 5 units whose owners did not properly register them. However, since there are relatively few of these buildings in the program (only 67 since 1981 and data on units prior to 1981 are not available) not including them in the second-phase coding procedure should produce only an insignificant error.

In buildings that contained six or more units at the time stabilization went into effect, which were converted to five or fewer units at a later date, units would remain stabilized. If a landlord failed to properly register one of these units as stabilized, it would be inaccurately coded as "other" for the purposes of this survey.

#### Post-1947 Stabilized

The following units were classified as post-1947 stabilized: units in buildings with six or more units which were constructed between 1947 and 1973 or after 1974 if the units received a 421-a or J-51 conversion tax abatement (some previously tax-abated units may no longer be rent stabilized after the

expiration of tax benefits) and the current tenant moved in prior to a cooperative or condominium conversion (if any); units in buildings constructed under the Mitchell-Lama program which have been "bought out" of the program; hotel accommodations with rents of \$350 per month or \$88 per week or less on May 31, 1968 where the current tenant took occupancy after December 2, 1949 (no official list of these units exists so no supplemental coding could be included for them); units in Stuyvesant Town and Riverton which were constructed pursuant to Section 125 of the PHFL and whose tax exemptions are being phased out under section 423 of the New York State Real Property Tax Law; other units in buildings constructed under and still subject to the Article 5 rental program. In addition, there are units which are subject to rent stabilization voluntarily, pursuant to Section 2521.1 (m) of the Rent Stabilization Code. They are New York City Housing Development Corporation (HDC) and HPD financed housing units.

#### Public Housing

Rental units in structures owned and managed by the New York City Housing Authority were classified as Public Housing. Only households with specified low- or moderate-income levels may qualify as tenants. Rentals and terms and conditions of occupancy are regulated by the Authority. Private housing leased by the Authority is not classified here as Public Housing.

#### Mitchell-Lama Rental

Rental units in buildings constructed under the provisions of the Article 2 of the PHFL were classified as Mitchell-Lama Rental.

The Mitchell-Lama program is primarily housing for middle-income tenants; therefore, occupancy is restricted to households meeting certain income limitations. The mechanisms employed to keep rents at affordable levels include tax exemption, state- or city-provided low interest mortgages, and limitations of return on equity. In certain instances, federal subsidy programs are combined with the state and local assistance measures to achieve the program's objectives. Rents are directly regulated; adjustments are based on changes in operating costs, debt structure, and profitability in the particular project and must be approved by the appropriate state or city agency. Certain Mitchell-Lama projects were refinanced under 223F, National Housing Act, and rents are regulated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

#### All Other Rental Housing

In the 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 HVSs printed tables prepared and distributed by the Census Bureau this is a single residual category encompassing all units excluded from the control status classifications described above. It includes the following categories which can be isolated when using the 1991, 1993, 1996 and 1999 HVS data tape files prepared by the Census Bureau.

#### a) Not Regulated

Units with no current governmental restrictions or regulation on rents or rental conditions or type of tenancy. This category is made up of the following units.

- Units regulated in the past and deregulated under the provisions of vacancy decontrol. For the most part these units are in buildings with five or fewer units built before 1947.
- (ii) Cooperative or condominium units which are renter occupied by tenants who moved into them after the buildings were converted to cooperatives or condominiums.
- (iii) Units which were never subject to government rent regulation. Units in this category are mainly located in structures of fewer than six units that were completed on or after February 1, 1947, or in rental buildings constructed after January 1, 1974 which did not receive 421-a tax abatements, or are in buildings originally constructed as cooperatives or condominiums.

#### (b) <u>In Rem</u>

*In Rem* includes units located in structures owned by the City of New York as a result of an *in rem* proceeding initiated by the city after the owner failed to pay tax on the property for 3 or more years for 1- and 2-family dwellings, or one or more years for a multiple dwelling. Though many of these units in multiple dwellings had previously been subject to either rent control or rent stabilization, they are exempt from both regulatory systems during the period of city ownership.

#### (c) <u>HUD Federal Subsidy</u>

Unit is in a building which received a subsidy through a federal program which requires HUD to regulate rents in the building. These programs include Section 8 New Construction, Substantial and Moderate Rehabilitation as well as other subsidized construction and rehabilitation programs. They do not include units in buildings which receive federal mortgage guarantees; nor, because the HUD lists used for the HVSs were organized by building, not unit, do they include units whose tenants receive Section 8 existing certificates or rent vouchers unless the entire building is receiving federal subsidy. Moreover, some units which receive subsidies from more than one government source may be listed under another control category such as Mitchell-Lama. Thus, the HVS data on HUD Federal Subsidy should not be used to study units or occupants of units participating in these programs.

#### (d) <u>Article 4</u>

Unit is in a building which was constructed under Article 4 of the PHFL and which is still covered by the provisions of the article. This program built limited-profit rental buildings for occupancy by households with moderate incomes.

#### (e) Loft Board Regulated Buildings

Unit is located in a building originally intended as commercial loft space, is occupied as rented residential space and has its rents regulated by the New York City Loft Board (as indicated by Loft Board records).

(f) "Other Regulated" as a category in tables in this report includes HUD-regulated, Article 4 and New York City Loft Board regulated units, described above. In tables where Mitchell-Lama units or *in rem* units are not categorized separately, they are also included in "Other Regulated".

#### Definition of Program Status Input

This variable is used only to determine rent control status as indicated by the control status recode variable. For reasons of confidentiality units in buildings receiving benefits from more than one program are only listed for one program by the Census Bureau. Thus, the variable does not give complete data for all programs and should not be used to study characteristics of units in the various programs. Definitions of programs are the same as those used in control status with the addition of the following two programs:

#### <u>421-a</u>

Unit is in a building which receives or received 421-a tax benefits from the City of New York. This program provides real estate tax exemptions and abatements to newly constructed units. Because of constraints placed on the data, for reasons of confidentiality, by the Census Bureau some units which do receive 421-a tax benefits but also receive benefits under other programs may not be listed as receiving 421-a tax benefits. Therefore, the HVS data on 421-a should not be used to study the size, effects, or beneficiaries of the 421-a tax abatement program.

#### <u>J-51</u>

Unit is in a building which receives or received J-51 tax benefits from the City of New York. This program provides real estate tax exemptions and abatements to existing residential buildings which are renovated or rehabilitated in ways which conform to the requirements of the statute. It also provides these benefits to residential buildings which were converted from commercial structures. The HVS data on J-51 should not be used to study size, effects, or beneficiaries of the J-51 tax abatement program for the following two reasons: first, the list used to code these buildings is only complete for 1982 and following years; and second, for reasons of confidentiality some units which receive J-51 benefits as well as other benefits are not listed as receiving J-51 benefits by the Census Bureau.

#### 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey: Sample Design, Estimation Procedure, Accuracy Statement and Topcoding Prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau

The purpose of the 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (NYCHVS) is to measure rental and homeowner vacancy rates, as well as various household and person characteristics. New York City is required by law periodically to conduct such a survey in order to determine if rent regulations should be continued. The actual enumeration was between mid-January and mid-May of 1999.

#### I. SAMPLE DESIGN

New York City's prime consideration is the "vacant available for rent" rate. This rate is the ratio of the vacant available for rent units to the total number of renter occupied and vacant available for rent units for the entire city. The design required the standard error of the estimate of this rate for the entire city to be no more than one-fourth of one percent, if the actual rate was three percent.

The Census Bureau selected the sample from the following four sample frames:

- 1. Housing units included in the 1990 Census.
- 2. Housing units constructed since the 1990 Census.
- 3. Units which were nonresidential at the time of the 1990 Census, but have since been converted to housing units.
- 4. Housing units in structures owned by New York City *(in rem)* that were over-sampled in order for the City to learn more about the characteristics of occupants of these types of units. These housing units are all part of frame one with maybe a few in frame three.

#### A. Housing Units Included in the 1990 Census

Within this frame, the Census Bureau sorted the housing units by:

- Borough
- Sub-borough
- Percent renter occupied in the block
- Tract
- Block number
- Basic street address
- Unit designation

A systematic sample of housing units was selected across all boroughs. This frame included *in rem* units.

#### B. Housing Units Constructed Since the 1990 Census

The Census Bureau selected units in this frame from Certificates of Occupancy (C of Os) issued between April 1, 1990 and October 31, 1998. The housing units on the C of Os were sorted by borough and date (i.e., year and month) of issue. A systematic sample of housing units within each borough was selected. Each structure containing sample housing units was listed and assigned unit designations based on the order in which the sample housing unit appeared on these listings. The Census Bureau dropped all sample housing units that were also on the 1990 census file from this sample.

#### C. Housing Units Converted from Non-residential Units Since the 1990 Census

Housing units in this frame were eligible for sample if a conversion C of O was issued for the structure between April 1, 1990 and October 31, 1998. The Census Bureau selected the sample from this frame using the same procedure as the frame for housing units constructed since the 1990 census.

#### D. Housing Units in Structures Owned by New York City (in rem)

This frame consisted of units in structures owned by New York City as of October 1998. The City owned these units because the owner failed to pay either real estate tax or other charges or both on the property. In 1991, 1993, and 1996, the Census Bureau selected a supplemental sample of *in rem* units from the City's *in rem* lists at the time of each enumeration to supplement the sample of *in rem* units from the 1990 Census frame. In 1999, units selected for the supplemental sample in previous enumerations were kept if they were still on the City's *in rem* lists. *In rem* units from prior years' supplemental samples which were no longer on the City's *in rem* lists were dropped. As a result, the Census Bureau needed to select additional supplemental *in rem* sample cases for 1999.

The supplemental sample of *in rem* units was selected in two steps:

- 1. The buildings were sorted by:
  - enumeration the building was added to the City's *in rem* lists,
  - borough, and
  - size of the building (number of units)

and a systematic sample of buildings was selected.

2. After listing the individual units in each building, a systematic sample of units within each sample building was selected.

#### E. Sample Size

Within each frame, the Census Bureau selected clusters (groups of housing units) of generally four housing units. For all frames except the *in rem* frame, the four housing units were consecutive units. For the *in rem* frame, a systematic sample of the four housing units was selected within each sample building.

The total number of sample housing units for New York City was 18,180. Of these housing units, 1,060 interviews were not obtained because, for occupied housing units, the occupants:

- refused to be interviewed,
- were not at home after repeated visits, or
- were unavailable for some other reason.

For vacant units, an interview was not obtained if no informed respondent could be found after repeated visits. These 1,060 noninterviews are known as type-A noninterviews. This classification produced a 94-percent overall response rate. There were an additional 658 units, known as type-C noninterviews, that were not interviewed because they no longer exist or are uninhabitable. The table below provides the total number of sampled housing units by borough.

Borough	Number of Housing Units
Bronx	2,735
Brooklyn	5,146
Manhattan	4,916
Queens	4,504
Staten Island	879
Total	18,180

The sample housing units were visited in mid-January through mid-May 1999 by field representatives (FRs) hired and trained for this task. The FRs visited each sample address and completed a questionnaire for both occupied and vacant units. In addition, for evaluation purposes, the occupancy status of all vacant units and a sample of occupied units was independently determined in a reinterview. An independent third interview reconciled any differences.

#### F. Exclusions

The survey included only housing units. The principal exclusions were living quarters classified as:

- transient hotels,
- commercial and mission lodging houses,
- inmate living quarters in institutions,
- quarters for the military on military installations, and
- other large group quarters not meeting the definition of a housing unit.

Also generally excluded were housing units in special places. These included housing units located on the grounds of institutions (both civilian and military), with the exception of residential hotels and motels. Housing units with a Certificate of Occupancy issued for the first time after October 31, 1998 were also excluded.

#### II. ESTIMATION PROCEDURE

To estimate <u>housing unit</u> characteristics the Census Bureau used a three-stage ratio estimation procedure. The same procedure to estimate <u>person</u> characteristics was used, but a ratio estimate factor was added to adjust for person undercoverage within households. Prior to the ratio estimation procedures, the basic weight (the inverse of the probability of selection for the unit) was adjusted for each interviewed unit to account for type-A noninterviews.

In rem units had multiple chances of selection. They were eligible for selection from:

- both the 1990 Census and the respective *in rem* frames,
- possibly the conversion frame (as such units could become *in rem*), and
- new construction frame (as such units could become *in rem*).

