Part 2: City-Wide Analysis
State of Land Use and the Built Environment

The city approved more units for construction in 2014 than in 2013, but the level remained below that of the mid-2000s. Meanwhile, city-initiated rezonings all but stopped in 2014; the number of blocks rezoned was the lowest since 2002.

1. In 2014, planned housing construction activity increased, even as the number of completed units fell slightly.

Development activity continued on an upward trajectory in 2014, though fewer units were completed than in 2013. As shown in Figure 2.1, 21,478 new residential units were authorized by new building permits, an increase of nearly 22 percent over the previous year. Newly planned and approved housing construction still remained below levels seen during the housing boom between 2005 and 2008, when over 25,000 new housing units were authorized by building permits each year. In 2014, 10,113 units were issued certificates of occupancy, a decrease of 12 percent compared to 2013.

As Figure 2.2 shows, medium and large projects dominated residential construction activity in 2014. Of all the new units authorized by building permits issued in 2014, 72 percent were in projects with 50 or more units.

While permitting activity was distributed throughout all five boroughs, as shown in Figure 2.3, there were concentrations of activity in a few communities in Manhattan, northern Brooklyn, and Long Island City.

A portion of those buildings with market rate units are participating in the city’s Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP) and therefore will generate units affordable to low-income households earning up to 80 percent of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Area Median Income.¹ The program allows developers to build larger buildings in the highest density residential districts (R10) or in areas designated in the Zoning Resolution in exchange for the provision of affordable units on site, within the same community district, or within one-half mile. As Figure 2.4 shows, the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development signed regulatory agreements for 936 affordable units participating in the IHP in fiscal year 2014. This was the second largest total number of units planned through the IHP for a single year on record.

Figure 2.5 shows the number of units issued certificates of occupancy in 2014 by building type. The number of new rental units remained stable while condo completions continued to fall for the sixth consecutive year. As a result, in 2014, 74 percent of all new residential units were in predominantly rental buildings with five or more units; only 16 percent of new units were in condominiums. By contrast, in 2008, 30 percent of new units were in predominantly rental buildings with five or more units and 51 percent were in condominiums.

¹ For a three-person household in 2014, 80 percent of the Area Median Income was $60,400. See the Methods chapter for more information on HUD Area Median Incomes.
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2. Fewer land use regulation changes were approved in 2014 compared to the previous year.

In 2014, the city adopted no zoning map amendments (also known as rezonings) initiated by the Department of City Planning. The city did, however, adopt a number of rezonings sought by property owners to accommodate specific plans. These rezonings only affected a small portion of the city—a total of 12 small areas—as shown in Figure 2.6 comprising just 17 blocks. As Figure 2.7 shows, the rezonings the city approved included the fewest blocks since 2002.

Two 2014 rezonings allowed residential use in what were manufacturing districts and created new IHP Designated Areas on the rezoned lots as an incentive to build affordable housing. At Hallets Point in Queens, the Astoria Cove project will create 1,723 new housing units, 460 of which will be affordable to households across a range of incomes. In Midtown West, another rezoning allows for a residential building in which 237 out of 1,189 units will be affordable.

The city rezoned lots in two Queens manufacturing districts to facilitate new residential development without establishing new IHP Designated Areas on the rezoned lots as an incentive to build affordable housing. At Hallets Point in Queens, the Astoria Cove project will create 1,723 new housing units, 460 of which will be affordable to households across a range of incomes. In Midtown West, another rezoning allows for a residential building in which 237 out of 1,189 units will be affordable.

In addition to rezonings, in 2014 the city approved 23 site-specific special permits enabling development or building conversions that do not strictly conform with bulk, use, and other regulations in the Zoning Resolution. Special permits allow modifications for a specific proposal and do not change the underlying zoning for a lot. As shown in Figure 2.8, most special permits were in Manhattan and none were in the Bronx. Ten special permits granted in 2014 facilitated new development or conversions in just two historic districts—the NoHo Historic District and the SoHo-Cast Iron Historic District. Four of the special permits permitted more parking than is allowed as of right. The remaining special permits allowed for deviations from bulk, use, and loading berth requirements in Brooklyn and Manhattan.

3. The Landmarks Preservation Commission designated somewhat fewer properties as part of new historic districts and landmarks.

In 2014, the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) designated three new historic districts as shown in Figure 2.9. The Chester Court Historic District designated 18 row houses in the South Crown Heights/Lefferts Gardens neighborhood of Brooklyn (BK 09). The Park Avenue Historic District extends from 79th street to 91st street on the Upper East Side of Manhattan (MN 08) covering 60 parcels. Lastly, the Central Ridgewood Historic District includes 930 properties in the Ridgewood neighborhood of Queens (QN 05). While fewer properties were included in new historic districts in 2014, it marked the fourth year in a row since 2011 in which the city added at least 1,000 properties to historic districts, as shown in Figure 2.10.

---

2 A similar figure in the State of New York City’s Housing and Neighborhoods in 2013 depicts the number of blocks affected only by DCP-initiated rezonings, while Figure 2.7 includes both DCP-initiated rezonings and those initiated by other actors. Therefore the two figures are not comparable.
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The city also designated six individual landmarks as shown in Figure 2.11. In Brooklyn, the city designated the Doering-Bohack House and the Ridgewood Lodge No. 710, Free and Accepted Masons in Bushwick and the Fourth Police Precinct Station House in Bedford-Stuyvesant. In Queens, LPC designated the Hawthorne Court Apartments in Bayside. In Manhattan, LPC designated the First German Baptist Church in the East Village as well as the Mills Hotel No. 3 in Midtown.

4. The city continued to experience a loss of space classified as industrial and manufacturing.
As shown in Table 2.1, over 40 percent of the city’s land area was classified by the Department of Finance as used for housing in 2013, while less than 15 percent was classified for commercial, office, public facility, institution, hotel, industrial and manufacturing uses combined.

As Table 2.1 shows, between 2003 and 2013, the land area in the city classified for manufacturing and industrial use declined by 9.9 percent. This had a dramatic effect on the amount of floor area in buildings the city classified for these purposes, as depicted in Figure 2.12. Between 2003 and 2013, the gross square footage of floor area in buildings classified as industrial and manufacturing use shrank by 23 percent. The drop was especially pronounced in Manhattan with a loss of 46 million square feet of floor area—a 55 percent decline. Brooklyn also lost a notable amount of floor area in properties classified as industrial and manufacturing, nearly 18 million square feet, over the same period. The reduction in all five boroughs may have come about through new residential construction facilitated through rezonings (to districts permitting residential), new hotel construction allowed as-of-right, repurposing of existing structures for commercial or office use, and formal reclassification by the Department of Finance of properties that had previously converted without filing a building permit.

To maintain consistency with other indicators in this report, several land use categories differ from their original definitions in PLUTO. 1-4 unit residential includes three- and four-unit buildings (not cooperatives or condominiums) previously classified as multifamily walkup or elevator buildings. 5+ unit rental includes walkup and elevator buildings not classified as cooperatives or condominiums in addition to primarily residential building classes originally classified as mixed residential and commercial. Cooperatives, residential condominiums, and hotels occupy separate categories.

Actual use of property may be different than use classified by the New York City Department of Finance.
1. The citywide homeownership rate in 2013 was basically unchanged from 2012, lower than 2007, but higher than 2000.

In contrast to the national decline, the homeownership rate in New York City remained basically unchanged from 2012 to 2013. The citywide rate rose by less than half a percentage point from 2012 to 2013 (from 31.7% to 32.0%), and remained substantially below the national average of around 63 percent in 2013. Changes to the homeownership rate varied across boroughs, but all changes were relatively small. Manhattan saw the largest growth in homeownership rates with a one percentage point increase; the Bronx saw the largest decline with a 0.6 percentage point drop.

Looking over a longer time period, the citywide homeownership rate in 2013 was nearly two percentage points higher than in 2000. The largest change over this 13-year period occurred in Staten Island, which is the only borough with a homeownership rate comparable to that of the U.S. The Bronx, the borough with the lowest homeownership rate in 2013, was the only borough in the city where the rate was lower in 2013 than 2000. In all boroughs, the homeownership rate in 2013 was lower than in 2007 (except in Manhattan, where it was about the same in these two years). Figure 3.1 shows the citywide and borough homeownership rates in 2000, 2007, and 2013. It also shows the national homeownership rates over this time period.

