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Executive Summary

ew York City and the country as a whole face an incredible set of new challenges. Nationwide, housing prices have fallen dramatically and housing starts are at the lowest point in more than a generation. While the housing crisis was slower to hit New York City, signs of a local housing downturn are now unmistakable. As we come to terms with the end of an era of rapid price appreciation, questions abound: how severe will the downturn be? How long will it last? How many foreclosures will result? How will the softening market affect our neighborhoods? Will the fiscal downturn lead to the unraveling of much of the social progress the City has made through reductions in City services or increases in crime?

In past years, the Furman Center’s State of New York City’s Housing and Neighborhoods (State of the City, for short) examined many of the trends that undoubtedly contributed to the housing downturn. In our 2006 report, we examined the growing affordability challenges faced by New York City homeowners. We found that less than 5% of homes were affordable to New Yorkers earning the City’s median income, and reported stark racial disparities in homeownership rates. Building on these findings, in 2007 we took a closer look at how New Yorkers have purchased homes over the past decade—exploring the rise of subprime and piggyback lending and shifts in the demographics of home buyers in the City. This past year, the Furman Center further explored the implications of high-leverage, high-cost lending, documenting significant increases in the City’s foreclosure rate and identifying the spillover costs of concentrated foreclosures on our communities.

TRENDS IN NEW YORK CITY HOUSING PRICE APPRECIATION

This year, we have taken a step back to investigate and describe the booms and busts of the City’s housing market over the past four decades, and to look for any lessons those earlier times provide for today. Using our own Index of Housing Price Appreciation—a measure of average sales price changes dating from 1974 that adjusts for inflation and controls for variation in the quality of housing—we track how the City, its boroughs and its community districts fared during the last four housing price cycles. Specifically, we look at the last two upturns (1980–1989 and 1996–2006) and the last two downturns (1974–1980 and 1989–1996). Over the entire period, from 1974 to 2006, home prices in New York City grew by 250%. That breaks down as follows:

- Between 1974 and 1980, prices declined by 12.4% citywide.
- Between 1980 and 1989, prices increased by 152%.
- From 1989 to 1996, prices dropped by 29.3%.
- From 1996 to 2006, the City’s latest boom, housing prices increased by 124%.

On average, despite very high price levels, housing prices in the City have not risen as much over the past two decades as they have around the country: in the most recent upturn, New York’s impressive growth of 124% was dwarfed by growth of 189% nationwide. Of course, the City and national averages obscure a lot of variation. Take, for example, the tremendous growth in Upper Manhattan during this last period of prosperity: In East Harlem, prices grew by 500%; in Morningside Heights, prices grew by 399%; and in Washington Heights, prices grew by 333%. During the busts, some neighborhoods were hit much harder than the City average, while other areas defied the City trend and actually saw big gains: from 1974 to 1980, Highbridge/Concourse in the Bronx lost 30% of its value, while prices in the Upper East Side grew by 60%. In our analysis chapter, we explain in detail how individual boroughs and community districts fared during these cycles.
In the chapter, we explore the relationship between neighborhood characteristics and neighborhood prices, and look for trends to help explain this variation. Some of our key findings are:

• **Despite the Downturns, the City Continued to Make Important Progress.** New York City appears to be highly resilient, recovering from troubled times in a way that many other older, industrial cities have not been able to. Over the period of time we study, which encompasses some of the darkest days in the City’s modern history, the City’s price gains far surpassed the losses. Social welfare indicators improved: crime rates fell, great progress was made in school performance, and poverty and unemployment rates improved in every borough.

• **Predicting Which Neighborhoods Will Do Well or Will Fare Poorly Is Very Difficult.** There is less correlation between how a neighborhood does in one cycle and how it does in the next than one might expect. However, a few general principles stand out:

  • **Price Trends During Past Downturns Are Not Reliable Predictors of Price Trends in Future Downturns.** Whether a neighborhood fared poorly or well in the 1974–1980 housing bust had little relationship to how that neighborhood performed in the next downturn.

  • **Strong Performance in 1980–1989 Upturn Was Correlated with Gains in the Most Recent Upturn.** Eight of the ten neighborhoods with the largest increases in the 1980s boom were also among the neighborhoods with the largest price increases in the most recent boom.