The basic weights reflect the fact that they had multiple chances of selection.

#### A. Type-A Noninterview Adjustment Factor

The Census Bureau applied the noninterview adjustment factor (adjusting for type-A noninterviews) to all interviewed units separately for old construction units (frames one and four) and new construction/conversion units (frames two and three).

For old construction units, the factor was computed separately by borough for 99 cells using the following NYCHVS characteristics:

- a) Monthly rent (less than 100, 100-199, 200-299, 300-399, 400-499, 500-599, 600-699, 700-999, 1000+).
- b) Value (less than 25000, 25000-49999, 50000-74999, 75000-99999, 100000-149999 150000-199999, 200000-249999, 250000-299999, 300000-399999, 400000-499999, 500000 +).
- c) Number of rooms (rent: 1, 2, 3, 4+, or 1-2, 3, 4, 5+, or 1-3, 4, 5, 6+; own: 1-4, 5, 6, 7+, or 1-3, 4, 5, 6+, or 1-3, 4, 5-6, 7+, or 1-4, 5, 6, 7+, or 1-5, 6, 7, 8+, or 1-5, 6-7, 8, 9+).
- d) Vacancy status (renter occupied/vacant for rent, owner occupied/vacant for sale, vacant/without tenure or vacancy status).

1996 NYCHVS data were used, where available, to determine the tenure and characteristics of a unit. If the 1996 NYCHVS data were not available, either 1993 NYCHVS data or 1991 NYCHVS data or 1990 Census data or 1999 NYCHVS data were used (in that order).

For new construction/conversion units, the non-interview factor was computed separately by type of unit (new construction and conversion), year the C of O was issued (new construction only), and borough.

The non-interview adjustment factor was equal to the following ratio for each cell:

#### (weighted count of interviewed units) + (weighted count of Type A noninterviews) (weighted count of interviewed units)

#### **B.** Ratio Estimate Factors

The Census Bureau used a three-stage housing unit ratio estimation procedure and a one-stage person ratio estimation procedure:

- to account for known sampling variability in the 1990 census frame (frame one),
- to account for known sampling variability in the *in rem* frame (frame four),
- to bring the sample estimates of housing units into close agreement with estimates derived from independent sources, and
- to account for housing unit and person undercoverage.

For each ratio estimation procedure, the Census Bureau computed factors for ratio estimate cells (characteristics) and applied the factors to the appropriate units in the corresponding cell. The factors were equal to the following ratio:

#### Independent estimate of number of HUs (persons) for the cell NYCHVS sample estimate of number of HUs (persons) for the cell

The denominators of the ratios equaled the sum of the weights of housing units, or persons, with all previous factors applied, on all records in the corresponding cell.

#### 1. <u>1990 Census Ratio Estimate Factor</u>

The Census Bureau applied this ratio estimation procedure to all 1990 census units in the NYCHVS sample (units from frame one and frame four). This procedure adjusted for differences between the 1990 census counts and the corresponding sample counts. These differences occurred because of sampling variability, which was increased since the sample was not selected from the final census file. The factors were computed separately by borough for each of the 138 cells using the following 1990 census characteristics:

- Monthly rent
- Value
- Race of householder
- Hispanic origin
- Vacancy status

The 1990 census counts of housing units were used as the independent estimates for each cell.

#### 2. <u>In Rem Ratio Estimate Factor</u>

The Census Bureau applied this ratio estimation procedure to all *in rem* sample units (frames one and four). This procedure adjusted for known sampling variability in the *in rem* sample selection. Ratio estimate factors were computed for each borough (five cells). The independent estimates were the total number of *in rem* units in each borough in the *in rem* frame.

#### 3. <u>1999 Housing Unit Ratio Estimate Factor</u>

The Census Bureau applied this ratio estimation procedure to all interviewed housing units. This procedure adjusted the 1999 NYCHVS sample estimate for housing unit undercoverage by controlling the sample estimate to independently derived estimates. The ratio estimate factor was computed for each of the boroughs (5 cells). The independent estimates were equal to the total number of housing units in each of the boroughs at the time of the survey.

#### 4. <u>1999 Person Ratio Estimate Factor</u>

This additional adjustment accounted for sampling variability and known coverage deficiencies for persons within interviewed households. The Census Bureau computed this factor within each borough by age, race, and sex (80 cells).

During the analysis of the 1993 NYCHVS, inconsistencies were noted when estimates were made using different weights (i.e., housing unit weight vs. person or population weight) for certain person characteristics. In order to reduce the effect of this discrepancy, the Census Bureau modified the calculation of the person ratio estimate factor, beginning with the 1996 NYCHVS.

Previously, the ratio equaled the independent estimate of persons for the cell divided by the NYCHVS sample estimate of persons for the cell. This method assumes that all persons with a given age/race/sex have an equal chance of being missed by the survey. Some of the observed inconsistencies in the data could be eliminated by assuming that the reference person and his or her spouse or unmarried partner are always picked up by the survey if the housing unit is interviewed (i.e., only persons other than reference persons, spouses, or unmarried partners could be missed in interviewed housing units).

Thus, the new numerator of the ratio equaled the independent estimate of persons for the cell minus the NYCHVS sample estimate of reference persons and spouses or unmarried partners. The new denominator of the ratio equaled the NYCHVS sample estimate of persons other than reference persons, spouses or unmarried partners for the cell. The new person ratio estimate factor was applied only to the persons other than reference persons, spouses, or unmarried partners.

#### C. Change in Methodology to Compute Person Controls

For 1991, the Census Bureau extrapolated the change between the 1980 and 1990 censuses to derive the person controls. Beginning in 1993, independently derived current estimates based on the 1990 Census and Medicare data were used.

Since 1993, the Census Bureau computed controls using a modified 1990 Census age/race/sex classification. Among other things, the modified age/race/sex classification puts Hispanics whose race is classified as "other" into a specific race category. The 1993, 1996 and 1999 controls, based on a modified age/race/sex classification, reflect Hispanics in all race categories except "other". On the other hand, the 1991 controls reflect Hispanics in the "other race"

category. Since this change caused unexplainable fluctuations in the "other race" category, the white and "other race" categories were combined in every enumeration since 1993 for the purposes of person ratio estimation.

As part of the regular NYCHVS processing, Hispanics and non-Hispanics who listed their race as "other" were allocated to specific race categories. Also, non-reports to the race question were allocated to specific race categories. The net effect of these changes was the African-American and "other race" controls increased and the white controls decreased. Some of this change may be real but most is probably due to the change in methodology.

During the re-processing of the 1991 data for the longitudinal file, it was discovered that the person controls originally used had not been reduced by an amount equal to the estimated number of persons living in special place housing units (see section I.F. for a description), which are not eligible for this survey. The problem was corrected for the longitudinal file, so any tabulations from this file will result in slightly lower estimates of total persons than had originally been produced for 1991.

The ratio estimation procedures, as well as the overall estimation procedure, reduced the sampling error for most statistics below what would have been obtained by simply weighting the sample by the basic weight.

#### III. SAMPLING AND NONSAMPLING ERRORS

The statistics produced from this survey are estimates derived from a sample. They will differ from the true values being estimated. There are two types of errors which cause estimates based on a sample survey to differ from the true value: nonsampling error and sampling error.

#### A. Nonsampling Errors

Suppose every housing unit in New York City were interviewed. Estimates would still differ from the true value (for example, the median contract rent). In this instance, the difference is due solely to nonsampling errors. The Census Bureau attributes nonsampling errors in sample surveys to many sources:

- Deficiencies in the sampling frame (i.e., not all housing units are covered),
- Inability to pick up all persons within sample households
- Inability to obtain information about all cases in the sample
- Definitional difficulties
- Differences in the interpretation of questions
- Inability or unwillingness to provide correct information on the part of the respondents, and
- Mistakes in recording, coding or keying the data obtained.

There are also other errors of collection, response, processing, coverage, and estimation for missing data.

In the 1999 NYCHVS, about three-fourths of 1 percent of the housing units in the five boroughs covered by the survey were missed. Overall, about 3 percent of the people in sample households were missed. This within-household undercoverage varied by age, race, sex, and borough. It ranged from about a 37-percent overcoverage of African American females between 15-24 in Staten Island to a 32-percent undercoverage of African American males between 25-64 in Manhattan. The following table gives the undercoverage of the various race-sex groups for the city as a whole:

Race-Sex Group	Undercoverage
White & Other Females	.014%
White & Other Males	2 %
African American Females	5 %
African American Males	9 %

The Census Bureau adjusted for this undercoverage through the housing unit and person ratio estimate factors. Measures of other errors for this survey are not available. However, some of the important response and most of the operational errors were detected and corrected during the Bureau's review of the data for reasonableness and consistency.

#### B. Sampling Errors

Sampling error reflects how estimates from a sample vary from the actual value. **NOTE: The** term "actual value" is the value the Census Bureau would have gotten had all housing units been interviewed, under the same conditions, rather than only a sample.

The formulas in Tables 1 through 6 can be used to compute a range of error for which there is a known probability of being correct if it is stated the actual value is within that range. The error formulas are approximations to the errors; they indicate the order of magnitude of the errors rather than the actual errors for any specific characteristic. To construct the range, add and subtract the error computed from the formulas to the estimate.

Use Tables 1-6 to compute errors for estimates from 1999 data.1

The letter "A" in the formula represents the weighted sample estimate that was derived from the file.

The letter "Z" determines the probability the actual value is within the computed range. The larger the value of Z, the larger the range, and the higher the odds the actual value will be in the range. The following values of Z are most commonly used.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Tables of formulas for errors of estimates for 1996, 1993 and 1991 data are available in HVS technical documentation prepared by the Census Bureau.

Value of Z	Meaning
1.00	There is a 67-percent chance that the actual value is in the range that was computed.
1.64	There is a 90-percent chance that the actual value is in the range that was computed.
1.96	There is a 95-percent chance that the actual value is in the range that was computed.
2.58	There is a 99-percent chance that the actual value is in the range that was computed.

Note that if Z = 1.00, the formula computes the standard error. Ranges of 90 and 95 percent are commonly used. The range of error is also referred to as the confidence interval since there is a certain level of confidence the actual value is within the interval.

For example there are 19,819 vacant-for-rent units in Brooklyn in 1999. To compute a 90 percent confidence interval, use the first formula in Table 3 and compute the error as follows:

$$Z \ge \sqrt{(266.27 \ge A) - (.000307 \ge A^2)}$$

#### $1.64 \times \sqrt{(266.27 \times 19,819) - (.000307 \times 19,819^2)} = 3,724$

Thus, there is a 90-percent chance the actual number of vacant-for-rent units in Brooklyn is 19,819 plus or minus 3,724, or in the range 16,095 to 23,543.

If the estimate involves two characteristics from Tables 1 through 6, use the formula with the larger first number under the square root.

1. <u>Percents</u>

The formula for computing the error of any percent derived from the data is the following:

$$Z \ge Y \ge \sqrt{\frac{K \ge P \ge (100 - P)}{B}}$$

where:

K = 266.27 for estimates from 1999,

Z: defines the confidence the range will include the actual value,

- Y: is the number from the last column of Tables 1 through 6 (chosen based on the denominator),
- P: is the calculated percent and
- B: is the denominator of the percent.

For example, in 1999, there were 898,395 households in units built between 1947 and 1969 and 338,701, or 37.7 percent, are owners. The error from sampling for a 90-percent confidence interval for that percentage of owners is:

$$1.64 \times 1.189 \times \sqrt{\frac{266.27 \times 37.7 \times 62.3}{898,395}} = 1.6$$

Thus, there is a 90-percent chance that the actual percentage of owners in buildings built between 1947 and 1969 is between 36.1 and 39.3 percent.

2. <u>Differences</u>

People often ask whether two numbers are actually different. If the range of error for the difference does not include zero, the numbers are different. As a general rule, if the confidence intervals do not overlap, they are different. To compute the range of error of the difference, use the following formula:

 $\sqrt{(\text{error on first number})^2 + (\text{error on second number})^2}$ 

This formula is quite accurate for:

- the difference between estimates of the same item in two different areas or
- the difference between separate and uncorrelated items in the same area.

If there is a high positive correlation between the two items, the formula will overestimate the error. If there is a high negative correlation, the formula will underestimate the error.