2. Home prices in New York City continued to rise in all five boroughs in 2014.

In 2014, for the third year in a row, prices in each borough were higher compared to the previous year. Brooklyn joined Manhattan in achieving housing prices that surpassed their pre-recession peak. Figure 3.2 shows that housing prices increased the most between 2013 and 2014 in Manhattan (13.5%), followed closely by Brooklyn (13.4%). Prices increased 8.4 percent in Queens, 8.1 percent in the Bronx, and 3.8 percent in Staten Island.

Figure 3.3 shows that prices also increased for all property types in 2014. Between 2000 and 2006, before the housing market dropped, prices were rising at roughly similar rates for all housing types. Since the downturn, prices for condominiums and buildings with five or more units recovered first and continue to increase faster than prices for the other types of properties, which remain below their peak levels. In 2014, for the second year in a row, condominium prices rose by over 10 percent year over year (10.5% price increase from 2013 to 2014, 11.6% price increase from 2012 to 2013). In 2014, single-family homes saw prices increase by 6.0 percent, and prices for two- to four-unit houses increased by 11.4 percent.

The median prices paid for properties sold in 2014 also differed markedly by property type and location. In 2014, the median sales price for a single-family home in New York City was $437,500, while the median price of a condominium (most of which are in Manhattan) was $806,950. The Bronx was the borough with the lowest median sales prices for both of these housing types—$355,000 and $120,000 respectively. These median sales prices in the Bronx also fell slightly from 2013 to 2014.

In order to purchase a single-family home or condominium, a potential buyer using a home loan needs to afford both the monthly mortgage payment and the down payment for purchase. In Table 3.1, we estimate the monthly payment and down payment necessary to purchase a typical housing unit in 2014, within the city in general and specifically in the Bronx. We tabulate these figures separately for four categories: single-family homes versus condominiums, and conforming loans versus Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans. For the typical single-family unit in New York City, Table 3.1 shows that a buyer must have over $15,000 available for a down payment, if she is able to obtain an FHA
loan and pay about $2,500 per month on her mortgage. If she has $87,500 for a down payment and could qualify for a conforming loan, her mortgage payment would be reduced to around $1,700 per month.

**What Is a Conforming Loan?**

A conforming loan is a mortgage loan that conforms to the requirements necessary for purchase by the government-sponsored enterprises Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. In Table 3.1, we assume that the mortgage covers only 80 percent of the value of the home with the rest of the purchase price covered by a down payment from the purchaser. Conforming loans typically have lower interest rates than non-conforming loans and do not require that the borrower obtain mortgage insurance. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac currently offer mortgage loans for up to 97 percent of a property’s value. These loans require the borrower to purchase mortgage insurance and often have higher interest rates than loans with larger down payments.

**What Is an FHA Loan?**

FHA loans—made by approved lenders and guaranteed by the FHA—can be made for up to 96.5 percent of the value of the property that serves as collateral for the loan. The FHA requires the borrower to pay a mortgage insurance premium, and FHA loans typically have higher interest rates than conforming loans.

| Table 3.1: Affordability Analysis for Home Purchase in New York City and in the Bronx, 2014 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **FHA Loan** | **Conforming Loan** |
| **(96.5% Loan to Value Ratio)** | **(80% Loan to Value Ratio)** |
| **Monthly Mortgage Payment** | **Required Down Payment** | **Monthly Mortgage Payment** | **Required Down Payment** |
| **Single-Family (New York City Median)** | $437,500 | $2,507 | $15,313 | $1,706 | $87,500 |
| **Condominium (New York City Median)** | $806,950 | $4,624 | $28,243 | $3,146 | $161,390 |
| **Single-Family (Bronx Median)** | $355,000 | $2,034 | $12,425 | $1,384 | $71,000 |
| **Condominium (Bronx Median)** | $120,000 | $688 | $4,200 | $468 | $24,000 |

Sources: New York City Department of Finance, Freddie Mac Primary Mortgage Market Survey, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, HSH Associates, NYU Furman Center
3. For the first time since 2011, the volume of home sales fell citywide in 2014.

In 2014, 31,839 units were sold through arm’s-length transactions in New York City—2,348 fewer sales than 2013. This marks the first year since 2011 in which annual sales volumes did not rise in every borough. With the exception of the Bronx, which saw a marginal increase but still had the lowest sales volume, each borough had fewer sales in 2014 than in 2013, as shown in Figure 3.4. Figure 3.5 shows the number of sales in 2014 by property type. The number of sales was basically unchanged between 2013 and 2014 for single-family units and two- to four-unit properties, slightly down for cooperatives, and significantly down (by 20%) for condominiums.


Mortgage lending in all five boroughs increased between 2012 and 2013 according to the most recent data available through the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. However, as Figure 3.6 shows, lending throughout the city in 2013 was still markedly lower than the peak years in the middle of the previous decade and even below levels seen in 2000.

As in New York City, the total number of first-lien home purchase loans made in the U.S. rose from 2012 to 2013. Figure 3.7 shows the number of home purchase loans made in the U.S. and New York City between 2004 and 2013, indexed to 2004 levels. Lending levels in 2013 remained substantially below where they were in 2004.

Loans backed by the FHA or U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) as a share of total home purchase loan originations, shown in Figure 3.8, fell in both New York City and the nation between 2012 and 2013. However, these loans continue to make up a much larger share in both markets than they did prior to the financial downturn of the last decade.

Figure 3.9 shows that refinance lending fell between 2012 and 2013 in all boroughs, corresponding with an uptick in the annual average U.S. conforming interest rate from 3.66 percent to 3.98 percent. Manhattan saw the largest decline in refinance lending with the number of originations falling roughly 25 percent between 2012 and 2013.

5. Foreclosure indicators signaled less mortgage-related distress in 2014 than in 2013.

A) Foreclosure filings dropped in 2014, but were still significantly higher than in the early 2000s.

The total number of foreclosure filings (lis pendens) for one- to four-unit properties and condominiums combined, shown in Figure 3.10, dropped in 2014 by 2,862 filings, or 18 percent. The number of filings also fell for each property type between 2013 and 2014. The total number of properties receiving a foreclosure notice, however, was still significantly elevated compared to the level in the early 2000s; the total number of filings in 2014 was close to double the number of filings in 2000.

Figure 3.11 shows the number of foreclosure filings in 2014 by borough. In 2014, Queens and Brooklyn continued to have higher numbers of filings than the other three boroughs, although the number of properties receiving foreclosure notices was lower across all boroughs in 2014 compared
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to 2013. The biggest drop occurred in Queens, which had 1,296 (21%) fewer filings in 2014. Foreclosure filings, shown in the map in Figure 3.12, continue to be concentrated in southeast Queens and northeast Brooklyn, as well as some areas of Staten Island and the Bronx, suggesting that there are neighborhoods in the city that are still suffering from the distress that can accompany concentrated foreclosures.

Figure 3.13 shows the number of foreclosure filings again but distinguishes between initial and repeat filings. We define an initial *lis pendens* as one in which the property owner did not receive a foreclosure notice in the previous six years. We define repeat filings as *lis pendens* that were filed on a property that had an earlier *lis pendens* filing in the previous six years and that did not experience a change in ownership during that time. A repeat filing can indicate that a borrower caught up on a previous delinquency but then fell behind again. It can also mean that the delinquency lingered for more than three years and required the lender to file an additional *lis pendens* to keep the case active, since *lis pendens* expire after three years. In either case, a repeat filing is an indication of prolonged homeowner distress.

In 2014, repeat filings made up about 50 percent of total foreclosure filings on one- to four-unit buildings and condominiums, up five percentage points from 2013. Thus, about half of the foreclosure filings in 2014 were a reflection of either repeat or ongoing mortgage distress that began during the foreclosure crisis. The number of initial filings in 2014 was still higher than the annual numbers for 2000 through 2005. However, the 2014 initial filings number was much lower than the number of initial filings seen annually from 2007 through 2010—the height of the foreclosure crisis in New York City.