  • **Price Trends in Wealthy Neighborhoods Are Counter-Intuitive.** Contrary to what one might expect, higher-income neighborhoods are not insulated from downturns, and investing in such a neighborhood does not necessarily guarantee strong future gains. Rather, prices in higher-income neighborhoods tended to grow less than the City average in the 1980s upturn and fall further in the 1990s downturn. In the most recent upturn (1996–2006), there was virtually no correlation between neighborhood income and sales price performance.

• **City Investment Is Correlated with Greater Stability in Poor Neighborhoods.** Poor neighborhoods that received significant public investment to rehabilitate and increase their affordable housing stock experienced smaller price declines in the 1990s downturn, and in some cases even saw prices increase during that period. Indeed, City investment was more closely related to smaller housing price declines than any other neighborhood characteristic we studied. These neighborhoods that enjoyed significant public investment in housing did not generally experience the large scale price drops and vacancy experienced in the 1970s. This finding takes on new salience today, as many local governments face difficult decisions about how to respond to neighborhoods devastated by foreclosure.

**Signs of Progress & New Challenges Facing the City**

Given the tumultuous past year, and the continuing gloomy news reports, it is hard to focus on recent progress. But it is important to recognize the impressive strides the City has made in revitalizing neighborhoods and the substantial gains it has made in improving the social welfare of its residents. These investments have hopefully created a safety net that will play an even more important role in helping to stabilize neighborhoods as the City faces a downturn. For example, the City’s median income continued to rise, reaching $48,631 in 2007—higher than most other large cities (with the exception of Washington D.C. and Boston). From 2006 to 2007, the poverty rate continued to fall, for the entire population as well as among more vulnerable populations (children under 18 and adults 65 and older). And the City’s New Housing Marketplace Plan reached the half way mark in 2008—having financed half of the 165,000 units of affordable housing it promises to create.

The building boom is over; in 2007, the number of new building permits issued dropped for the first time
in a decade, falling from 31,453 in 2006 to 25,189 in 2007. This trend certainly continued in 2008 although we don’t yet have final figures for 2008. Foreclosure filings increased 50% citywide between 2006 and 2007, from 10,000 to 15,000, and remained at 15,000 in 2008. At the same time, mortgage financing has begun to dry up: 14% fewer borrowers took out loans to purchase a home, and 31% fewer homeowners obtained refinance loans in 2007 than in 2006. Particularly troubling is the disproportionate impact that both increases in foreclosures and declines in mortgage lending have had on communities of color throughout the City. Our research shows that in many cases the same neighborhoods that had the highest rates of high cost lending, and the highest rates of foreclosure, are now also seeing the greatest declines in new investment, leaving these neighborhoods particularly vulnerable to further decline.

WHAT’S NEW IN THE STATE OF THE CITY 2008?

This year, we’ve added several indicators to help measure the environmental health of our neighborhoods, and to lay the foundation for tracking the impact of some of the sustainability strategies that the City recently has put in place. For the first time, this State of the City tracks waste and recycling data, bicycle and public transportation usage, proximity to major air pollutants, and access to parks. Some of these data are featured in a new section titled “The State of Sustainable New York City,” which looks at how New York City neighborhoods are faring on several environmental indicators. Additional data on environmental quality can be found on the individual community district pages. Detailed descriptions of what these new indicators measure is available in the “Indicator Definitions and Rankings” section.

In addition, we have added a new section, “The State of New York City Preservation,” which looks at historic landmark and preservation activity across the City over the past five decades. Data on the percentage of units in a historic district can be found on the borough pages. We have also updated the State of New Yorkers section, which was first introduced last year and reports quality of life indicators by race/ethnicity rather than by geography.

We added several new features to the Community District profiles. At the top of each page, we have custom maps and tables that highlight interesting and important trends for each district, from maps of foreclosure filings or buildings in a historic district to graphs showing how the composition of the district’s housing stock compares to that of the City.