The following illustration shows how to compute the error of a difference:

In 1999, there were 10,406 vacant-for-rent units with 3 to 5 units in the building and 3,646 vacant-for-rent units with 6 to 9 units in the building. The respective errors for a 90-percent confidence interval are 2,725 and 1,615. The error for a 90-percent confidence interval for the 6,760 difference is the following:

$$\sqrt{(2,725)^2 + (1,615)^2} = 3,168$$

Thus, there is a 90-percent chance the actual difference between vacant-for-rent units in 3 to 5 unit buildings vs. 6 to 9 unit buildings in 1999 is between 3,592 and 9,928.

#### 3. <u>Medians</u>

The median is the value 50-percent of the way through the distribution. Thus, 50percent of the total falls below and 50-percent falls above the median. Note that the median presented in this example is the true median (i.e., computed by SAS), not an approximation. A confidence interval can be constructed around the median by computing the standard error on a 50-percent characteristic and then translating that into an interval for the characteristic.

- a. Using the error formula for percents above, compute the error of 50- percent. The total number of housing units from the distribution is the denominator in the formula. Subtract the "not applicable" category from the total.
- b. Calculate the confidence interval for the true median by adding and subtracting the width of the interval containing the median times the standard error on the 50-percent characteristic divided by the proportion of units in the interval containing the median, to the median.

The probability that the actual median is within the interval depends on the value of Z in the error of percent formula. The following example shows how to compute a 90-percent confidence interval:

Value	Number of HUs
Less Than \$25,000	61,739
\$25,000-\$49,999	40,434
\$50,000-\$74,999	43,832
\$75,000-\$99,999	31,103
\$100,000-\$149,999	93,692
\$150,000-\$199,999	203,682
\$200,000-\$249,999	154,846
\$250,000-\$299,999	108,783
\$300,000-\$349,999	56,393
\$350,000-\$399,999	28,257
\$400,000-\$499,999	29,249
\$500,000-\$599,999	14,890
\$600,000-\$699,999	6,396
\$700,000-\$799,999	11,246
\$800,000-\$999,999	10,112
\$1,000,000 or more	20,474
Not Applicable (renter occupied)	1,953,289
TOTAL	2,868,412

Distribution of Value of Units

The median value for all owner-occupied housing units in 1999 is \$190,000. The number of owner-occupied housing units in the distribution of value of units for 1999 is presented in the preceding table.

1) The error on a 50-percent characteristic based on 915,123 (2,868,412 minus the "not applicable") housing units is calculated as follows:

$$1.64 \ge 1.0000 \ge \sqrt{\frac{266.27 \ge 50 \ge 50}{915,123}} = 1.40$$

2) The 90-percent confidence interval for the median (\$190,000) is:

$$190,000 \pm (199,999.5 - 149,999.5) \times \frac{1.40}{22.26} = 190,000 \pm 3,145$$

where:

- 199,999.5-149,999.5 is the width of the interval that contains the median
- 1.40 is the error for a 90-percent confidence interval for the 50-percent characteristic
- 22.26 is the percent of cases that fall in the interval containing the median

Thus, there is a 90-percent chance that the actual median for all owner-occupied housing units in New York City in 1999 (\$190,000) is between \$186,855 and \$193,145.

4. <u>Means</u>

The mean and the median usually differ. The mean is usually higher because it is influenced more heavily than the median by very large values. Use the following formula to estimate the error of the mean:

$$Z x Y x \sqrt{\frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} x_{i}^{2} - (\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} x_{i})^{2}\right]}{c}} x K$$

where:

K = 266.27 for estimates from 1999,

- Y: is the number from the last column of Tables 1 through 6
- Z: defines the confidence the range will include the actual value
- $p_i$ : is the proportion of total households or persons from a distribution in the  $i^{th}$  interval
- $x_i$ : is the midpoint of the i<sup>th</sup> interval (NOTE: The midpoint of the openended interval is 1.5 times the lower limit)
- c: is the total number of households or persons in the distribution (NOTE: Subtract the number of "not applicable" from the total to get c)
- n: is the total number of intervals in the distribution

For example, the mean (or average) value of all owner-occupied housing units in 199	19
was \$235,358 (compared to a median of \$190,000). The distribution from	m
which the mean was computed is given in the table below.	

Value	Number of HUs	Pi	Xi
Less Than \$25,000	61,739	.0675	\$12,500
\$25,000-\$49,999	40,434	.0442	\$37,500
\$50,000-\$74,999	43,832	.0479	\$62,500
\$75,000-\$99,999	31,103	.0340	\$87,500
\$100,000-\$149,999	93,692	.1024	\$125,000
\$150,000-\$199,999	203,682	.2226	\$175,000
\$200,000-\$249,999	154,846	.1692	\$225,000
\$250,000-\$299,999	108,783	.1189	\$275,000
\$300,000-\$349,999	56,393	.0616	\$325,000
\$350,000-\$399,999	28,257	.0309	\$375,000
\$400,000-\$499,999	29,249	.0320	\$450,000
\$500,000-\$599,999	14,890	.0163	\$550,000
\$600,000-\$699,999	6,396	.0070	\$650,000
\$700,000-\$799,999	11,246	.0123	\$750,000
\$800,000-\$999,999	10,112	.0110	\$900,000
\$1,000,000 Or More	20,474	.0224	\$1,500,000
Not Applicable	1,953,289		
Total	2,868,412	1.000	

Plugging the numbers in the above formula, the error for a 90-percent confidence interval on the mean home value is computed as follows:

$$1.64 \times 1.000 \times \sqrt{\frac{117,943,625,000 - (243,240,00)^2}{915,123}} \times 266.27 = \$6,782$$

Thus, there is a 90-percent chance that the mean value of owner-occupied housing units in New York City in 1999 is between \$228,576 and \$242,140.

#### Table 1: Errors for New York City: 1999

	Publication Estimates	Percentages
	The error is the larger of:	Value of Y for Percent Formula
	Errors on Housing Units	
Characteristics of Housing Units Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{266.27 \times A000088 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 266$	1.000
Housing Unit Clustering Items <sup>1</sup> (see Table 7 for a listing)	$Z \propto \sqrt{360.62 \times A000118 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 361$	1.164
NYC Housing Unit totals (all borough and sub- borough)	$Z \propto \sqrt{534.71 \times A000165 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 535$	1.417
	Errors on Persons	
Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{304.11 \times A000042 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 304$	1.069
	NOTE: For any of the person characteristics listed below that are cross-tabbed by Borough and Sub-borough use the formula for the specific characteristic listed below. Don't use the formulas listed below for cross-tabs of characteristics of persons listed below {e.g., Age by sex (males under 25), Age by Race (African Americans under 25), or sex by race (white females)}. Use the formula above (Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below).	
Whites and other Races and Ethnicity	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000162 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Males	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000 \ 239 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Females	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000 \ 212 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Persons under 25 yrs. old	$Z \propto \sqrt{531.86 \times A000073 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 532$	1.413
African Americans	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A000687 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400
Borough and Sub- borough	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A000 \ 212 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400

#### Table 2: Errors for The Bronx: 1999

	Publication Estimates	Percentages					
	The error is the larger of:	Value of Y for Percent Formula					
	Errors on Housing Units						
Characteristics of Housing Units Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{266.27 \times A000593 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 266$	1.000					
Housing Unit Clustering Items <sup>1</sup> (see Table 7 for a listing)	$Z \propto \sqrt{360.62 \times A000799 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 361$	1.164					
Sub-borough and Borough Housing Unit totals	$Z \propto \sqrt{534.71 \times A001190 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 535$	1.417					
	Errors on Persons						
Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{304.11 \times A000268 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 304$	1.069					
	NOTE: For any of the person characteristics listed below that are cross-tabbed by Borough and Sub-borough use the formula for the specific characteristic listed below. Don't use the formulas listed below for cross-tabs of characteristics of persons listed below {e.g., Age by sex (males under 25), Age by Race (African Americans under 25), or sex by race (white females)}. Use the formula above (Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below).						
Whites and other Races and Ethnicity	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A001252 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748					
Males	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A001568 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748					
Females	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A001325 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748					
Persons under 25 yrs. old	$Z \propto \sqrt{531.86 \times A000469 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 532$	1.413					
African Americans	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A003174 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400					
Sub-borough and Borough	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A001354 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400					

#### Table 3: Errors for Brooklyn: 1999

	Publication Estimates	Percentages
	The error is the larger of:	Value of Y for Percent Formula
	Errors on Housing Units	
Characteristics of Housing Units Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{266.27 \times A000 \ 307 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 266$	1.000
Housing Unit Clustering Items <sup>1</sup> (see Table 7 for a listing)	$Z \propto \sqrt{360.62 \times A000  413 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 361$	1.164
Sub-borough and Borough Housing Unit totals	$Z \propto \sqrt{534.71 \times A000616 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 535$	1.417
	Errors on Persons	
Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{304.11 \times A000138 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 304$	1.069
	NOTE: For any of the person characteristics listed below that are cross-tabbed by Borough and Sub-borough use the formula for the specific characteristic listed below. Don't use the formulas listed below for cross-tabs of characteristics of persons listed below {e.g., Age by sex (males under 25), Age by Race (African Americans under 25), or sex by race (white females)}. Use the formula above (Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below).	
Whites and other Races and Ethnicity	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000615 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Males	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000789 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Females	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000691 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Persons under 25 yrs. old	$Z \propto \sqrt{531.86 \times A000 \ 241 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 532$	1.413
African Americans	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A001731 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400
Sub-borough and Borough	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A000694 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400

Table 4.	Errors	for	Manhattan.	1999
Labic 4.	LITOIS	101	Mannattan.	1777

	Publication Estimates	Percentages
	The error is the larger of:	Value of Y for Percent Formula
	Errors on Housing Units	
Characteristics of Housing Units Not Listed Below	$Z \times \sqrt{266.27 \times A000 \ 340 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 266$	1.0000
Housing Unit Clustering Items <sup>1</sup> (see Table 7 for a listing)	$Z \propto \sqrt{360.62 \times A000459 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 361$	1.164
Sub-borough and Borough Housing Unit totals	$Z \propto \sqrt{534.71 \times A000684 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 535$	1.417
	Errors on Persons	
Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{304.11 \times A000196 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 304$	1.069
	NOTE: For any of the person characteristics listed below that are cross-tabbed by Borough and Sub-borough use the formula for the specific characteristic listed below. Don't use the formulas listed below for cross-tabs of characteristics of persons listed below {e.g., Age by sex (males under 25), Age by Race (African Americans under 25), or sex by race (white females)}. Use the formula above (Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below).	
Whites and other Races and Ethnicity	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A000698 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 813$	1.748
Males	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A001112 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Females	$Z \propto \sqrt{813.49 \times A000991 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 813$	1.748
Persons under 25 yrs. old	$Z \propto \sqrt{531.86 \times A000343 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 532$	1.413
African Americans	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A003972 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400
Sub-borough and Borough	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A000988 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400

#### Table 5: Errors for Queens: 1999

	Publication Estimates	Percentages
	The error is the larger of:	Value of Y for Percent Formula
	Errors on Housing Units	
Characteristics of Housing Units Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{266.27 \times A000  339 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 266$	1.000
Housing Unit Clustering Items <sup>1</sup> (see Table 7 for a listing)	$Z \propto \sqrt{360.62 \times A000  456 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 361$	1.164
Sub-borough and Borough Housing Unit totals	$Z \propto \sqrt{534.71 \times A000680 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 535$	1.417
	Errors on Persons	
Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{304.11 \times A000156 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 304$	1.069
	NOTE: For any of the person characteristics listed below that are cross- tabbed by Borough and Sub-borough use the formula for the specific characteristic listed below. Don't use the formulas listed below for cross-tabs of characteristics of persons listed below {e.g., Age by sex (males under 25), Age by Race (African Americans under 25), or sex by race (white females)}. Use the formula above (Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below).	
Whites and other Races and Ethnicity	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A000539 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 813$	1.748
Males	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A000 \ 871 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 813$	1.748
Females	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A000799 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 813$	1.748
Persons under 25 yrs. old	$Z \propto \sqrt{531.86 \times A000 \ 272 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 532$	1.413
African Americans	$Z x \sqrt{1,533.89 x A003 458 x A^2}$ or $Z x 1,534$	2.400
Sub-borough and Borough	$Z \propto \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A000786 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 1,534$	2.400