**B) The number of new real estate owned (REO) properties continues to be well below the peak during the foreclosure crisis.**

As the number of foreclosures in the city dropped following the foreclosure crisis, the city also experienced a reduction in the number of properties becoming “real estate owned” (REO), shown in Figure 3.14. A property becomes REO when, after a completed foreclosure, it fails to sell for a price acceptable to the foreclosing lender. At that time, the lender acquires the property and records it as an asset on its financial statement. Thus, the number of properties entering REO status is both a function of the foreclosure pipeline and the surrounding housing market. In 2014, 306 properties in New York City entered REO status, a level that has remained stable since 2011, and is far below the number of properties entering REO status during the foreclosure crisis between 2007 and 2010.

**C) Pre-foreclosure notices were significantly lower in 2014 than 2013.**

For the second year in a row, pre-foreclosure notices, which lenders must send to delinquent borrowers at least 90 days prior to filing a foreclosure case, decreased citywide and in every borough, as seen in Table 3.2. After remaining stable from 2011 to 2012 and falling by 9.2 percent between 2012 and 2013, the total number of pre-foreclosure notices issued in New York City fell substantially, by 36 percent, from 2013 to 2014. This suggests that owners of one- to four-unit properties and condominiums in the city are at lower risk of entering the foreclosure process in the coming year.

**D) The share of city homeowners with underwater mortgages fell between 2012 and 2014, but remained high in some neighborhoods.**

A mortgage is “underwater” when the amount owed to the bank is more than the current market value of the home. While the vast majority of people with underwater mortgages remain current on their payments, having an underwater mortgage makes a homeowner more vulnerable because it limits her options in the event of a financial setback.

Citywide, the share of mortgages that were underwater fell substantially between 2012 and 2014, in part reflecting the increase in prices observed in Figure 3.2. Figure 3.15 compares the share of underwater homes in the city and in each borough between the third quarter of 2012 and the same quarter in 2014. The share of homes with underwater mortgages fell in each borough over that period, with the Bronx experiencing the largest drop. Figure 3.16 reveals, however, that a number of neighborhoods still have a substantial percentage of mortgaged homes with underwater mortgages. Many of these neighborhoods are also the neighborhoods with a concentration of new foreclosure filings, shown in Figure 3.12.
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State of Renters and Their Homes

As rents rose and renters’ incomes remained stagnant from 2012 to 2013, many New Yorkers continued to face heavy rent burdens. In 2013, roughly 30 percent of the city’s renter households faced rental costs of 50 percent or more of their income.

1. Renters make up a majority of households.
In 2013, 2.1 million households in New York City rented their homes. Figure 4.1 shows that renters made up 68.0 percent of all city households in 2013. This share was far higher than in the United States as a whole, where 36.5 percent of households rented their homes in 2013.

New York City has always had a large share of renters, but this share has fluctuated somewhat in recent years. Figure 4.2 shows that the share of renters in New York City fell by 11 percentage points, from 76.6 percent to 65.6 percent, between 1980 and 2006. From 2006 to 2011, the rental share crept up to 68.7 percent, and then dropped slightly to 68.0 percent by 2013. In contrast, the national share of renters grew consistently between 2007 and 2013.

2. Rents continued to rise.
Renting an apartment in New York City is expensive and may be out of reach for many. The American Community Survey reports that the median monthly gross rent paid by rental households in New York City in 2013 was $1,244, about $300 more than the median rent in the United States as a whole. Figure 4.3 shows that the median rent in New York City increased by 12 percent in real terms between 2005 and 2013.

Because many renters live in rent-stabilized apartments, receive rent subsidies, or simply get favorable terms as a result of long-term tenancy, the median gross rent paid by all New Yorkers may not reflect the experience of those looking for an apartment on the open market. The median asking rent of apartments advertised for rent on StreetEasy in 2013 was $2,900—more than double the median rent paid by all renters in the city.

There is tremendous variation in asking rents across the city’s neighborhoods. Figure 4.4 shows the median asking rent by community district in 2013. Median asking rents were highest in Manhattan and the neighborhoods closest to Manhattan. A home is commonly considered affordable if its occupants spend 30 percent or less of their income on rent. Table 4.1 shows that, in eight neighborhoods, the median asking rent met or exceeded $3,000 a month, a level that would be unaffordable to any household that earned less than $120,000 per year. Still, in 19 neighborhoods, the median asking rent for apartments on the market was $1,500 or below.

3. Rents levels have increased faster than income.
Over the past nine years, rent increases have far surpassed income growth. Figure 4.5 shows that between 2005 and 2013, the median rent increased by nearly 12 percent while the median income of renter households increased by only 2.3 percent, as measured in real terms. Further, while rents steadily increased during this period, incomes were more volatile. After rising from 2005 to 2008, median renter household income fell during the Great Recession, recovered slightly from 2011 to 2012, and then remained stagnant through 2013.

---

1 Gross rent includes the rent charges specified on a lease as well as any additional utility payments. Unless otherwise specified, all references to rent in this report refer to gross rent. For more information, see the definition of median rent in the Indicator Definitions and Rankings chapter.

2 This only reflects advertised rent levels, not the actual terms of leases.
Figure 4.1: Renter Share of Households, 2013
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Figure 4.2: Renter Share of Households, New York City
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Figure 4.3: Median Gross Rent (2014$), New York City
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Figure 4.4: Median Asking Rent by Community District, 2013
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Table 4.1: Top and Bottom 10 Median Asking Rent by Community District (Ranked by Rent Level), 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Community District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Median Asking Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MN 01</td>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MN 05</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>$3,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MN 04</td>
<td>Clinton/Chelsea</td>
<td>$3,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MN 02</td>
<td>Greenwich Village/Soho</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MN 06</td>
<td>Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay</td>
<td>$3,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BK 01</td>
<td>Greenpoint/Williamsburg</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MN 07</td>
<td>Upper West Side</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MN 03</td>
<td>Lower East Side/Chinatown</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BK 02</td>
<td>Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>$2,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BK 06</td>
<td>Park Slope/Carroll Gardens</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottom 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Community District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Median Asking Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>BX 10</td>
<td>Throgs Neck/Co-op City</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>BX 04</td>
<td>Belmont/East Tremont</td>
<td>$1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>BX 09</td>
<td>Parkchester/Soundview</td>
<td>$1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>BX 12</td>
<td>Williamsbridge/Baychester</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>QN 14</td>
<td>Rockaway/Broad Channel</td>
<td>$1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>BX 05</td>
<td>Highbridge/Concourse</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>BX 07</td>
<td>Kingsbridge Heights/Bedford</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>SI 02</td>
<td>South Beach/Willowbrook</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>BX 06</td>
<td>Fordham/University Heights</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>BX 02</td>
<td>Hunts Point/Longwood</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: StreetEasy, NYU Furman Center

Note: Three community districts, Morris Park/Bronxdale (BX 11), South Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN 10), and Tottenville/Great Kills (SI 03), were excluded from this analysis because there were fewer than 30 rental listings in 2013. Only the 10 community districts with the highest and lowest median asking rents are shown here. Data for all 56 community districts with available data can be found on the community district data pages.
A household earning the median renter income of about $41,450 in 2013 would be able to afford an apartment renting for $1,036 or less if paying less than 30 percent of their income on rent. In 2013, 54 percent of renter households were rent burdened, facing housing costs equal to at least 30 percent or more of their income. Figure 4.6 suggests that this share has stopped rising in recent years. The 2013 rate was slightly lower than the rate in 2011,1 but it remained high compared to historical trends. As recently as 2000, just 43.2 percent of renters were rent burdened.

4. Compared to higher-income renters, a much larger share of low-income renters are rent burdened.

A larger share of renters at all income levels faced rent burdens in 2013 than in 2000. However, not all renter households in New York City are equally likely to be burdened by high rents. Low-income renters are especially hard hit. Figure 4.7 shows that in 2013, more than 80 percent of very low-income renters were rent burdened, with about 42 percent of households making between 30 percent and 50 percent of the area median income (AMI) being severely rent burdened, or facing housing costs equal to half or more of their income. In 2013, nearly 55 percent of renter households earning between 51 percent and 80 percent of AMI ($47,451–$61,850 for a three-person household) were rent burdened, with nearly 10 percent facing a severe rent burden.

Compared to other household sizes, single-person households are the most likely to be rent burdened—61 percent faced rental housing costs equal to at least 30 percent of their income in 2013. Yet, Figure 4.8 shows that the rent-burdened share increased for households of all sizes since 2000, with the largest households seeing the greatest increases. The share of four-person households facing rental housing costs equal to 30 percent or more of their income increased from 39.6 percent in 2000 to 52.7 percent in 2013.