Finally, we are delighted to announce that this year, in conjunction with the release of the State of the City, we are releasing a redesigned, streamlined NYCHANIS. As we hope you already know, the New York City Housing and Neighborhood Information System (NYCHANIS) is an interactive website that allows users to view, map, and download data on the housing, demographics and social welfare of New York City’s neighborhoods. Thanks to a partnership with Knowledgeplex, the new site features enhanced searching capabilities and advanced mapping and graphing techniques. We encourage you to visit the new site at www.nychanis.com.

We hope you appreciate these additions and we look forward to your feedback and ideas, which you can send to furmancenter@nyu.edu.
As New Yorkers come to accept that the housing boom of the last ten years is over, many are wondering how the downturn will affect their neighborhoods: How much, if at all, will sale prices fall? Will the prices in my neighborhood drop more than in other neighborhoods? Should I be concerned about other negative trends, such as an increase in poverty or crime?

While there is no crystal ball to predict how bad this downturn will be or which neighborhoods will be hit hardest, history can provide some helpful context. In the past 34 years, New York City housing prices experienced two periods of rapid increase—1980–1989 and 1996–2006—and two periods of decline—1974–1980 and 1989–1996. Fortunately, both booms were substantial, and both busts, although difficult, were relatively small. Overall, prices increased by 250% from 1974 to 2006.

This chapter explores these four periods of price appreciation and decline, using the Furman Center’s Index of Housing Price Appreciation and other data, to identify persistent trends and useful lessons. The chapter is divided into three parts. The first describes each boom and bust, its impact on the City and boroughs, and the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the neighborhoods with the biggest price changes. The second looks at a variety of neighborhood characteristics and attempts to identify which, if any, are useful predictors of how a neighborhood will fare in an upturn or downturn. Finally, to address questions about individual neighborhoods, we provide a detailed case study of one representative community from each borough. These case studies follow the neighborhoods from 1970 to 2006 and describe not only housing sale price trends but also changes in other economic, social and environmental characteristics.

1 According to the Furman Center’s Index of Housing Price Appreciation, derived from sales data collected by the New York City Department of Finance, 1974–2006. 2 For more information on the Index of Housing Price Appreciation, see the Indicator Definitions and Rankings section. The index shows a decrease in housing sale prices from 2006 to 2007 for single family and 2–4 family buildings in New York City.

**Figure 1: Index of Housing Price Appreciation in New York City (1974–2006)**

(Index=100 in 1989)
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Source: New York City Department of Finance, Furman Center
In the 1970s, New York City was devastated by national and municipal economic crises. Rising crime, unemployment and poverty rates, coupled with a lack of social services, made many neighborhoods inhospitable. The City’s population declined by more than 800,000 people, and many disadvantaged neighborhoods were littered with abandoned buildings. Between 1974, the first year for which we have sales price data, and 1980, housing sale prices declined by 12.4% citywide. After at least six years of decline, housing sale prices across the City soared from 1980 to 1989, increasing by 152%. Prices in 18 neighborhoods increased by more than 200%, and only one neighborhood saw prices grow by less than 100%. This boom ended as the nation entered a recession in 1989.

From 1989 to 1996, prices dropped by 29.3%. In contrast, during this period housing prices remained quite flat in the ten largest metro areas, declining only 4%. In 1996, the City entered the decade-long boom that only just ended. Sale prices increased in every neighborhood, and the average price increase for the City was 124.2%. Construction exploded (new building permits quadrupled between 1996 and 2006, see Figure 2) and the City’s population grew significantly.

While the City’s latest upturn was large, the boom was even more pronounced nationwide; prices increased 189% in the ten metro areas (including New York City) covered by the Case-Shiller Composite of 10 Price Index. Figure 3 compares the housing price trends of these ten metro areas to New York City.

The City government reacted to the changing economic landscape with City investment programs. In the 1970s, as vacant buildings and tax foreclosures increased, the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development became the second largest landlord in the City. By 1979, the City had taken over ownership of 100,000 residential units. Ultimately, the City undertook a massive program of affordable housing renovation, rehabilitation and new construction. The program began in 1985 with the launch of the Five-Year Plan, which was quickly extended and renamed the Ten-Year Plan. Funds were concentrated in the South Bronx and Upper Manhattan—some of the most distressed areas in the City. By the end of the 1990s downturn, most City-owned buildings had been rehabilitated and most vacant land was
in development. As the Ten-Year Plan wound down, the City’s housing stock was in much better shape: 34,000 new affordable units had been built, 49,000 affordable units were rehabilitated, and 125,000 units had received renovation subsidies. In 2003, in response to continuing affordability pressures, the City launched a new affordable housing initiative, the New Housing Marketplace Plan.8

HOW DID THE DIFFERENT BOROUGHS AND NEIGHBORHOODS FARE IN BOOMS AND BUSTS?