#### Table 6: Errors for Staten Island: 1999

	Publication Estimates	Percentages			
	The error is the larger of:	Value of Y for Percent Formula			
	Errors on Housing Units				
Characteristics of Housing Units Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{266.27 \times A001744 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 266$	1.000			
Housing Unit Clustering Items <sup>1</sup> (see Table 7 for a listing)	$Z \propto \sqrt{360.62 \times A002350 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 361$	1.164			
Sub-borough and Borough Housing Unit totals	$Z \propto \sqrt{534.71 \times A003502 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 535$	1.417			
	Errors on Persons				
Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below	$Z \propto \sqrt{304.11 \times A000763 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 304$	1.069			
	NOTE: For any of the person characteristics listed below that are cross-tabbed by Borough and Sub-borough use the formula for the specific characteristic listed below. Don't use the formulas listed below for cross-tabs of characteristics of persons listed below {e.g., Age by sex (males under 25), Age by Race (African Americans under 25), or sex by race (white females)}. Use the formula above (Characteristics of Persons Not Listed Below).				
Whites and other Races and Ethnicity	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A002219 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 813$	1.803			
Males	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A004  212 \times A^2} \text{ or } Z \times 813$	1.803			
Females	$Z \times \sqrt{813.49 \times A003958 \times A^2}$ or $Z \times 813$	813 1.803			
Persons under 25 yrs. Old	$Z \propto \sqrt{531.86 \times A001334 \times A^2}$ or $Z \propto 532$	32 1.413			
African Americans	$Z x \sqrt{1,533.89 x A047 835 x A^2} \text{ or } Z x 1,534$	$Z x \sqrt{1,533.89} x A047 835 x A^2 \text{ or } Z x 1,534 $ 2.400			
Sub-borough and Borough	$Z = \frac{Z \times \sqrt{1,533.89 \times A003848 \times A^2} \text{ or } Z \times 1,534}{2.400}$				

#### Table 7

#### Housing Unit Clustering Items<sup>1</sup>

- Access from Sidewalk to Elevator/Unit without using Stairs
- Additional Heating Required
- Boarded up Buildings in Neighborhood
- Broken Plaster/Peeling Paint
- Condition of Building and External Walls, Windows, Stairways, and Floors of Building for Total Occupied and Renter Occupied
- Control Status (renters and owners)
- Elevator in Building with 2 or more stories
- Floor Unit is on
- Heating Fuel utility gas electricity only
- Heating System Breakdown
- Households Receiving Public Assistance/Welfare Payments
- Length of Lease
- Maintenance Deficiencies
- Number of Stories in Building.
- Number of Units in Building
- Plumbing Facilities
- Poor physical condition of Building
- Race and Ethnicity of Householder
- Rodent Infestation
- Structure Classification/Condition Rating
- Wheel Chair Accessibility
- Year Building Built

#### Topcoding

To ensure the confidentiality of the data on the microdata files, all financial characteristics that are not calculated variables have been topcoded. The number of cases that need to be topcoded for each characteristic is equal to either  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 percent of the total universe, or 3 percent of all reporting cases, whichever is less. In addition, age was topcoded to 90 years, stories in structure and floor of unit were topcoded at 21 floors, and units in structure was topcoded at 100 units.

For each characteristic, the value which meets one of the two criteria above was determined and became the topcode value. The mean value for all cases falling above the topcode value was calculated and was then assigned to each individual case. For example, approximately ½ of 1 percent of the renter occupied units had a contract rent above \$2,950. The mean contract rent for these cases was calculated to be \$3,817. This rent was assigned to each case falling above the topcode.

For calculated variables such as contract rent per room, contract rent as a percent of income, gross rent per room, and gross rent as a percent of income, cases with values above the topcode amounts are included in the not computed category.

A list of the items topcoded, the topcode amount, and the mean value above the topcode that was assigned are shown on the following pages.

Item	Topcode Value <sup>1</sup>	Mean Value <u>Above Topcode</u>
Age	90 years	N/A
Asking Rent	\$2,500	\$3,820
Down Payment	\$180,000	\$326,974
Monthly Condominium or Maintenance Fees	\$2,500	N/A
Monthly Contract Rent	\$2,950	\$3,817
Monthly Cost of Electricity	<b>\$24</b> 0	\$333
Monthly Cost of Gas	\$390	\$509
Monthly Cost of Gas and Electricity Combined	\$290	\$392
Monthly Mortgage Payment	\$2,800	\$7,825
Number of Stories/Floor of Unit	21	N/A

1 Data represents values above which topcoding begins.

Item	Topcode Value <sup>1</sup>	Mean Value <u>Above Topcode</u>
Units in Structure	100	N/A
Person Income From:		
Wages, Salary, Commissions, etc.	\$160,000	\$300,966
Farm or Nonfarm Business, etc.	\$120,000	\$220,565
Interest, Dividends, Royalties, etc.	\$36,000	\$71,607
Social Security or Railroad Retirement	\$17,401	\$21,454
SSI, AFDC, Home Relief, or other Public Assistance Payments	\$10,801	\$13,904
Retirements, Survivor, or Disability Pensions	\$41,601	\$62,352
VA Payments, Unemployment, Child Support, Alimony, or Other Income Sources	\$17,501	\$30,814
Purchase Price	\$500,000	\$1,019,513
Value	\$730,000	\$1,272,095
Year Built	1990	N/A
Yearly Cost of Other Fuels	\$3,840	\$5,372
Yearly Cost of Water and Sewer	\$828	\$ 893
1998 Fire and Liability Insurance	\$1,900	\$5,154
1998 Real Estate Taxes	<b>\$7,5</b> 00	N/A

1 Data represents values above which topcoding begins.

### **E** New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey Questionnaire 1999

		ОМВ	No. 0607-0757: A	pproval Expires 09/30/99			
Form H-100 (9-4-98) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR		NOTICE - confidence employees	Your answers will and will be seen and used only fo	Il be held in strict only by sworn Census or statistical purposes.			
	ANCY	A. NAM	16	CODE			
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE		B. DAT	B. DATE OF INTERVIEW				
		0.050		\ 99			
		Date	Time	3 Bemarks			
		Date	a.m	hemarks			
			p.n   a.n	<u>ւ</u>			
			p.n	1.			
			p.n	n.			
			a.n p.n	n. n.			
Fill items D through J by observing the condition of the building containing the sample unit as you approach it and walk inside. – Mark (X) all that apply in D through G.	K. OCCUPANO		S acant				
D. EXTERNAL WALLS	L. RESPONDE	NT					
001 1 └ Missing bricks, siding, or other outside wall material	Name						
003 3 Major cracks in outside walls				······			
004     * • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Occupied Vecent up	unit – Go i it Mork i	to M				
		rintendent					
E. WINDOWS	2 Renta	I office/ag	ent	KIP to question 58			
007 2 Rotted/loose window frames/sashes		estate age er		n page 20			
009 3 Boarded-up windows	5 🗆 Other – Specify д						
011 5 Unable to observe windows							
F. STAIRWAYS (exterior and interior)	Ask – M. How many	v people i	live or stav h	ere?			
012 1 Loose, broken, or missing stair railings 013 2 Loose, broken, or missing steps	Include any	one with	out a usual ho	me elsewhere.			
014 3 None of these problems with stairways							
016 5 No exterior steps or stairways		SKIP to a	uestion 1 on	page 2.			
oss 6 Unable to observe stairways	explain why i	n the "Not	es" area on pa	age 22.			
G. FLOORS	N. SAMPLE U	NIT					
018 2 Slanted or shifted doorsills or door frames	033 01 Questionnaire complete						
019 3 Deep wear in floors causing depressions	Questionn 02 🗌 Refus	aire not c ed	omplete				
021 5 None of these problems with floors		ne home	cent - 1 mont	h or longer			
	05 Other	– Explain	in "Notes" ar	ea on page 22			
023 1 Dilapidated – Go to I	06 🛛 Demo 07 🗋 Cond	olished emned					
Not dilapidated –	08 🗆 Nonr	esidential ed with an	other unit - Gi	ve address below -			
3 Deteriorating							
windows on this street? - Include sample unit building	10 🖵 Unit 11 🗖 Build	damaged ing board	by fire ed up				
024 1 Yes 2 No	12 🗆 List p	rocedure	applied ss (house our	her/street)			
J. WHEELCHAIR ACCESSIBILITY	14 🗌 Othe	r – Explair	in "Notes" ar	ea on page 22			
036       1 Accessible       3 Unable to observe         2 Inaccessible       building entrance	Complete after an occupied unit interview. O. FORM TYPE 10 One form only 2 First of two forms						
2. Elevator (door width 36", cab depth 51")	<u> </u>	OFFIC		,			
037         1 □ Accessible         3 □ Unable to observe elevator           2 □ Inaccessible         4 □ No elevator	026 TS	027	A	028 B			
3. Residential unit entrance (width 32")							
038       1 Accessible       3 Unable to observe         2 Inaccessible       residential unit entrance							

Place a check mark ( ✓ ) in □ beside the respondent.					
<ol> <li>HOUSEHOLD ROSTER</li> <li>What are the names of all persons living or staying here? Start with the ADULT who owns or rents this apartment (house). (Enter that name on line 1 below.)</li> <li>Include anyone staying here with no other home</li> </ol>					
<ul> <li>Include anyone who us temporarily away trave</li> <li>Include lodgers, board</li> </ul>	oling or at school ers, babies, etc.				
<b>b. ismale or female?</b> <b>C. How old is</b> ? (Enter w	hole years ONLY I				
on PERSON 1 - Reference	e Person (owner/renter)				
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex c. Age 1 Male 2 Female				
02 DERSON 2					
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex c. Age 1 □ Male 7 2 □ Female 1				
03 🛛 PERSON 3					
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex         c. Age           1         Male           2         Female				
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex         c. Age           1 I Male         1           2 I Female         1				
05 PERSON 5					
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex         c. Age           1 I Male         1           2 I Female         1				
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex c. Age 1 Male 7 2 Female				
07 D PERSON 7					
a. Last name					
First name	b. Sex c. Age 1 Male 2 Female				
a. Last name	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
First name	b. Sex     c. Age       1 Male     1       2 Female     1				

Use continuation form for additional persons.

Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS							
d. How is related to (reference	e. Is of Spanish or Hispanic origin?	f. What is's race?	These next two questions may seem like ones I asked before, but I must ask them to double check.				
person) (person on Line 1)? Show Flashcard I and enter the appropriate code in the box below.	(If Yes, read the categories and mark the appropriate box, otherwise mark "No.")	Show Flashcard II and enter the appropriate code in the box below.	(Don't ask for persons under 15) <b>g. Does have</b> a spouse or unmarried partner in the household?	h. Does have a parent in the household?			
R Reference person	1 □ No 2 □ Puerto Rican 3 □ Dominican 4 □ Cuban 5 □ South/Central American 6 □ Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano 7 □ Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No." ☐ 1 ☐ No ☐ Under 15	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
	1 No 2 Puerto Rican 3 Dominican 4 Cuban 5 South/Central American 6 Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano 7 Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No."	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
	1 □ No 2 □ Puerto Rican 3 □ Dominican 4 □ Cuban 5 □ South/Central American 6 □ Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano 7 □ Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No."	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
	1 □ No 2 □ Puerto Rican 3 □ Dominican 4 □ Cuban 5 □ South/Central American 6 □ Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano 7 □ Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No."	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
	1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Puerto Rican 3 ☐ Dominican 4 ☐ Cuban 5 ☐ South/Central American 6 ☐ Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano 7 ☐ Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No." 1 No Under 15	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
	1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Puerto Rican 3 ☐ Dominican 4 ☐ Cuban 5 ☐ South/Central American 6 ☐ Mexican, Mexican-American, 7 ☐ Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No." I No Under 15	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
	<ol> <li>No</li> <li>Puerto Rican</li> <li>Dominican</li> <li>Cuban</li> <li>South/Central American</li> <li>Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano</li> <li>Other Spanish/Hispanic</li> </ol>		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No."	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			
Page 2	1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Puerto Rican 3 ☐ Dominican 4 ☐ Cuban 5 ☐ South/Central American 6 ☐ Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano 7 ☐ Other Spanish/Hispanic		If yes, enter person number of spouse or partner; otherwise mark "No." I No Under 15	If yes, enter person number(s) of parent(s); otherwise mark "No."			

	Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued										
2a.	Is there anyone now living in this apartment (house) that came here within the past five years from a homeless situation such as a shelter, transitional center or hotel?	   050 	1	] Yes ] No	Go SKI	to 2b P to 3		-	_		
b.	Who are they? (Fill in the persons who answered "ves" to 2a above)	055		056		057	058	059	_	060	
	Refer to the roster, page 2, and enter the person	1	1		1	1	1		1		1
	nambono, caning in box coo.		2	000	2	2	2		2		2
			1	062	1	1	1	065	1	066	1
			2		2	2	2		2		2
c.	Was in the homeless situation mainly because he/she could not afford his/her own apartment (house) or mainly for other reasons?	L       	 Affo Oth	L ordabil er reas	ity - son	L - Circle "1" – Circle "2	next to part t	erson ni person r	uml num	ber in ber in	2b. 2b. 2b.
	The following questions (3 through 11c) refer to	the re	ferei	nce pe	rsoi	n (the pers	on listed	on line	1).		
3.	Where was the most recent place (reference person) lived for six months or more before moving into this apartment (house)? (Show Flashcard III to respondent and have him/her select an answer; then mark (X) the appropriate box.)	       	IN I 01 [ 02 [ 03 [ IN I	NEW Y ] Alwa ] Othe ] Same NEW Y	/OR iys l r un e bo /OR	K CITY, <u>S4</u> ived in thi it in same rough but K CITY, <u>O</u>	AME BOR s unit building another l	<u>DUGH</u> building KOUGH	)		
	<b>NOTE</b> – If the respondent indicates that the reference person lived in the SAME borough that he/she currently lives in, DON'T mark any of boxes 04–08; mark (X) either box 01, 02, or 03. Also, don't mark (X) box 01 unless you are certain. Many people may feel as though they lived in a unit forever, but it's rare. The reference person had to live there since birth. Be sure to probe.	IN NEW YORK CITY, <u>OTHER BOROUGH</u>									
4a.	In what year did (reference person) move into this apartment (house)?		Y T	'ear		If 197	/1 – Ask 4	ь b		84 4 4	
	Enter last two digits of year.	052			L	If any	other ye	ar – <i>SK</i>	IP t	o 5 	
b.	Ask only if reference person moved here in 1971 Did (reference person) move here on or after July 1, 1971?	053	1 2	] Yes, ] No,	on befo	or after Ju pre July 1	ıly 1 in 19 in 1971	71			
5.	Are you the first occupant(s) of this apartment (house) since its construction, gut rehabilitation, or creation through conversion?	054	1 2 3	] Yes, ] No,   ] Don'	firs prev 't kn	t occupand viously occ low	cy cupied				
CHI	CHECK ITEM A REFER TO QUESTION 4a ABOVE Moved here 1996 or later – GO to question 6 on page 4 Moved here 1995 or earlier – SKIP to question 7 on page 5										

Section I – OCCUPIED UNITS – Continued						
<ol> <li>What is the main reason (reference person) moved from his/her previous residence?</li> </ol>	EMPLOYMENT					
6. What is the main reason (reference person) moved from his/her previous residence? Mark (X) ONLY one box.	EMPLOYMENT         110       01         Job transfer/new job         02       Retirement         03       Looking for work         04       Commuting reasons         05       To attend school         06       Other financial/employment reason         FAMILY       07         Needed larger house or apartment         08       Widowed         09       Separated/divorced         10       Newly married         11       Moved to be with or closer to relatives         12       Family decreased (except widowed/ separated/divorced)         13       Wanted to establish separate household         14       Other family reason					
	Image: NEIGHBORHOOD         15 Neighborhood overcrowded         16 Change in racial or ethnic composition of neighborhood         17 Wanted this neighborhood/better neighborhood services         18 Crime or safety concerns         19 Other neighborhood reason         HOUSING         20 Wanted to own residence         21 Wanted to rent residence         22 Wanted to rent residence         23 Wanted less expensive residence/difficulty paying rent or mortgage         23 Wanted better quality residence         24 Evicted         25 Poor building condition/services         26 Harassment by landlord         27 Needed housing accessible for persons with mobility impairments         28 Other housing reason					
	OTHER 29 Displaced by urban renewal, highway construction, or other public activity 30 Displaced by private action (other than eviction) 31 Schools 32 Natural disaster/fire 33 Any other - Specify Z					
Notes						
Page 4	FORM H-100 (9-4-9					
Section I – OCCUPIED UNITS – Continued						
--	---	---------------------	---	----------------------	---	---
7.	Place of birth Where was	a.	(reference person) <b>born?</b>	b.	's (reference person's) father born?	C's (reference person's) mother born
	09. New York City	111	09 C 10 C	112	09 🗆 10 🗆	113 09 [] 10 []
	12. Dominican Republic	   	12		12	12
	Dominican Republic)       .         14. Mexico       .         25. Central America, South America       .		13 🛄 14 🛄 25 🛄		13 🗌 14 🛄 25 🛄	13 🗆 14 🗔 25 🗔
	<ol> <li>15. Europe</li> <li>16. Russia/Successor States to Soviet Union (Ukraine, Georgia, etc.)</li> </ol>	     	15 🖸		15 🗋	15 🗆
	17. China, Hong Kong, Taiwan	4     	17 🗌 18 🗌 19 💭		17 🗋 18 🗍 19 🗍	17 🗋 18 🗖 19 🗍
	26. Pakistan, Bangladesh     20. Philippines	   	26		26 🗌 20 🔲	26 🗆
	21. Southeast Asia (Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam)     22. Other Asia	   	21 🖸 22 🖸		21 🗌 22 🗍	21
	24. All other countries	1	24		24	24
	11-24 on Flashcard III match exactly as shown above. Mark (X) box 09 above for categories 01-08 on Flashcard III. Mark (X) box 10 above for categories 09 and 10 on Flashcard III.)	   				
8.	Is this apartment (house) part of a condominium or cooperative building or development? A condominium is a building or development individually owned apartments or houses having commonly owned areas and grounds. A cooperative or "co-op" is a building or development that is owned by its shareholders.	       	1 Oo 2 Yes, a coo 3 Yes, a coo 4 Don't kno	ndor oper w	ninium ative	
9a.	Is this apartment (house) owned or being bought by (reference person) or someone else in this household?	115	0 □ Yes, own 0 □ No - <i>GO</i>	ed o <i>to 91</i>	r being bought - b 	– SKIP to 11a
b	Does (reference person) or someone else in this household own cooperative shares for this apartment (house)?	   	1 □ Yes – <i>SKI</i> 2 □ No 3 □ Don't kno	IP to	11a GO to 9c 	
c	. Does (reference person) pay cash rent for this apartment (house) or does he/she occupy it rent free?	116	2 Pay cash 3 Occupy r	rent ent f	– GO to Check ree – SKIP to 20	ltem B
	CK       REFER TO QUESTION 8 ABOVE         I B       Condominium (box 2 marked)         I Cooperative (box 3 marked)       GO to 10         I All other renter occupied (box 1 or 4 marked)	<i>0a</i> Irkec	I) SKIP to 20			
10a	Did (reference person) live here and pay cash rent at the time this building became a condominium or cooperative?	   117 	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't kno	w		
b	When this apartment (house) became a condominium or cooperative was it done through a non-eviction plan?	118	1    Yes 2    No 3    Don't kno	) w	SKIP to 20	
FORM H-	evicted for NOT buying their unit.	I				Page

Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued					
11a. In what year did (reference person) acquire this apartment (house)?	Year				
Enter last two digits of year.					
<b>b.</b> Before (reference person) acquired this apartment (house) was it owned and occupied by another household, rented by (reference person), rented by another household, or never previously occupied?	120       1 Owned and occupied by another household         2       Rented by reference person         3       Rented by another household         4       Never previously occupied         5       Don't know				
C. Before (reference person) acquired this apartment (house) was it part of a condominium or cooperative building or development?	121 1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know				
CHECK ITEM C Acquired 1994 or later - GO to 12a Acquired 1993 or earlier - SKIP to 13					
12a. What was the purchase price for this apartment (house)?	122 \$00 123 0□ Don't know				
b. What was the down payment for this apartment (house)?	124 \$00 125 0□ Don't know				
13. What is the value of this apartment (house), that is, in your opinion, how much would it currently sell for if it were on the market?	126 \$00				
14. Is there a mortgage, home equity loan, or similar loan on this apartment (house) or is this apartment (house) owned free and clear?	127       1 Mortgage, home equity, or similar loan         2 Owned free and clear – SKIP to Check Item D				
15. What are the current monthly mortgage or loan payments? Include payments on first, second, home equity loan, and any other mortgages.	1 128 \$ 00 Per month				
CHECK ITEM D       REFER TO QUESTION 8 ON PAGE 5         Condominium (box 2 marked)       GO to 16         Cooperative (box 3 marked)       GO to 16         All other owner occupied (box 1 or 4 marked)	ed) – <i>SKIP to 18a</i>				
<ol> <li>What are the monthly condominium or co-op maintenance fees for this apartment (house)? Exclude payments for any mortgages (loans) on this unit.</li> </ol>	130 \$00				
CHECK REFER TO QUESTION 1c ON PAGE 2 FOR EA	CH PERSON				
With any household member age 62 or over – Si	er – GO to 17 KIP to 18a				
17. Is any household member receiving a Senior Citizen Carrying Charge Increase Exemption?	140 1□ Yes 2□ No 3□ Don't know				
18a. Is the fire and liability insurance premium for this apartment (house) paid separately? (Separately means not included in the mortgage or loan payment or the condominium or co-op maintenance fee.)	141       1       Yes -GO to 18b         2       No, included in mortgage or loan payment - SKIP to 18c         3       No insurance - SKIP to 19a				
b. What was the cost of fire and liability insurance for 1998?	142 \$00				
C. Does the fire and liability insurance for this apartment (house) also cover personal possessions?	143 1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't know				
Page 6	FORM H-100 (9-4-98)				

	Section I - OCCUPIE	D UNI	TS – Continued
19a.	Are the real estate taxes for this apartment (house) paid separately? (Separately means not included in the mortgage or loan payment or the condominium or co-op maintenance fee.)	144	1 Yes - GO to 19b         2 No, included in mortgage or loan payment         3 No, included in condominium or maintenance fee
ь.	What were the real estate taxes for 1998?	145	\$00
NOTE	- Questions 20–22a, 23a and 23b pertain to the build same box in each question for all forms within the	ling. Be same	e certain to mark (X) the building.
20.	How many units are in this building?	146	o1□1 unit without business
	If the respondent doesn't know, canvass the building and count the units.		1 unit with business         02       1 unit with business         03       2 units with business         04       2 units with business         05       3 units         06       4 or 5 units         07       6 to 9 units         08       10 to 12 units         09       13 to 19 units         10       20 to 49 units         11       50 to 99 units         12       100 to 199 units         13       200 or more units
~ ~	If owner occupied, mark "Yes" without asking.	147	1 Yes
21.	Does the owner of this building live in this building?		2⊔ № 3□ Don't know
22a.	How many stories are in this building?	148	01□ One - <i>SKIP to 23c</i>
	Count the basement if there are people living in it.	: : : : : : : : : : : : :	02 I WO 03 Three 04 Four 05 Five 06 Six to ten 07 11 to 20 08 21 to 40 09 41 or more
b.	On what floor is this unit?	l .	o□ Basement
	Enter the 2-digit floor number or mark (X) box "0" if basement unit. Enter the lowest floor number if on more than one floor.	 	Floor
23a.	Is there a passenger elevator in this building?	149	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No – <i>SKIP to 23c</i>
b.	Is it possible to go from the sidewalk to a passenger elevator without going up or down any steps or stairs?	173	1    Yes 2    No 3    Don't know
c.	Is it possible to go from the sidewalk to this unit without going up or down any steps or stairs?	171	1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know
24a.	How many rooms are in this apartment (house)? Do not count bathrooms, porches, balconies, halls, foyers, or half-rooms.	150       	1 One - <i>SKIP to 25a</i> 2 Two 3 Three 4 Four 5 Five 6 Six 7 Seven 8 Eight or more
b.	. Of these rooms, how many are bedrooms?	151       	01 ☐ None 02 ☐ One 03 ☐ Two 04 ☐ Three 05 ☐ Four 06 ☐ Five 07 ☐ Six 08 ☐ Seven 09 ☐ Eight or more