5. New York City continues to face a shortage of affordable rental housing.

Another potential indicator of housing affordability challenges is the number of rental units recently on the rental market that were affordable to households at different income levels. Of rental units that were recently available (occupied units whose tenants moved in less than five years before their survey date) in 2013, only about 476,700 units (51.7%) would be affordable to an appropriately-sized4 household earning 80 percent of AMI. As Figure 4.9 shows, the share of available units affordable at this income level fell substantially since 2000, when just short of 70 percent of recently available units were affordable to an appropriately-sized household.

Households with income less than 50 percent of AMI may be eligible to use a housing choice voucher, although the total number of vouchers is limited. In 2013, about 122,000 low-income renter households (6.4% of all households in privately owned rental units) used federal housing choice vouchers5 to supplement their rent. A household using a housing choice voucher in New York City may choose to live in any privately owned rental unit in the city that rents at a level less than or equal to the maximum payment standard, which is $1,555 for a two-bedroom unit in 2015. The voucher holder has their rent payment capped at 30 percent of their income, and the federal government pays the remainder of the contract rent directly to the landlord. Households with a housing choice voucher may rent an apartment with a contract rent above the maximum payment standard if the household pays the difference between the payment standard and the contract rent, but pays no more than 40 percent of their income on rent.

Although the housing choice voucher program allows a household to live in any apartment renting at the prices described above, these lower-rent apartments are not distributed evenly across the city, resulting in concentrations of voucher holders in some neighborhoods. Figure 4.10 and Table 4.2 illustrate the share of households in privately owned rental units using a housing choice voucher by sub-borough area. In four Bronx neighborhoods, more than 15 percent of all renter households used a housing choice voucher in 2013, while in five other neighborhoods across the city, less than one percent of households in privately owned rental units used a voucher.

---

1 The difference between the 2012 rate and the 2013 rate is within the margin of error for this data set, so these rates are not statistically significantly different from one another.

4 Our analysis of the affordability of recently available units is based in part on household size, because the income guidelines used by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) subsidy programs differ by household size. In this affordability analysis, we determine the affordability of studio apartments (no bedrooms) for one-person households, one-bedroom units for two-person households, two-bedroom units for three-person households, and units with three or more bedrooms for four-person households. In the State of New York City’s Housing and Neighborhoods in 2013, for this indicator, we determined affordability for recently available rental units using the three-person income limits. Because of these differences, Figure 4.9 in this edition of the report should not be compared to similar figures in previous editions. For more information on HUD’s income guidelines, please see the Methods chapter.

5 These are sometimes known as Section 8 vouchers.
Figure 4.6: Rent-Burdened Share of Households, New York City

Figure 4.7: Rent-Burdened Households by Income, New York City

Figure 4.8: Rent-Burdened Share by Household Size, New York City

Figure 4.9: Recently Available Rental Units Affordable to Appropriately-Sized Households, New York City

Figure 4.10: Housing Choice Vouchers (Percent of Occupied, Privately Owned Rental Units) by Sub-Borough Area, 2013

Table 4.2: Neighborhoods With the Highest Percentages of Housing Choice Voucher Holders (Percent of Occupied, Privately Owned Rental Units) by Sub-Borough Area, 2013
6. Vacancy rates remain low.

Despite new market-rate and subsidized rental housing construction, the rental vacancy rate remained low. Figure 4.11 shows that just 3.5 percent of New York City’s rental units were vacant in 2013, the lowest rate since 2007.

Some households may respond to the lack of affordable housing by doubling up in the same unit with other households. Figure 4.12 shows that, in 2013, 4.4 percent of rental units in New York City were severely overcrowded, with more than 1.5 people per room. For example, a two-bedroom apartment with a living room and a kitchen is considered severely overcrowded if seven or more people are living there. The severe crowding rate increased slightly in 2013, indicating that households appear to be coping with increasing rents in the city in part by sharing space.

7. The housing code violation rate increased slightly between 2013 and 2014.

Although affordability has been declining in recent years, housing quality as measured by housing code violations may be slowly improving. Figure 4.13 shows that, in 2014, the city issued about 210.8 housing code violations per 1,000 rental housing units. This was a slight increase from 2013, but still lower than any other year since 2004, the first full year during which the city’s 311 hotline was fully operational.6 Part of the 2014 increase may be due to a spike in heating complaints during January 2014, an abnormally cold month.

---

6 The 311 system is the source of most complaints that lead to housing code violations.
State of Residents: Demographics, Income, and Wellbeing

Since 2000, the population of New York City became more diverse, older, and healthier. The city’s median household income showed continued signs of recovery in 2013, but remained below the 2008 peak.

1. Demographics

A) Adults made up a growing share of the city’s population.

Between 2000 and 2013, the share of the city’s population age 18 or older, including those aged 65 and older, grew, while the percentage under 18 declined. The proportion of the population aged 18 to 64—working age adults—grew the most, nearly two percentage points, to reach 66.0 percent of the city’s population in 2013. As shown in Figure 5.1, the proportion of the population aged 65 and older grew slightly, by one percentage point, from 11.7 percent in 2000 to 12.8 percent in 2013. Children under age 18 made up over 24 percent of the city’s residents in 2000 but just over 21 percent by 2013. The number of children fell as well, from 1.94 million in 2000 to 1.78 million in 2013, while the number of adults of all ages grew.

Some neighborhoods have experienced different shifts in their age distributions. Figure 5.2 depicts the change in the share of households with children in different neighborhoods. The share of households with at least one child increased between 2000 and 2011-2013 in several neighborhoods, despite the overall citywide decline in the number of children. Most of the neighborhoods that experienced an increase in the share of children were in parts of Manhattan south of 110th Street and western Brooklyn. No neighborhood experienced an increase in excess of five percentage points. In contrast, the share of households with children fell substantially, by more than five percentage points, in several sections of the city during this period—mainly in Upper Manhattan, the central and South Bronx, northwest Queens, and north and central Brooklyn.

In most neighborhoods the share of the population aged 65 and older remained stable or increased slightly between 2000 and 2011-2013. Figure 5.3 maps these changes. The Upper East Side (MN 08) experienced the largest growth in the percentage 65 or over of just more than five percentage points, and other increases occurred in Upper Manhattan, the western Bronx, northern and eastern Brooklyn, and southern and central Staten Island. A few neighborhoods experienced minor reductions in their shares of older adults. These include Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK 01), three neighborhoods in southwest Brooklyn, Central Harlem (MN 10), and Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN 06). Two of these neighborhoods, Central Harlem and Greenpoint/Williamsburg, also had falling shares of households with children during the same period, indicating that they experienced significant boosts in their population of working-age adults aged 18 to 64.

B) New York’s population became more diverse.

From 2000 to 2013, the city’s Asian and Hispanic shares of population increased while white and black shares decreased. Of the four racial and ethnic categories shown in Figure 5.1, the proportion Asian grew the most, by almost four percentage points, from 9.7 percent of the city’s population in 2000 to 13.4 percent in 2013. In 2000, whites made up 35 percent of the city’s population, but as a result of the subsequent demographic changes, no race or ethnicity accounted for more than a third of the total population by 2013.

As shown in Figure 5.4, changes in the non-white share of population across community districts between 2000 and 2011-2013 were highly uneven. Northern and central Brooklyn, Upper Manhattan, and Astoria (QN 01) saw relatively large declines in their non-white population percentages during this period. Meanwhile, parts of the northern Bronx, southern Brooklyn, much of Queens, and Staten Island faced relatively large increases in their proportion non-white.
Figure 5.1: Demographic Characteristics of New Yorkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Under 18</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 18 to 64</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 65 and Older</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Population Under 18</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Population 65 and Older</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected Youth</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Hispanic population may be of any race, while we define the Asian, black, and white populations as being non-Hispanic. Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.2: Percentage Point Change in Percentage of Households with Children Under 18, 2000 to 2011-2013

- Decreased 10.0 or More
- Decreased 5.0–9.9
- Decreased 1.0–4.9
- Little Change (+/- 1.0)
- Increased More Than 1.0

Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2011-2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.3: Percentage Point Change in Percentage of Population Age 65 and Older, 2000 to 2011-2013

- Decreased 1.0 or More
- Little Change (+/- 1.0)
- Increased 1.1–5.0
- Increased More Than 5.0

Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2011-2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.4: Percentage Point Change in Percent Non-White Population, 2000 to 2011-2013

- Decreased 5.0 or More
- Decreased 1.0–4.9
- Little Change (+/- 1.0)
- Increased 1.1–5.0
- Increased More Than 5.0

Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2011-2013), NYU Furman Center
Accompanying the increase in racial and ethnic diversity in the city was a slight increase in the percentage foreign-born from 35.9 percent of the city’s population in 2000 to 37 percent in 2013, as displayed in Figure 5.1. As shown in Figure 5.5, the proportion foreign-born increased outside of Lower and central Manhattan with some clusters of large increases occurring in the South and central Bronx and western Queens. Only a handful of neighborhoods experienced declines in their share foreign-born, with the largest drop occurring in Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK 01).