New York is a city of diverse neighborhoods; looking solely at citywide trends masks significant variation. What follows is a more detailed examination of how different parts of the City fared in each boom and bust, including analysis of the ten neighborhoods with the greatest sale price increases and decreases in each upturn and downturn; the tables list five from each group.

OUR DATA

Our analysis is based on the Index of Housing Price Appreciation, a “repeat sales index” the Furman Center constructs using data on property sales provided by the New York City Department of Finance. This inflation-adjusted index is based on average price changes in individual properties sold multiple times between 1974 and 2007. This method provides a more accurate picture of price changes than simply looking at changes in the median or average price of all sales each year because it controls for differences in the underlying characteristics of the properties that sell in any given year. The index includes almost a quarter of a million pairs of sales throughout the City. However, in the context of this chapter, it is important to remember that the number of repeat sales in some community districts (CDs) is relatively small.9 Sales volumes are particularly low in Upper Manhattan and the South Bronx, where the vast majority of residents are renters.10

In this chapter, to increase the volume of sales under investigation, we pooled data for repeat sales of single family, two to four family buildings, five or more family buildings, and condominiums (co-ops are excluded). After 1974, we report data in a rolling two-year average to smooth out variations that may be due to small numbers of sales in some years. For example, the 1980 figure is the average of sales data from 1980 and 1979. In some CDs this may mask variations in house prices between the start and end of each period.

The repeat sales index is an excellent indicator of changes in neighborhood quality.11 As a neighborhood improves, it becomes more attractive to renters, buyers and landlords, which causes housing sale prices to rise. However, understanding the other neighborhood changes that accompany price trends is also a key part of understanding the impact of these housing cycles. Therefore, in addition to our repeat sales index, we investigate changes in neighborhood characteristics and demographic patterns, using data from the Neighborhood Change Database12 and the American Community Survey.13

---

8 Van Ryzin and Genn (1999).
9 Sales volumes are particularly low in Upper Manhattan and the South Bronx, where the vast majority of residents are renters.10
10 For example, the 1980 figure is the average of sales data from 1980 and 1979. In some CDs this may mask variations in house prices between the start and end of each period.
11 The repeat sales index is an excellent indicator of changes in neighborhood quality.11 As a neighborhood improves, it becomes more attractive to renters, buyers and landlords, which causes housing sale prices to rise. However, understanding the other neighborhood changes that accompany price trends is also a key part of understanding the impact of these housing cycles. Therefore, in addition to our repeat sales index, we investigate changes in neighborhood characteristics and demographic patterns, using data from the Neighborhood Change Database12 and the American Community Survey.13
12 The Neighborhood Change Database, created by the Urban Institute and Geolytics, reports census tract level data from the long form of each Decennial Census between 1970 and 2000 with tract boundaries normalized to 2000. For more information see http://www2.urban.org/mnip/ncua/nodb.html.
13 There are some restrictions in comparing across datasets (outlined in Methods). For example, racial comparisons are not advised between 1970 and later years because racial definitions have changed.
The 1970s Downturn

During the 1970s downturn, prices fell by 12.4% city-wide. As shown in Figure 4, prices in all boroughs except Manhattan declined.

The Bronx
- In the South Bronx, homes lost between a quarter and a third of their value.
- Prices in the northern Bronx also fell, but saw a more modest decline of 3–13%.

Brooklyn
- Every neighborhood in Brooklyn, except Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights and Park Slope/Carroll Gardens, saw price declines.

Manhattan
- Manhattan survived this downturn largely unscathed, with an average price increase of 28.6%.14
- The Lower East Side/Chinatown was a notable exception to Manhattan’s price appreciation, and is detailed in case study 3.