Page 7

	Section 1 – OCCUPIE	D UN	ITS	- Continued
25a.	Does this apartment (house) have complete plumbing facilities; that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet, and a bathtub or shower?	152	0 1 2	Yes, has complete plumbing facilities – <i>Go to 25b</i> No, has some but not all facilities in this apartment (house) – <i>SKIP to 25c</i> No plumbing facilities in this apartment (house) – <i>SKIP to 26a</i>
b.	Are these facilities for the exclusive use of this household or are they also for use by another household?	153	3 4	For the exclusive use of this household Also for use by another household
C.	Was there any time in the last three months when all the toilets in this apartment (house) were not working for six consecutive hours?	 154	1 [ 2 [ 3 [	Yes No No toilet in this apartment (house)
26a.	Does this apartment (house) have complete kitchen facilities? Complete kitchen facilities include a sink with piped water, a range or cookstove, and a refrigerator.	155	0 1 2 2 3	Yes has complete kitchen facilities – <i>GO to 26b</i> No, has some but not all facilities in this apartment (house) – <i>SKIP to 26c</i> No kitchen facilities in this apartment (house), but facilities available in building No kitchen facilities in this building
b.	Are these facilities for the exclusive use of this household or are they also for use by another household?	156	4 C 5 C	For the exclusive use of this household Also for use by another household
с.	Are all the kitchen facilities in your apartment (house) functioning?	157	1 [] 2 []	] Yes, all are functioning ] No, one or more is not working at all
27.	How is this apartment (house) heated – by fuel oil, utility gas, electricity, or with some other fuel?	158   	1 2 3 4 5	] Fuel oil ] Utility gas ] Electricity ] Other fuel (including CON ED steam) ] Don't know
28. a.	I have some questions about utility costs. (1) Do you pay for your own electricity?	     	1 [ 2 [ 3 [	<ul> <li>Yes - GO to 28a(2)</li> <li>Yes, but combined with gas - Ask for separate estimates; if not possible SKIP to 28c</li> <li>No, included in rent, condominium or other fee - SKIP to 28b(1)</li> </ul>
	(2) What is the average MONTHLY cost?	     160	\$_	. 00
b.	(1) Do you pay for your own gas?	     	1 C 2 C 3 C	Yes – GO to 28b(2) No, included in rent, condominium or other fee No, gas not used
	(2) What is the average MONTHLY cost?	    162	\$_	.00
	<b>IMPORTANT –</b> SKIP 28c unless the respondent cannot a combined bill. If separate estimates are available, fill	provi 28a(2)	de s and	eparate estimates for electricity and gas, and pays I 28b(2), leave 28c blank, and SKIP to 28d(1).
c.	What is your combined average electricity and gas payment each month?	163	\$_	. 00
d.	(1) Do you pay your own water and sewer charges?	164	1 C 2 C	Yes - GO to 28d(2)         No, included in rent, condominium or other fee or no charge - SKIP to 28e(1)
	(2) What is the total YEARLY cost?	165	\$_	. 00
θ.	(1) Do you pay for your own oil, coal, kerosene, wood, steam, etc.?	166   	1 [ 2 [ 3 [	Yes - GO to 28e(2)         No, included in rent, condominium or other fee         No, these fuels not used
	(2) What is the total YEARLY cost?	167	\$_	. 00
Page 8				FORM H-100 (9-4-98)

Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued						
	REFER TO QUESTION 9 ON PAGE 5					
	☐ Owner occupied (question 9a, box 1 mark ☐ Owns co-op shares (question 9b, box 1 m ☐ Occupy rent free (question 9c, box 3 mark ☐ Pay cash rent (question 9c, box 2 marked)	ed) arkedj (ed) - GO	) SKIP to to 29	32a		
29. What is apartm from w expire	29. What is the length of the lease on this apartment (house) that is, the total time from when the lease began until it will expire?          111       1       Less than 1 year         2       1 year       2         3       More than 1 but less than 2 years         4       2 years         5       More than 2 years         6       No lease         7       Don't know					
<b>30a. What i</b> (If rent manual	s the MONTHLY rent? is paid other than monthly, refer to the I on how to convert it.)	182	\$	[	00 Per month	
b. Is this apartment (house) under Rent Control or Rent Stabilization?						
31a. Is any apartn follow membe landlo	part of the monthly rent for this nent (house) paid by any of the ing government programs, either to a er of this household or directly to the rd?	,     				
(1) Fe pr	deral Section 8 certificate or voucher ogram	541	1 🗆	Yes д	∞ 🗆 No 🍃	004 🗆 Don't know
			Since 19		1 Ves 2 No	
(2) Pu pr	ogram	542	 ۱۵	IYes <sub>₹</sub>	00 □ No <sub>¥</sub>	004 □ Don't know
		   	Since 19	Li	Has it ever since 1993? 1   Yes 2   No	
(3) Se (S	onior Citizen Rent Increase Exemption CRIE)	 [184]	1	- — — - ]Yes <sub>₽</sub>	00 🗍 No 룾	004 □ Don't know
		     L	Since 19		Has it ever since 1993? 1   Yes 2   No	
(4) Ar pr	nother Federal housing subsidy ogram	543	1	Yes 🖌	00 🗌 No 🍃	004 □ Don't know
		• • •	Since 19		Has it ever since 1993? 1   Yes 2   No	
(5) Ai pr	nother state or city housing subsidy ogram	544 	1	Yes д	∞□No <sub>₹</sub>	004 □ Don't know
		     	Since 19		Has it ever since 1993? 1 Yes 2 No	
b. Of the how m house (Out of pays fo or othe	(amount from 30a) rent you reported, nuch is paid out of pocket by this hold? i pocket means the money your household or rent over and above any shelter allowance or government housing subsidy.)	547     	 \$ ₀ □ None		00	
FORM H-100 (9-4-98)		1			<u></u>	Page 9

322. Now, I would like to eak you some generations about the condition of this having unit.       Image: Condition of this having unit.         At any time during this winter was there a having unit.       Image: Condition of this having unit.         At any time during this winter was there a having unit.       Image: Condition of this having unit.         B. How many times did that happen?       Image: Condition of this having unit.         B. How many times did that happen?       Image: Condition of the condition of this have to us additional sources of provide enough having for the last 90 days have you assee any mice or rate or signs of mice or rate in this building?         344. At any time, in the last 90 days have you assee any mice or rate or signs of mice or rate in this building?       Image: Condition of the last 90 days have you assee any mice or rate or signs of mice or rate in this building?         b. to be this apartment (house) have open crates of signs of mice or rate in this building?       Image: Condition of the condition of your negling paint is the last 12 moorths, excluding in the last 12 moorth, excluding in the last 12 moorth, excluding in the last 12 moorth, excluding in the last 12 moort	Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued				
At any time during this winter was there a breakdown in your heading equipment; that       Image: Disconting the summable for 0 and 0	32a. Now, I would like to ask you some questions about the condition of this housing unit.				
b. How many times did that happen?     185   20   23.   b. How many times did that happen?   24.   24.   24.   24.   25.   26.   26.   27.   26.   27.   27.   28.   28.   29.   29.   20.   20.   20.   21.   21.   22.   23.   23.   24.   24.   24.   25.   26.   27.   28.   28.   28.   29.   29.   20.   20.   20.   20.   20.   20.   21.   22.   23.   23.   28.   29.   20.    20.	At any time during this winter was there a breakdown in your heating equipment; that is, was it completely unusable for 6 consecutive hours or longer?	195 0 □ Yes - GO to 32b 1 □ No - SKIP to 33			
33. During this winter when your regular methods, severe you, at my time, have to use additional sources of heat bacause your regular system (as working, did you, at my time, have to use additional sources of heat bacause your regular system (as working, did you, at my time, have to use additional sources or any time in the last 90 days have you seen any nice or rats in this building?       117 1 97 15         34a. At any time in the last 90 days have you seen any nice or rats in this building?       1189 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Does this apartment (house) have open cracks.       1190 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Does this apartment (house) have open cracks.       1190 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Does this apartment (house) have open cracks.       1190 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Boes this apartment (house) have open cracks.       1190 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Boes this apartment (house) have open cracks.       1190 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Boes this apartment (house) have holes in the floors?       1191 1 97 45       2       No         35a. Hore any broken plaster or peeling paint in the floors?       1192 1 97 6       2       No         35a. Hore any broken plaster or peeling paint in the floors?       1192 2 97 45       2       No         35b. Hore any borden plaster or peeling paint in the floors?       1192 1 97 6       2       No         35b. Hore any b	<b>b.</b> How many times did that happen?	186       2 □ One         3 □ Two         4 □ Three         5 □ Four or more times			
34a. At any time in the last 90 days have you rest in this building?       188 1 Yes 2 No         b. Is this building serviced by an exterminator regularly, or not at all?       189 1 Yes 2 No         35a. Does this apartment (house) have open in the interformation of point in the interformation of the continue with needed services of point in the interformation of the continue with questions for each point in the interformation of the continue with questions for each point in the interformation of the continue with questions for each point on the continue with questions for each point on the continue with questions for each person on page 12.	33. During this winter when your regular heating system was working, did you, at any time, have to use additional sources of heat because your regular system did not provide enough heat? Additional sources may be the kitchen stove, a fireplace, or a portable heater.	187 1 □ Yes 2 □ No   			
b. is this building serviced by an exterminator not at all?       189         Regularly         120       Only when needed         Imegularly         120       No         Imegularly         364. Is there any broken plaster or peeling paint         192         Yes         121       Yes         No       > SKP to 37         b. Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint         192         Yes         137       Hes water leaked into your apartment         194         Yes           Fair         190         Yes         10         38. Are there any boarde	34a. At any time in the last 90 days have you seen any mice or rats or signs of mice or rats in this building?	188 1 🗆 Yes 2 🗆 No			
35a. Does this apartment (house) have open celling? Do not include hairline cracks.       190       1 Yes         b. Does this apartment (house) have holes in the floors?       191       Yes         36a. Is there any broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 8% inches by 11 inches?       192       0 Yes         37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?       194       1 Yes         37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?       194       1 Yes         37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?       194       1 Yes         38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?       195       1 Yes       2 Good         39. How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this mething about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.       196       1 Excellent         2 Good       3 Fair       3 Fair       3 Fair       3 Fair         3 Fair       3 Fair       3 Fair       3 Fair       3 Fair         39. How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this momenting about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.       3 Fair      <	b. Is this building serviced by an exterminator regularly, only when needed, irregularly, or not at all?	189       1       Regularly         2       Only when needed         3       Irregularly         4       Not at all         5       Don't know			
b. Does this spartment (house) have holes in       191       1 Yes         368. Is there any broken plaster or peeling paint on the ceiling or inside walls?       192       0 Yes - GO to 36b         10       0. SKIP to 37       10       0. SKIP to 37         b. Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 3% inches by 11 inches?       193       2 Yes         36.       Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 3% inches by 11 inches?       133       2 Yes         36.       Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 3% inches by 11 inches?       133       2 Yes         36.       Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 3% inches by 11 inches?       133       2 Wes         37.       Has water leaked into your apartment fnowing?       194       1 Yes         19.       Is the resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?       194       1 Yes         28.       Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood.       199       1 Excellent       2 Good         39.       How would you rate the physical condition of your neightoRHOOD - would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?       191       1 Excellent       2 Good         30.       Fair       4 Poor       Poor       1 Pair       4 Poor         Notes	35a. Does this apartment (house) have open cracks or holes in the interior walls or ceiling? Do not include hairline cracks.	190 1 Yes 2 No			
36a. Is there any broken plaster or peeling paint on the ceiling or inside walls?       192       0       Yes - GO to 36b         b. Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 3%; inches by 11 inches?       193       2       Yes         37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?       194       1       Yes         We are also interested in the condition of your neighborhood.       194       1       Yes         38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?       195       1       Yes         39. How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this NEIGHBORHOOD - would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?       199       1       Excellent 2       Good         30. Now in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.         Notes         Continue with questions for each person on page 12.	b. Does this apartment (house) have holes in the floors?	 [191] 1□ Yes   2□ No			
b. Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 3½ inches by 11 inches?       192   Yes         3. Mo       194   Yes         37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?       194   Yes         38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?       195   Ves         39. How would you rate the physical condition of your neighborhood?       196   Excellent         30. Mo       195   Poor         39. How would you rate the physical condition of your neighborhood?       196   Poor         30. No in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.         Notes	36a. Is there any broken plaster or peeling paint on the ceiling or inside walls?	192 0□ Yes - GO to 36b 1□ No - SKIP to 37			
<ul> <li>37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?</li> <li>We are also interested in the condition of your neighborhood.</li> <li>38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?</li> <li>39. How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this NEIGHBORHOOD - would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?</li> <li>Now in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.</li> <li>Notes</li> </ul>	b. Is the area of broken plaster or peeling paint larger than 8½ inches by 11 inches? Show unfolded flashcard.	193] 2 Yes 3 No			
We are also interested in the condition of your neighborhood.         38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?         39. How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this NEIGHBORHOOD - would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?         30. Now in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.         Notes         Continue with questions for each person on page 12.	37. Has water leaked into your apartment (house) in the last 12 months, excluding leaks resulting from your own plumbing fixtures backing up or overflowing?	194 1 ☐ Yes 2 □ No			
38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?       195       1 Yes 2 No         39. How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this NEIGHBORHOOD - would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?       196       1 Excellent         30. Mow in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.         Notes         Continue with questions for each person on page 12.	We are also interested in the condition of your neighborhood.				
<b>39.</b> How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this NEIGHBORHOOD - would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?       196       1 Excellent         30. Fair       2 Good         31. Fair       4 Poor         Now in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.         Notes         Continue with questions for each person on page 12.	38. Are there any boarded up buildings in this neighborhood?	195 1 Ves 2 No			
Now in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member. Notes	<b>39.</b> How would you rate the physical condition of the residential structures in this NEIGHBORHOOD – would you say they are on the whole excellent, good, fair, or poor?	196 1 Excellent 2 □ Good 3 □ Fair 4 □ Poor			
Notes Continue with questions for each person on page 12.	Now in order to better understand the housing situation in the city, we need to learn something about the income, employment, and education level of each household member.				
Continue with questions for each person on page 12.	Notes				
Continue with questions for each person on page 12.					
	Continue with question	s for each person on page 12.			