2. Income, Poverty, and Inequality

Despite continued overall economic gains, not all New Yorkers have benefited and many continue to struggle to make ends meet. Income inequality was higher in 2013 than it was at any point over the past two decades.

A) The metropolitan area economy continued to grow.

The New York metropolitan area economy continued to grow since 2009, though at a slower rate than that of U.S. metropolitan areas as a whole, as shown in Figure 5.6. The combined gross domestic product (GDP) of all U.S. metropolitan areas grew in real terms by nine percent between 2009 and 2013, and by 2.2 percent between 2012 and 2013. At the same time, the New York metropolitan area GDP expanded less, by about 6.7 percent since 2009 and by one percent since 2012, to reach a total of $1.378 billion in 2013, the latest year in which GDP data are available for individual metropolitan areas. Despite the growth in the regional economy, not all New Yorkers have benefited from this expansion.

B) The typical household’s income is recovering weakly.

Even as the median household income grew slowly between 2011 and 2013, it remained well below its pre-recession peak, as seen in Figure 5.7. The inflation-adjusted income earned by the typical household in New York City grew after the early 2000s to a pre-recession high of $56,416 in 2008, just above its 2000 level of $56,299. After last decade’s recession, the median household income fell precipitously, hitting a trough of $51,959 in 2011. Since then, it has grown by just under one percent annually to reach $52,914 in 2013, remaining well below pre-recession levels.

Since 2000, the majority of the city’s neighborhoods experienced declines in median household income while a handful saw some income growth. Figure 5.8 maps inflation-adjusted changes in the median household income by neighborhood between 2000 and 2011-2013. The mean decline in the median household income across all neighborhoods was about 7.3 percent over this period. In 2011-2013, many neighborhoods suffered declines that were considerably larger—with some seeing declines greater than

---

1 Reported income in the 2000 decennial Census corresponds to income earned in 1999.
10 percent. These areas include the South Bronx, northern Queens, southeastern Brooklyn, and northern Staten Island. Meanwhile, several neighborhoods experienced an increase in their median income in excess of five percent. These increases were concentrated in northwest Brooklyn, the west side of Manhattan south of 59th Street, and Central Harlem (MN 10). Much of the rest of Manhattan saw little change in their median household income, except for Washington Heights/Inwood (MN 12) and East Harlem (MN 09) where the median income fell.
C) The poverty rate fell slightly between 2012 and 2013.

As the median income rose slightly between 2012 and 2013, the city’s poverty rate also fell marginally. Figure 5.9 plots the city’s poverty rate and the rates for children and older adults between 2000 and 2013. In 2000, 21.2 percent of the city’s population had an income below the federal poverty line. The poverty rate fell during the early- and mid-2000s, hitting a low of 18.2 percent in 2008. Afterward, the poverty rate grew steadily back to 21.2 percent in 2012. Since then, the poverty rate fell marginally to 20.9 percent in 2013.

The poverty rate for children under 18 and for adults 65 and older, two potentially vulnerable populations, exhibited some divergence from the dominant trends. Historically, the poverty rate for children has been higher than that for the whole population; in 2013, 29.8 percent of children were below the poverty line. Further, from 2000 to 2013, the poverty rate for children fluctuated more than the overall poverty rate. The poverty rate for older adults rose between 2000 and 2005 as the overall poverty rate fell. While the overall poverty rate started to increase after its 2008 low, the poverty rate for older adults continued to fall until 2010, when 17.2 percent of adults aged 65 and older were under the poverty line. The rate for older adults increased to 19.0 percent in 2011 and has remained somewhat stable since then, falling slightly to 18.8 percent in 2013.

D) Income inequality remained high.

The distribution of income shifted between 2000 and 2013 as the citywide median income declined. During this period, the share of households earning a moderate or middle income fell, the share earning low incomes increased, and the proportion earning the highest incomes stayed about the same. Figure 5.10 shows the distribution of income in 2000 and 2013. The percentage of households earning between $40,001 and $100,000 fell by almost three percentage points in this period. Meanwhile, the share of households with an income of $40,000 or less grew by nearly the same amount. In addition, the share of households earning more than $100,000 remained generally stable, although the percentage among them earning up to $250,000 fell slightly, while the share earning more than $250,000 marginally increased. As the city’s population grew over those 13 years, the absolute number of households who earned more than $100,000 grew substantially, by almost 30,000 households. The number of households earning $40,000 or less grew even more over this period—by just over 120,000.

Using the income diversity ratio—a measure that shows how much a household in the 80th percentile of the income distribution earns relative to a household in the 20th percentile—income inequality has remained elevated since the onset of the recession. Figure 5.11 reveals how this measure has changed since 1990. In 1990, the income diversity ratio of 5.5 meant that the 80th percentile household earned 5.5 times more income than the household at the 20th percentile of the income distribution. The income diversity ratio increased over the next 15 years to reach 6.1 in 2005 as the city’s economy expanded. This period was followed by a decline in the ratio in 2007 as a result of an increase in the 20th percentile income. However, as the economy first suffered and then began to recover from the recession, the earnings of households at the lower end of the household income distribution fell more than those at the top in percentage terms. By 2013, the income diversity ratio reached 6.2, the highest level in the past two decades.

3. Education and the Labor Force

A) The proportion of college-educated New Yorkers continued to grow.

The share of New Yorkers aged 25 and older with a four-year degree or higher increased from 34.7 percent in 2012 to 35.7 percent in 2013, continuing a trend observed since 2000, when 27.4 percent of adults had at least a bachelor’s degree (Figure 5.1). Between 2000 and 2011-2013, all neighborhoods experienced an increase in their percentages of college-educated adults, and a few showed large gains in excess of 15 percentage points. These increases occurred in Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK 01), Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK 02), and Crown Heights/Prospect Heights (BK 08) in Brooklyn; East Harlem (MN 09) and Central Harlem (MN 10) in Manhattan; and Astoria (QN 01) in Queens. Further, most of Manhattan, northern and western Brooklyn, and western Queens showed increases of 10 percentage points or more. No neighborhoods in the Bronx or Staten Island experienced growth of more than 10 percentage points in their proportion of residents with college degrees.
Figure 5.9: Poverty Rate by Age, New York City
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Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2005-2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.10: Household Income Distribution, New York City
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Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.11: Income Diversity Ratio, New York City
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Figure 5.12: Percentage Point Change in Percentage of Residents With a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher, 2000 to 2011-2013
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Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2011-2013), NYU Furman Center
B) Labor force participation remained largely the same between 2012 and 2013.

The labor force participation rate, the percentage of civilians aged 18 to 64 who are employed or actively looking for work, declined marginally between 2012 and 2013. This decline of 0.1 percentage points was smaller than the decline of 0.3 percentage points observed for the country as a whole in the same period. Figure 5.13 displays the evolution of the labor force participation rate in New York City and in the U.S. between 2000 and 2013. Before 2011, the city’s labor force participation rate was typically lower than that for the country as a whole, but the gap between the local and national rates closed steadily since 2000 during last decade’s recession. By 2012 the gap in the labor force participation rate between the city and the country as a whole had vanished.

C) The city’s unemployment rate continued to fall.

The unemployment rate in New York City fell from 7.5 percent to 6.4 percent between 2013 and 2014, a 0.9 percentage point drop similar to the decline experienced nationwide. Figure 5.14 compares the local and national unemployment rates since 2000. Between 2000 and 2006, the unemployment rate in the city was consistently greater than in the country as a whole. The largest difference of 2.7 percentage points arose in 2002 as a result of the sluggish metropolitan economy, as observed through the metropolitan GDP in Figure 5.6. The unemployment rate in the city and in the country as a whole exhibited relatively similar trends between 2006 and 2010. While the national unemployment rate continued to drop after 2010, the rate in the city fluctuated around nine percent in 2011 and 2012, after which it fell steeply, mirroring the nationwide trend. By 2014, the city’s unemployment rate still remained one percentage point higher than in the country as a whole.

D) Older teens in the city were more likely to be enrolled in school or attached to the labor force.

In 2013, the percentage of disconnected youth, people aged 16 to 19 who were neither enrolled in school nor participating in the labor force, was 7.2 percent, a share much lower than in 2000, when 9.1 percent of these older teens were neither in school nor in the labor force. This decline between 2000 and 2013 masked an increase during last decade’s recession, illustrated for each borough in Figure 5.15. Both the Bronx and Manhattan saw notable increases in their percentage of disconnected youth, which grew by 3.0 and 2.8 percentage points respectively between 2005-2007 and 2008-2010. These shares remained generally stable in Brooklyn and Queens, and the percentage of disconnected youth grew by only half a percentage point in Staten Island. By 2011-2013, with the exception of Brooklyn, in each of the boroughs the percentage of disconnected youth either returned to its pre-recession level or, in the case of Queens, remained generally stable. In Brooklyn, however, the percentage of disconnected youth fell by more than a percentage point between 2008-2010 and 2011-2013 after staying steady through the recession.

4. Health

A) Fewer New Yorkers were hospitalized for asthma.

The asthma hospitalization rate in 2012 continued to decline, hitting its lowest recorded level since 2000 of 2.7 hospitalizations per 1,000 residents from a level of 3.3 hospitalizations per resident in 2000. The drop in the rate of 0.4 hospitalizations per 1,000 residents observed between 2006 and 2012 was twice as large as the 0.2 drop experienced between 2000 and 2006. While clear racial disparities in asthma hospitalization persist, the overall decrease citywide in asthma hospitalizations was primarily driven by decreases among black and Hispanic residents. As Figure 5.16 illustrates, the percentage of blacks and Hispanics hospitalized declined by 0.3 and 0.4 percentage points between 2006 and 2012. In comparison, asthma hospitalizations for Whites and Asians only decreased by 0.2 and 0.1 percentage points.

---

2 In order to provide more timely estimates of the citywide unemployment rate, this figure uses data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This data source differs from the unemployment rate presented in Part 3, which uses data from the American Community Survey to produce neighborhood-level estimates for sub-borough areas. The two sources come from different surveys and should not be compared.
Figure 5.13: Labor Force Participation Rate, New York City and U.S.

Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2005-2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.14: Annual Average Unemployment Rate, New York City and U.S.

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics, NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.15:Disconnected Youth by Borough, New York City

Sources: American Community Survey (3-Year Estimates), NYU Furman Center

Figure 5.16: Asthma Hospitalization Rate (Per 1,000 Residents), New York City

B) The city’s infant mortality rate continued to fall and is now well below the national rate.

The city’s infant mortality rate, which reports the number of infants dying before reaching one year of age per 1,000 live births in a given year, fell from 6.7 in 2000 to 4.6 in 2013. This citywide decline of 2.1 infant deaths per 1,000 births was much larger than the national drop of 0.9 infant deaths per 1,000 births over the same period. After being nearly equal in 2000, the city rate in 2013 was well below that of the U.S. As illustrated in Figure 5.17, reductions in the infant mortality rate occurred for all races/ethnicities in the city, with infants born to black mothers experiencing the largest drop—2.8 infant deaths per 1,000 births. Infants born to white and Hispanic mothers showed declines in mortality of 1.5 infant deaths per 1,000 births, and infants born to Asian mothers had the lowest reduction of 0.6 infant deaths per 1,000 births. Relative to the reduction in the rates observed in the country as a whole for blacks and whites, the decline in the mortality rate of infants born to black mothers in New York was similarly large, while the rate for infants born to white mothers fell more in the city than in the country as a whole. In 2013, clear racial disparities in the infant mortality rate persisted in the city. Hispanics had a rate that exceeded that of whites by 1.4 infant deaths per 1,000 births while the gap for blacks was even larger, at 5.3 infant deaths per 1,000 births.

C) New Yorkers live longer but gender and racial disparities persist.

Life expectancies increased for both men and women between 2002 and 2012, and large disparities by gender persisted. In 2012, women lived longer than men and this difference was greatest among Hispanics, with a gap of ten years, and smallest for whites with a gap of seven years. The gender gap widened by a year for Hispanics and by two years for Asians, but remained steady for whites and blacks. Furthermore, large disparities within gender by race also persist. Of all women in 2012, white women lived longest at 84 years, followed by Asian women at 80 years, Hispanic women at 77 years, and then black women at 75 years. The same pattern exists across races/ethnicities for males. The racial/ethnic groups that had the largest gains in median life span between 2002 and 2012 were Hispanics (for both men and women) and Asians (especially females).

3 Our U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention source on national infant mortality by race does not provide tabulations for Asian or Hispanic mothers.
State of Neighborhood Services and Conditions

Indicators of school performance and public safety continued to improve in New York City. Meanwhile, the share of commuters using transit increased citywide, as did the share of bicycle commuters.

1. Elementary and Middle Schools and Student Performance

A) Proficiency rates in both math and English language arts improved in public elementary and middle schools between 2013 and 2014.

Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, New York State administered new annual exams designed to assess third through eighth graders’ performance according to the new Common Core Learning Standards. Compared to tests administered the previous year, markedly fewer students scored proficient or above on the new tests. However, students’ test scores improved in every borough between the first and second years in which the Common Core-based exams were administered.

Figures 6.1 and 6.2 show the percentage of students in grades three through eight scoring at or above a proficient level in math and English language arts, respectively, in the school years ending in 2013 and 2014. Students in Queens were more likely to perform at grade level in math than students in any other borough, with 42 percent scoring at or above proficient, while Manhattan had highest percentage performing at grade level in English language arts (34.8%). Students in Staten Island showed the greatest gains between 2013 and 2014 in math proficiency, while those in Brooklyn improved the most in English language arts. Students in the Bronx were less likely than those in other boroughs to perform at grade level in both subjects, and they made the smallest gains between 2013 and 2014.

B) There was significant variation in math and English language arts proficiency across school districts.

Figure 6.3 shows the variation in math proficiency rates across districts, and Figure 6.4 shows proficiency rates in English language arts. A majority of students performed at grade level in math in only four of New York City’s 32 districts: district 2 in Manhattan (Financial District/Mid-town/Upper East Side), district 20 in Brooklyn (Bay Ridge/Borough Park/West Bensonhurst), and districts 25 and 26 in Queens (Flushing/Whitestone/Kew Gardens Hills and Fresh Meadows/Bayside/Bellerose). Only in districts 2 and 26 did a majority of students score at or above proficient in English in 2014. Fewer than one in five students performed at grade level in math in eastern Brooklyn, central Harlem, and portions of the central and southern Bronx, while fewer than one in five performed at grade level in English language arts in eastern and central Brooklyn, northern Manhattan, and every district in the Bronx.

1 All figures in this section refer to New York City District schools, which do not include public charter schools.
Figure 6.1: Students (Grades Three through Eight) Performing at Grade Level in Math

Figure 6.2: Students (Grades Three through Eight) Performing at Grade Level in English Language Arts

Figure 6.3: Share of Students in Grades Three through Eight Performing at Grade Level in Math by School District, 2014

Figure 6.4: Share of Students in Grades Three through Eight Performing at Grade Level in English Language Arts by School District, 2014

Sources: New York City Department of Education, NYU Furman Center
It is difficult to measure longer-term changes in school performance, as the state tests have changed dramatically in recent years. Rather than looking at changes in proficiency rates, we instead ranked each district’s performance in math and English language arts in 2000 and 2014, and compared districts’ rankings in those two years. The districts with the greatest changes in rank in each subject are listed in Table 6.1 and Table 6.2. Three districts, all in Manhattan, stand out for their improved ranks in both math and English: districts 1 (Lower East Side), 3 (Upper West Side/Morningside Heights), and 4 (East Harlem). Each of these districts moved up at least six places between 2000 and 2014 in both subjects. In addition, districts 15 (Carroll Gardens/Park Slope/Sunset Park) and 13 (Brooklyn Heights/Prospect Heights/Clinton Hill) in Brooklyn improved notably in English language arts compared to other districts in the city, while districts 9 (Concourse/Highbridge/University Heights) and 10 (Fordham/Norwood/Riverdale) in the Bronx moved up four spots in math between 2000 and 2014. District 18 (Canarsie/Remsen Village) in Brooklyn experienced the greatest relative declines in both English language arts and math rank since 2000.