Page 10



Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued					
CHECK ITEM G Ask questions 40a–50 of ALL household members age 15 and above. Refer to question 1c on page 2 for each person's age.	40a. Did work at any time last week?	b. How many hours did work last week at all jobs? (Subtract time off; add overtime or extra hours worked)	41. Was TEMPORARILY absent or on layoff from a job last week?	42. Has been doing anything to find work during the last four weeks?	
601 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18	201 1 ☐ Yes - Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No - Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) - SKIP to 41	211 I Hours – SKIP to 45a	221 ] 1 ☐ Yes, on layoff 2 ☐ Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 ☐ No	231 1 □ Yes - <i>SKIP to 44</i> 2 □ No	
602 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18	202 1 ☐ Yes – Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No – Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) – SKIP to 41	212 Hours - <i>SKIP</i> <i>to 45a</i>	222 1 ☐ Yes, on layoff 2 ☐ Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 ☐ No	232 1 - Yes - <i>SKIP to 44</i> 2 - No	
603 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18	203 1 ☐ Yes - Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No - Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) - SKIP to 41	213 1 Hours - SKIP to 45a	223 1 ☐ Yes, on layoff 2 ☐ Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 ☐ No	233 1 UYes - <i>SKIP to 44</i> 2 UNo	
604 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18	204 1 ☐ Yes – Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No – Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) – SKIP to 41	Hours - SKIP to 45a	224 1 ☐ Yes, on layoff 2 ☐ Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc. – <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 ☐ No	234 1 Urg Yes - <i>SKIP to 44</i> 2 Urg No	
605 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18	205 1 ☐ Yes - Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No - Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) - SKIP to 41	215       Hours - <i>SKIP</i> <i>to 45a</i>	225 1 Yes, on layoff 2 Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc SKIP to 45a 3 No	235 ] 1 [] Yes - <i>SKIP</i> <i>to 44</i> 2 [] No	
606 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18	206 1 ☐ Yes - Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No - Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) - SKIP to 41	Hours – SKIP to 45a	226 1 ☐ Yes, on layoff 2 ☐ Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 ☐ No	236 ] 1 🗆 Yes – <i>SKIP to 44</i> 2 🗋 No	
607         1 □ 15 years or older –         Ask questions         40a-50         2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to         Check Item H on         page 18	207 1 ☐ Yes - Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No - Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) - SKIP to 41	Letter Hours - SKIP to 45a	227 1 🗋 Yes, on layoff 2 🗋 Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 🗋 No	237 1 1 Yes - <i>SKIP to 44</i> 2 1 No	
608 1 □ 15 years or older – Ask questions 40a–50 2 □ Under 15 – SKIP to Check Item H on page 18 Page 12	208 1 ☐ Yes – Full or part-time (includes helping without pay in family business) 2 ☐ No – Did not work (or did only own housework, school work, or volunteer work) – SKIP to 41	Hours – SKIP to 45a	228 1 Yes, on layoff 2 Yes, on vacation, temporary illness, labor dispute, etc <i>SKIP to 45a</i> 3 No	238 1 Yes - SKIP to 44 2 No FORM H-100 (9-4-94	

	Section	on I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Co	ontinued	
43. What is the main reason	44. When did last work at his/her job or	The following questions as If had more than one job, o If didn't work, refer to the r	<b>c about the job worked</b> lescribe the one work most recent job since 199	last week. ed the most hours. 4.
is not looking for work?	DUSINOSS <i>(</i>	45a. For whom did work? Print the name of the company, employer, business, or branch of armed services if on active duty.	b. What kind of business or industry is this? For example: hospital, newspaper publishing, garment manufacturing, stock brokerage.	C. Is this mainly manufacturing, wholesale trade, retail trade, or something else?
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. 7	241     1     1999     GO       2     1998     to     45a       3     1994–1997     45a     5       4     1993 or earlier     to       5     Never worked     49b		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	251 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. <del>2</del> 632	242         GO           1         1999         to           2         1998         45a           3         1994–1997         45a           4         1993 or earlier         to           5         Never worked         49b		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	252 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. 7	243       1 □ 1999       2 □ 1998       3 □ 1994–1997       4 □ 1993 or earlier       5 □ Never worked		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	253 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. 7	244     1     1999     GO       2     1998     to     45a       3     1994–1997     45a       4     1993 or earlier     SKIP       5     Never worked     to		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	254 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. g	245         1       1999         2       1998         3       1994–1997         4       1993 or earlier         5       Never worked		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	255 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. g	246         1       1999         2       1998         3       1994–1997         4       1993 or earlier         5       Never worked		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	256 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. <del>v</del>	$\begin{array}{c c} 247 \\ 1 & 1999 \\ 2 & 1998 \\ 3 & 1994-1997 \\ 4 & 1993 \text{ or earlier} \\ 5 & Never worked \\ 5 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} GO \\ 45a \\ 5 \\ 45a \\ 45$		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	257 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
Show Flashcard IV and enter the code. 7 638	248       1     1999       2     1998       3     1994-1997       4     1993 or earlier       5     Never worked		Describe the main activity at location where employed. 7	258 1 Manufacturing 2 Wholesale trade 3 Retail trade 4 Other (service, construction, government, etc.)
FORM H-100 (9-4-98)				Page 13

Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued						
46a.What kind of work was	b. What are's usual	OFFICE USE ONLY				
doing, that is what's his/her occupation? For example: registered nurse, personnel manager, seamstress, stockbroker.	activities at this job? For example: patient care, directing hiring policies, stitching pants, selling stock.	Industry	Occupation			
		261	271			
		Code	Code			
		262	272 ]			
	·····	263 ]	273			
		264	274			
		265	275			
		266	276			
		267	277			
Page 14		268	278 1 1 Code FORM H-100 (9-4-94			

Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued					
47.	What type of business or organization does work at? Read all categories unless the answer is apparent from the information given in question 45, then mark (X) the appropriate box.	<b>48a. How many weeks did work in 1998?</b> Count paid vacation, paid sick leave, and military service.	b. How many hours did usually work each week in 1998?		
281	<ul> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government – Federal</li> <li>Government – State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ul>	291 I Weeks or ∞ □ None - <i>SKIP to 49b</i>	301		
282	<ol> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government – Federal</li> <li>Government – State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ol>	292	302		
283	<ul> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government - Federal</li> <li>Government - State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ul>	293 UWeeks or 00 None -SKIP to 49b	303 I Hours		
284	<ul> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government - Federal</li> <li>Government - State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ul>	294 I Weeks or ∞ □ None - <i>SKIP to 49b</i>	1 Hours		
285	<ul> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government - Federal</li> <li>Government - State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ul>	295 U Weeks or ∞ □ None <i>–SKIP to 49b</i>	1 Hours		
286	<ul> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government - Federal</li> <li>Government - State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ul>	296	306 i Hours		
287	<ol> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government - Federal</li> <li>Government - State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ol>	297 J	307		
288 FORM F	<ul> <li>Private FOR PROFIT company, business, or individual for wages, salary, or commission</li> <li>Private NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization</li> <li>Government – Federal</li> <li>Government – State or local (city, borough, etc.)</li> <li>Self-employed in own incorporated or unincorporated business or professional practice</li> <li>Working without pay in family business</li> </ul>	298 ↓ Weeks or ∞ □ None <i>-SKIP to 49b</i>	Bace 1		

	Sec	ction I – OCCl	JPIED UNITS - Continu	ed		
The foll a best es	owing questions are ab stimate. If there was a net	out income re loss in b or c, r	eceived during 1998? If mark the "Loss" box and e	an exa nter th	act amou ne dollar a	nt is not known, accept amount of the loss.
49a.Did wages, bonuse	earn income from jes, salary, commissions, uses, or tips? b. Did earn any income from (his/her) own farm or nonfarm business, proprietorship, or partnership?		irn any income from win farm or nonfarm proprietorship, or ip?	C. Didreceive any interest, dividends, net rental or royalty income, or income from estates and trusts? Include even small amounts credited to an account.		
311 312 1 No Yes	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items \$	☐ Yes - 331 332 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Loss ☐ Yes - 333	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 Annual amount - Dollars How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	351 352 353 354	☐ Yes - 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Loss ☐ Yes -	How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars - How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars
313	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars	334 1 🗆 No	Annual amount – Dollars		2 Loss	
314 1 No Yes	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items \$00 Annual amount - Dollars	2 🗌 Loss Q Yes - 335 336 1 🗌 No 2 🗋 Loss	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$	355	1 O Yes - 1 No 2 O Loss	- How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars
☐ Yes 317 318 1 □ No	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items 2 \$	Yes -	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 Annual amount – Dollars	357	☐ Yes - 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Loss	- How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars
☐ Yes · 319 320 ₁ ☐ No	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items 2 \$	Yes -	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 Annual amount - Dollars	359	☐ Yes - 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Loss	- How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars
☐ Yes 321 322 1 □ No	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items 2 \$	Yes -	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 Annual amount – Dollars	361 362	☐ Yes - 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Loss	- How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars
323 324 1 🗆 No	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items \$	☐ Yes - 343 344 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Loss	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 Annual amount - Dollars	363 364	☐ Yes - 1 [] No 2 [] Loss	+ How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars
325 326 1 No	- How much from all jobs? Report the amount before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues or other items \$00 Annual amount - Dollars	☐ Yes - 345 346 1 □ No 2 □ Loss	How much? Report net income after business expenses \$00 Annual amount – Dollars	365	1 No 2 Loss	- How much? \$00 Annual amount – Dollars FORM H-100 (5-6-8)