2. High School Graduation Rates
A) After dropping between 2010 and 2012, the high school graduation rate rebounded between 2012 and 2014.

The share of New York City high school students who graduate on time (by the end of June of their class year, which is four years after they matriculate in ninth grade) increased by more than 10 percentage points between 2005 and 2014 (to 64.2%), as shown in Figure 6.5. Citywide graduation rates dipped slightly from the class of 2010 to the class of 2012, but more than recovered by the class of 2014.

More than three-quarters of the class of 2014 in Staten Island graduated on time, while less than 55 percent in the Bronx graduated on time. While all boroughs experienced dips in on-time graduation rate after 2010, the Bronx was the only borough not to have fully recovered by 2014, with 56.1 percent of the class of 2010 graduating on time, and only 54.7 percent of the class of 2014 graduating on time.

B) In all five boroughs, fewer students dropped out of high school, and more received Regents diplomas in 2014 compared to 2005.

Between 2005 and 2014, the citywide dropout rate (defined as the share of students who have not graduated and are also not still enrolled in school as of June 30, four years after entering ninth grade) declined by 6.5 percentage points, as Figure 6.6 illustrates. In 2012, the New York State Board of Regents implemented a policy to end issuing local (that is, non-Regents) diplomas. Accordingly, the percentage of students receiving a Regents diploma increased during that period by 25.4 percentage points, to 60.6 percent. In 2014, Staten Island continued to have the highest percentage of Regents graduates (69.6%) while the Bronx, despite gains, had the lowest (50.5%). Students in Staten Island were also most likely to graduate with a Regents diploma with advanced distinction, although that rate has not changed significantly since 2005. The share receiving Regents diplomas with advanced distinction increased by nearly three percentage points citywide since 2005 and by more than four percentage points in Queens, a larger gain than in any other borough. Students in the Bronx are notably less likely to receive an advanced Regents diploma than in any other borough, with a rate more than seven percentage points lower than for the city as a whole.

2 In addition to the implementation of the Common Core standards, in 2010 the state increased the score required to meet the level of proficiency in each subject.
Table 6.1: Districts with Greatest Increases and Decreases in Rank for Math Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Math Rank 2000</th>
<th>Math Rank 2014</th>
<th>Change in Math Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower East Side</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Harlem</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upper West Side, Morningside Heights</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BX</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Concourse/Highbridge/University Heights</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BX</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fordham/Norwood/Riverdale</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greatest Decreases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ELA Rank 2000</th>
<th>ELA Rank 2014</th>
<th>Change in ELA Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Flatbush/Flatlands/Sheepshead Bay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bushwick</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Stuyvesant Heights</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Canarsie/Remsen Village</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: New York State Department of Education, NYU Furman Center

Table 6.2: Districts with Greatest Increases and Decreases in Rank for English Language Arts (ELA) Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ELA Rank 2000</th>
<th>ELA Rank 2014</th>
<th>Change in ELA Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lower East Side</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upper West Side, Morningside Heights</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Carroll Gardens/Park Slope/Sunset Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Harlem</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brooklyn Heights/Prospect Heights/Clinton Hill</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greatest Decreases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ELA Rank 2000</th>
<th>ELA Rank 2014</th>
<th>Change in ELA Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Washington Heights, Inwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Stuyvesant Heights</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E. Jamaica/Hollis/Queens Village/Rosedale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>BX</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Parkchester/Coop City/Williamsbridge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>BK</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Canarsie/Remsen Village</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: New York State Department of Education, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.5: Four-Year High School Graduation Rates (Measured in June), by Borough

Sources: New York City Department of Education, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.6: High School Outcomes in June of Class Year (Four Years after Matriculation)

Note: “Other” includes students who transferred to “an approved alternative high school education preparation program” and students who received Individualized Education Plan Diplomas in years in which such diplomas were offered. (New York State phased out these diplomas in 2013.)

Sources: New York City Department of Education, NYU Furman Center
The likelihood of a student attending college or other postsecondary programs varies widely by neighborhood. The New York City Department of Education calculates the postsecondary enrollment rate as the share of all students in each cohort who have both graduated high school and enrolled in a postsecondary institution—which includes two- and four-year colleges, vocational programs, and public service programs—six months after they were scheduled to graduate. Figure 6.7 shows how this rate varied across neighborhoods in 2013. In much of Manhattan, more than 80 percent of students in the class of 2013 were enrolled in a postsecondary institution by the end of 2013. In most of the Bronx and central Brooklyn, the rates were less than 50 percent.

3. Crime and Police

A) The serious crime rate in New York City declined dramatically over the past two decades but has remained steady in recent years.

Figure 6.8 shows the rate of serious felonies since 2000, broken out into serious property crimes (burglary, grand larceny, and car theft) and violent crimes (murder and non-negligent manslaughter, rape, felony assault, and robbery). The rate of serious felonies in 2014 (13.0 per 1,000 residents) was relatively unchanged from the low of 12.9 per 1,000 residents reached in 2010, which represented a drop of 10.1 crimes per 1,000 residents from 2000. Violent crime decreased significantly from 2000, when it was 7.6 per 1,000 residents, to 2009, when it reached a low of 4.6 per 1,000 residents, similar to the 2014 rate of 4.7 per 1,000 residents. The rate of serious property crimes fell to 8.1 per 1,000 residents in 2011, a decrease of 7.3 crimes per 1,000 residents from 2000, before increasing slightly to 8.4 per 1,000 residents in 2014.

B) Of the seven serious felonies, the rate of motor vehicle theft decreased the most since 2000, while the rate of grand larceny dropped the least.

Figure 6.9 illustrates the change in prevalence for each of the seven serious felonies reported by the New York City Police Department (NYPD), using an index where the rate for each crime type in 2000 is set at 100, allowing us to compare rates of change across crime types. The rate for all seven categories of crime was lower in 2014 than in 2000. Car theft showed the most dramatic declines since 2000, with rates in 2014 nearly 80 percent lower than in 2000. Burglary rates went down nearly 60 percent in that period, while murder (including non-negligent manslaughter) and robbery rates in 2014 were less than half their rates in 2000. Grand larceny, primarily comprised of the theft of property exceeding $1,000, declined the least during the first decade of the century and has increased slightly since reaching a low in 2010. The incidence of felony assault and the incidence of rape (as reported to the NYPD) have also both increased since reaching lows in 2008 and 2009 respectively.

C) Crime rates vary widely across neighborhoods.

Figure 6.10 shows the rates of serious violent felonies per 1,000 residents by borough. In 2014, the rate of serious violent crime in the Bronx was nearly three times the rate in Staten Island. Figure 6.11 shows that, even though the prevalence of serious property crimes fell dramatically in Manhattan since 2000, in 2014 it was still nearly three times as high as in Staten Island. Crime rates per 1,000 residents in Manhattan, however, are somewhat misleading. Manhattan, as a center for employment as well as leisure activities and tourism, attracts a large number of people during the day who do not live in the borough. (See sidebar for further discussion of the challenge of calculating crime rates.)
Figure 6.7: Post-Secondary Enrollment Six Months after High School Graduation by Zip Code, 2013
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Note: High schools are more likely to draw students from a wider geographic area than elementary or middle schools, so we allocated each high school’s rate of postsecondary enrollment according to the number of students living in each zip code who went to that high school.

Sources: New York City Department of Education, NYU Institute for Education and Social Policy, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.8: Serious Crime Rate (per 1,000 Residents) by Major Type, New York City
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Sources: New York City Police Department, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.9: Index of Crime Rates by Type of Crime, New York City (Index=100 in 2000)
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Sources: New York City Police Department, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.10: Serious Violent Crime Rate (per 1,000 Residents) by Borough
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Sources: New York City Police Department, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.11: Serious Property Crime Rate (per 1,000 Residents) by Borough
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Sources: New York City Police Department, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center
Daytime or Ambient Population and Alternative Definitions of Neighborhood Crime Rates

Crime rates are traditionally calculated by dividing the number of crimes by the number of residents in an area. For large geographies, using the count of residents as the denominator works well, as the count of residents reflects the overall population. For smaller geographies, however, especially those in which non-resident workers or others spend a significant portion of the day, the assumption that the resident population will include the whole set of potential victims and potential perpetrators is more problematic.

Figure 6.12 illustrates how traditional crime rates can sometimes be misleading. It shows the rate of serious property crimes per 1,000 residents in 2014, by police precinct. The colors group precincts into quintiles, and according to the map, eight of the 10 precincts in Manhattan below 59th Street are in the top quintile in terms of the rate of serious property crimes. But these rates are misleading because the daytime or ambient population of those neighborhoods, the number of people who typically spend time there over the course of a day, includes large numbers of workers, shoppers, tourists, and other visitors. (Much of the ambient population resides in New York City, and thus is included in citywide measures of the crime rate, but even such citywide measures do not account for populations of commuters, tourists, and shoppers.)

The primary reason resident population is normally used as the denominator in crime rate calculations is, of course, that such data are readily available; ambient population is much more difficult to estimate, as it changes based on many factors, including time of day, day of the week, time of year, and weather. We can, however, get closer to the true ambient population by adding the number of employees in a neighborhood to the number of residents. In order to avoid double-counting those who live and work in the same neighborhoods, we exclude employees who also reside in the same area.

Figure 6.13 shows the rate of serious property crimes per 1,000 residents and non-resident employees in 2014, colored according to quintile as in Figure 6.12. Comparing the two, the greatest differences are in lower Manhattan. When using resident population as the denominator, eight of the 10 precincts in lower Manhattan were in the top quintile; when using residents plus non-resident employees instead, only two of those precincts remain in the top quintile, while four move into the bottom quintile. The 84th precinct, covering Brooklyn Heights and Downtown Brooklyn, also goes from the top quintile to the bottom quintile.

When we examine the rate of serious violent crimes using each denominator, precincts in lower Manhattan appear to have lower rates relative to the rest of the city when including non-resident employees, although the difference is not as great as it is with property crimes.

4. Transit

A) More than 70 percent of New Yorkers commuted without a car in 2013, up from 64 percent in 2000.

Figure 6.14 illustrates the transportation modes used by commuting workers. In 2013, 27.4 percent of workers commuted by car, down from 33.9 percent in 2000. While the share of workers commuting by bicycle increased somewhat, the bulk of the increase in car-free commutes since 2000 came from the growth in the share of commuters using public transit, which rose from 32.6 percent to 59.1 percent. As Figure 6.15 shows, subway ridership increased in recent years, to nearly 5.5 million average weekday riders in 2013, while ridership on Metropolitan Transportation Authority buses decreased, suggesting that the increasing rate of public transit commuting was due to increased subway usage.
Figure 6.12: Serious Property Crime Rate (per 1,000 Residents) by Precinct, 2014
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Sources: New York City Police Department, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.13: Serious Property Crime Rate (per 1,000 Residents and Non-Resident Workers) by Precinct, 2014
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Sources: New York City Police Department, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.14: Means of Travelling to Work (Share of Workers Who Do Not Work at Home), New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Travel</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Free (Transit + Walk + Bike)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To be consistent with the way commute transportation modes are tabulated in the American Community Survey, public transit rates from the 2000 Census exclude those commuting by taxi. “Car” refers only to those using a personal motor vehicle other than a motorcycle.

Sources: U.S. Census (2000), American Community Survey (2013), NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.15: Average Weekday Ridership on Metropolitan Transportation Authority, New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subway</th>
<th>Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,465,034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5,042,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,693,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,372,939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,052,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,731,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,410,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bus category includes both New York City Transit bus and MTA Bus Company ridership.

Sources: Metropolitan Transportation Authority, NYU Furman Center
B) In most neighborhoods, the majority of commuters traveled to work by public transit, and that share grew across New York City.

Figure 6.16 shows, by neighborhood, the share of workers (excluding those who worked at home) who commuted via public transportation. Rates tended to be highest just outside the central business district (roughly, Manhattan south of 59th Street), in neighborhoods such as the Upper West Side in Manhattan, Astoria and Long Island City in Queens, and western and central Brooklyn. Areas without convenient subway access to Lower and Midtown Manhattan, such as eastern Queens, Flatlands/Canarsie in Brooklyn, and all of Staten Island, had much lower rates of public transit usage on average.

Still, the majority of workers in most neighborhoods used public transit to get to work; more than one third of commuters traveled to work via public transportation in all but three sub-borough areas: Tottenville/Great Kills (SI 03) and South Beach/Willowbrook (SI 02) in Staten Island, and Bayside/Little Neck (QN 11) in Queens.

Furthermore, Figure 6.17 shows that the share of commuters traveling to work via public transit increased in every neighborhood in the city between 2000 and 2011–2013. In Mott Haven/Hunts Point in the Bronx, Bushwick and East New York/Starrett City in Brooklyn, and Ridgewood/Maspeth in Queens, the share commuting by public transit increased by more than 10 percentage points between 2000 and 2011–2013.

C) The share of commuters who use a bicycle to get to work grew since 2000, though it remained small and concentrated in certain neighborhoods.

In most neighborhoods, as shown in Figure 6.18, cyclists comprised less than one percent of commuters, yet in northern and western Brooklyn, and in the Lower East Side in Manhattan, cyclists represented roughly four percent of commuters. Neighborhoods with relatively high shares of bicycle commuters also tended to have a high density of designated on-street bike routes (which includes bike lanes as well as signed bike routes without designated bike lanes). Sunset Park, Borough Park, and Flatbush/Midwood in Brooklyn, and Jackson Heights and Elmhurst/Corona in Queens, have relatively high shares of commuters traveling by bicycle despite comparatively limited on-street bike routes.

5. Parks

A) Although a large majority of New Yorkers live close to parks, some neighborhoods lack access to parks.

Figure 6.19 illustrates the share of residential units, by borough, living within a quarter mile of a park of at least a quarter acre in size. In 2014, only 56.8 percent of residential units in Staten Island were within a quarter mile walk of a park of at least a quarter acre, the lowest share of the five boroughs. Manhattan had the highest share (89.4%) of the five boroughs, with the Bronx close behind at 84.9 percent.

Access to parks varies widely by neighborhood, as Figure 6.20 illustrates. In the 1920s, the Bronx became known as the “Borough of Parks,” and indeed 95 percent or more of residential units in neighborhoods in the South and central Bronx were within a quarter mile of a park in 2014. Access to parks at least a quarter of an acre in size in some parts of southern Brooklyn and Queens was more limited, however. In Bensonhurst (BK 11), Borough Park (BK 12), Flatbush/Midwood (BK 14), and East Flatbush (BK 17) in Brooklyn, as well as Kew Gardens/Woodhaven (QN 09), South Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN 10), and Queens Village in Queens (QN 13), less than half of residential units were within one-quarter mile of a park a quarter acre or larger in size.
Figure 6.16: Share of Commuters Traveling to Work by Public Transit by Sub-Borough Area, 2011–2013
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Sources: American Community Survey, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.17: Percentage Point Change in Percentage of Commuters Using Public Transit by Sub-Borough Area, 2000 to 2011–2013

- 3.0 or Fewer
- 3.1-6.5
- 6.6-10.0
- More Than 10

Figure 6.18: Share of Commuters Traveling to Work by Bike by Sub-Borough Area, 2011–2013
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Sources: American Community Survey, New York City Department of Transportation, U.S. Census, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.19: Share of Residential Units Within a Quarter Mile of a Park of at Least a Quarter Acre, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, LION, PLUTO, NYU Furman Center

Figure 6.20: Share of Residential Units Within a Quarter Mile of a Park of a Quarter Acre or More, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-64.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%-79.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-94.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% or More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Parks and Airports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: New York City Department of Parks and Recreation; New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation; LION; PLUTO; NYU Furman Center