Section I – OCCUPIED UNITS – Continued					
49d.	Did receive any Social Security or Railroad Retirement payments? Include payments as a retired worker, dependent, or disabled worker.	6. Did receive any income from government programs for Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Temporary Assistance for Needy Familes (TANF), Home Relief, Safety Net, or any other public assistance or public welfare payments, including shelter allowance?	f. Didreceive any income from retirement, survivor, or disability pensions? Include payments from companies, unions, Federal, State, or local governments and the U.S. military. Do NOT include Social Security.		
	□ Yes - How much? 💦	🗆 Yes – How much? 🍃	□Yes - How much? ァ		
371 372	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars	391 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 392 1 □ No	411 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 412 1 □ No		
	□Yes - How much? <sub>₹</sub>	□ Yes How much? 룾	□ Yes - How much? 🍞		
373 374	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars □ □ No	333 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 394 1 □ No	413 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars		
	□Yes - How much? ₽	Ves - How much? 🍃	□ Yes - How much? <sub>7</sub>		
375	\$00] Annual amount Dollars □ No	395 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 396 1 □ No	415 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 416 1 □ No		
	□Yes - How much? <i>¥</i>	Yes - How much? 🗾	□Yes - How much? 🍃		
377 378	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars	397 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 398 1 □ No	417 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 418 1 □ No		
	□Yes - How much? <sub>₹</sub>	□Yes - How much? 룾	□ Yes - How much? 🗾		
379 380	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars	399 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 400 1 □ No	419 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 420 1 □ No		
	□Yes - How much? 🗾	Yes - How much? 🗾	□ Yes - How much? 🗾		
381	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars	401 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 402 1 □ No	421 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars		
	□ Yes - How much? 📈	□ Yes - How much? <sub>✔</sub>	☐ Yes - How much? <sub>✔</sub>		
383	\$00] Annual amount – Dollars 1 □ No	403 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars	423 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars 424 1 □ No		
	□Yes - How much? <sub>₹</sub>	Yes - How much? 💦	☐ Yes - How much? <sub>✔</sub>		
385	\$00 Annual amount – Dollars	405 \$ 00 Annual amount - Dollars 406 1 🗋 No	425 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 426 1 □ No		
FORM H-1	00 (9-4-98)	····	Page 17		

Section I – OCCUPIED UNITS – Continued			
49g.Didreceive any income from Veterans' (VA) payments, unemployment compensation, child support, alimony, or any other regular source of income? Do NOT include lump-sum payments such as money from an inheritence or the	50. How much school has completed?	CHECK ITEM H Is this the last person listed?	
Sale of a home.	471 01 □ No school 06 □ Some college but completed no degree	☐ Yes – GO to 51 □ No – Return to	
431 \$00 Annual amount – Dollars	02       Up to 6th grade       07       Associate degree         03       7th or 8th grade       08       College graduate         04       9th, 10th, 11th, or       12th grade but no       9       Some graduate/         05       H.S. diploma       10       Graduate/         05       H.S. diploma       professional degree	Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - <b>How much?</b> 433 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 434 1□ No	472       01       No school completed       06       Some college but no degree         02       Up to 6th grade       07       Associate degree         03       7th or 8th grade       08       College graduate         04       9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no H.S. diploma       09       Some graduate/ professional training         05       H.S. diploma       10       Graduate/ professional degree	☐ Yes - GO to 51 ☐ No - Return to Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - How much? 435 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 436 1□ No	473       01       No school completed       06       Some college but no degree         02       Up to 6th grade       07       Associate degree         03       7th or 8th grade       08       College graduate         04       9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no H.S. diploma       09       Some graduate/ professional training         05       H.S. diploma       10       Graduate/ professional degree	☐ Yes - GO to 51 ☐ No - Return to Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - <b>How much?</b> 437 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 438 1□ No	474       o1 □ No school completed       o6 □ Some college but no degree         o2 □ Up to 6th grade       o7 □ Associate degree         o3 □ 7th or 8th grade       o8 □ College graduate         o4 □ 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no H.S. diploma       o9 □ Some graduate/ professional training         o5 □ H.S. diploma       n0 □ Graduate/ professional degree	☐ Yes - GO to 51 ☐ No - Return to Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - How much? 439 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 440 1□ No	475       01       No school completed       06       Some college but no degree         02       Up to 6th grade       07       Associate degree         03       7th or 8th grade       08       College graduate         04       9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no H.S. diploma       09       Some graduate/ professional training         05       H.S. diploma       10       Graduate/ professional degree	☐ Yes - GO to 51 ☐ No - Return to Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - How much? 441 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 442 1□ No	476       o1 □ No school completed       o6 □ Some college but no degree         02 □ Up to 6th grade       o7 □ Associate degree         03 □ 7th or 8th grade       o8 □ College graduate         04 □ 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no H.S. diploma       o9 □ Some graduate/ professional training         05 □ H.S. diploma       professional degree	☐ Yes - GO to 51 ☐ No - Return to Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - How much? 443 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars	477       o1 □ No school completed       o6 □ Some college but no degree         02 □ Up to 6th grade       o7 □ Associate degree         03 □ 7th or 8th grade       o8 □ College graduate         04 □ 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no H.S. diploma       o9 □ Some graduate/ professional training         05 □ H.S. diploma       no degree	☐ Yes - GO to 51 ☐ No - Return to Check Item G on page 12 for the next person	
☐ Yes - <b>How much?</b> 445 \$00 Annual amount - Dollars 446 1□ No	478       01       No school completed       06       Some college but no degree         02       Up to 6th grade       07       Associate degree         03       7th or 8th grade       08       College graduate         04       9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade but no       09       Some graduate/ professional training         05       H.S. diploma       10       Graduate/ professional degree	Yes - GO to 51     No - GO to     Check Item G     on page 3 of     form H-100C     for the next     person	

	Section I – OCCUPIE		Section I - OCCUPIED UNITS - Continued			
51.	Does anyone in this household (including children under age 15) receive public assistance or welfare payments from any of the following?					
a.	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), or Family Assistance (previously called AFDC)	548 1	□ Yes	2 🗌 No	3 ☐ Don't know	
b.	Safety Net, also called Home Relief	549 1	🗆 Yes	2 🗆 No	3 ☐ Don't know	
c.	Supplemental Security Income (SSI), including aid to the blind or disabled	550 1	🗆 Yes	2 🗆 No	3 ☐ Don't know	
d.	• Other – Specify <sub>₹</sub>	551 1	🗆 Yes	2 🗆 No	3 ☐ Don't know	
CHE	CK REFER TO QUESTION 7a FOR THE REFERENCE	E PERS	ON			
	<ul> <li>Born in New York City (box 9 marked)</li> <li>Born in U.S. outside New York City (box</li> <li>Born outside U.S. (box 11-24 marked)</li> </ul>	SKIP to c 10 ma Go to t	o closing st rked) – SKI 52a	atement be P to 53	əlow.	
52a.	Did (reference person) move to the United States as an immigrant?	560 1 2	☐ Yes ⊡ No			
b.	. In what year did (reference person) move to the United States?	561	1.9			
53.	In what year did (reference person) move to New York City? (most recent move if more than one)	562	1.9		(IP to closing statement below.	
54	57. OFFICE USE ONLY					
	CLOSING STATEMENT Thank you for answering the survey questions make certain I didn't skip anything. If I did, it u than return here. Would you please give me yo follow-up. Area code Number           Area code         Number           029         1         1	Beford vould b ur phoi	e i turn it i ee easier t ne numbe	in, l'Il revi o call you r in case l	iew this form to back rather need to	
	END INTERVIEW . Fill item	N and	O on the	front cov	er.	
Note	19					
FORM H-1	00 (9-4-98)				Page 19	

	Section II - VACANT UNITS					
58.	If this apartment (house) is occupied, will it be the first occupancy since its construction, gut rehabilitation, or creation through conversion?	518       1 I Yes, first occupancy         2 I No, previously occupied         3 I Don't know				
NOTE	<ul> <li>Questions 59–61a, 62a and 62b pertain to the build same box for each form in the same building.</li> </ul>	ling. Be certain to mark (X) the				
59.	How many units are in this building? If the respondent doesn't know, canvass the building and count the units.	519       01       1 unit without business         02       1 unit with business         03       2 units without business         04       2 units with business         05       3 units         06       4 or 5 units         07       6 to 9 units         08       10 to 12 units         09       13 to 19 units         10       20 to 49 units         11       50 to 99 units         12       100 to 199 units         13       200 or more units				
60.	Does the owner of this building live in this building?	520 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know				
61a.	How many stories are in this building? Count the basement if there are people living in it.	521       01       One - SKIP to 62c         02       Two         03       Three         04       Four         05       Five         06       Six to ten         07       11 to 20         08       21 to 40         09       41 or more				
b.	<b>On what floor number is this unit?</b> Enter the 2-digit floor number or mark (X) box "0" if basement unit. Enter the lowest floor number if on more than one floor.	0 □ Basement				
62a.	Is there a passenger elevator in this building?	522 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No - <i>SKIP to 62c</i>				
b.	Is it possible to go from the sidewalk to a passenger elevator without going up or down any steps or stairs?	553     1 Yes       2 No       3 Don't know				
с.	Is it possible to go from the sidewalk to this unit without going up or down any steps or stairs?	555 1 ∐ Yes 2 □ No 3 □ Don't know				
63a.	How many rooms are in this apartment (house)? Do not count bathrooms, porches, balconies, halls, foyers, or half-rooms.	523       1       One - SKIP to 64a         2       Two         3       Three         4       Four         5       Five         6       Six         7       Seven         8       Eight or more				
b.	Of these rooms, how many are bedrooms?	524       01       None         02       One         03       Two         04       Three         05       Four         06       Five         07       Six         08       Seven         09       Eight or more				
Note:	0	FORM H-100 (9.1.8)				

ed 525 0 Yes, has complete plumbing facilities - GO to 64b 1 No, has some but not all facilities in this apartment (house) 2 No plumbing facilities in this apartment (house) SKIP to 65a
526       3 For the exclusive use of the intended occupants of this apartment (house)         17       4 Also intended for use by the occupants of another apartment (house)
es 527 0 Yes, has complete kitchen facilities – GO to 65b 1 No, has some but not all facilities in this apartment (house) 2 No kitchen facilities in this apartment (house), but facilities available in building 3 No kitchen facilities in this building
<ul> <li>For the exclusive use of the intended occupants of this apartment (house)</li> <li>Also intended for use by the occupants of another apartment (house)</li> </ul>
uel   er 529 1 Fuel oil 2 Utility gas 3 Electricity 4 Other fuel (including CON ED steam) 5 Don't know
tum 530 1 No 1 Yes, a condominium g 3 Yes, a cooperative 4 Don't know
531       1 Less than 1 month         2       1 up to 2 months         3       2 up to 3 months         4       3 up to 6 months         5       6 up to 12 months         6       1 year or more
nt 532 1 Owner occupied 2 Renter occupied 3 Never previously occupied 4 Don't know
533       1       No         2       Yes, a condominium         3       Yes, a cooperative         4       Don't know

70. Is this apartment (house) -       534       1 □ Ava         534       1 □ Ava         2 □ Ava       3 □ Not         71. What are the reasons that this apartment (house) is not available for sale or rent?       535       01 □ Ren         List all reasons mentioned, and then be sure to mark (X) ONLY one box for the primary reason.       535       01 □ Ren         04 □ Uni       04 □ Uni	ilable for rent? – <i>SKIP to 72</i> ilable for sale only? – <i>SKIP to closing</i> <i>statement below.</i> available for rent or sale? – <i>GO to 71</i> ted, not yet occupied d, not yet occupied t or building is lergoing renovation t or building is niting renovation ng converted to residential purposes re is a legal dispute
71. What are the reasons that this apartment (house) is not available for sale or rent?       535       o1       Ren o2         List all reasons mentioned, and then be sure to mark (X) ONLY one box for the primary reason.       o3       Uni und o4	ted, not yet occupied d, not yet occupied t or building is lergoing renovation t or building is hiting renovation ng converted to residential purposes re is a legal dispute
	Skip the unit and converted or awaiting version to condominium or perative d for occasional, seasonal, or reational use o owner cannot rent or sell at time due to personal problems age or illness) ng held pending sale of building ng held for planned demolition d for other reasons – Specify r
<ul> <li>72. What is the MONTHLY asking rent? (If rent is paid other than monthly, refer to the manual on how to convert it.)</li> <li>INTERVIEWER: If the respondent indicates that the monthly rent for the vacant unit is based upon the income of the tenant – ask for a rent range such as \$700-\$800. Then enter the midpoint of the range; in this case \$750.</li> </ul>	. 00 Per month
CLOSING STATEMENT Thank you for answering the survey questions. Before I tur make certain I didn't skip anything. If I did, it would be eas than return here. Would you please give me your phone nu follow-up. Area code Number 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	m it in, I'll review this form to sier to call you back rather mber in case I need to
END INTERVIEW. Fill item N on the	front cover.
Notes	
Dama 22	