Queens
- Houses in Rego Park/Forest Hills maintained value, but home prices in all other neighborhoods dropped, with most decreasing 10–20%.
- Ozone Park/Howard Beach (highlighted in case study 4) saw the biggest drop in value—19.4%.

Staten Island
- Prices in St. George/Stapleton fell by 14%, compared with modest 1–5% declines throughout the rest of the borough.

Tables 1 and 2 highlight the five neighborhoods that had the greatest declines in housing sale prices and the five neighborhoods that had the greatest increases in housing sale prices during this period.

There are several notable features of the neighborhoods whose sale prices fared best and worst during this time period. The neighborhoods with the largest decreases had high rates of poverty, low mean incomes and low educational attainment.15 The neighborhoods that saw price increases were mostly in Manhattan. They had relatively high mean incomes, more educated residents and large white populations. In both groups, a neighborhood’s performance during this downturn was a poor predictor of its performance in subsequent booms and busts. The worst performing neighborhoods, rather than continuing to fall behind, tended to follow the City average in later decades. With the exception of the two Brooklyn neighborhoods, the neighborhoods that did relatively well in this downturn did not see housing prices grow faster than the City average in subsequent decades.

14 The Financial District and Central Harlem are omitted from analysis for this period due to a lack of complete data.
15 In these neighborhoods, the poverty rate was 21% (City rate: 14.7%); the mean income ranged from $5,893 to $11,504 (City: $10,351); and 31.4% of the population had a high school education (compared to 36.3% of the City’s population). Only South Ozone Park/Howard Beach had an average household income that was higher than the City average.
1980–1989 Boom Times

The 1980s were a time of rapid price appreciation; prices increased by 152% citywide from 1980 to 1989, and all boroughs saw big gains.

**The Bronx**
- Those neighborhoods closest to Manhattan fared no better than those in the North Bronx.
- Only one neighborhood (Belmont/East Tremont) saw prices rise more than the City average.

**Brooklyn**
- Prices climbed considerably: half of the community districts in Brooklyn saw prices increase by more than 200%.
- Park Slope/Carroll Gardens, Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights and Greenpoint/Williamsburg—the three areas neighboring Manhattan—fared exceptionally well.
- The eastern half of Brooklyn had smaller but still sizable increases, between 150 and 175%.

**Manhattan**
- Neighborhoods with higher initial home values enjoyed a smaller percentage increase than neighborhoods which started the decade with lower initial home values.\(^{16}\)
- Upper Manhattan neighborhoods experienced significant price increases.

**Queens**
- Prices increased at a greater rate than the City average in the neighborhoods closest to Manhattan, while neighborhoods bordering Long Island saw smaller increases.\(^{17}\)

**Staten Island**
- Home values increased by only 103–130%, less than the City average.

The characteristics of neighborhoods with the largest and smallest sale price increases in the 1980s were notably different from the characteristics associated with the largest and smallest decreases in the 1970s. In the housing bust of the 1970s, the neighborhoods with the largest decreases tended to have high poverty rates, low mean incomes, and few white residents. In contrast, in the boom years of the 1980s, the neighborhoods with the smallest sale price increases had higher mean incomes and a greater than average percentage of white residents. In addition, these neighborhoods (with the exception of those in the Bronx) tended to have much higher home ownership rates than the City average.

The neighborhoods that experienced the biggest increases in the 1980s had larger Hispanic populations, higher poverty rates, fewer home-owning residents, and lower mean household incomes than the City as a whole.

\(^{16}\) For example, Greenwich Village/Soho, Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay, Upper East Side, and Upper West Side saw more modest increases than neighborhoods like Morningside/Hamilton Heights, Central and East Harlem and Washington Heights/Inwood.

\(^{17}\) The neighborhoods with larger increases were: Astoria, Woodside/Sunnyside, Jackson Heights, Elmhurst/Corona and Kew Gardens/Woodhaven.

---

**Table 3: Neighborhoods with the Largest Increases in Sale Prices (1980–1989)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>East Harlem (MN)</td>
<td>354.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK)</td>
<td>299.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Sunset Park (BK)</td>
<td>265.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)</td>
<td>262.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)</td>
<td>257.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Neighborhoods with the Smallest Increases in Sale Prices (1980–1989)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Midtown (MN)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)</td>
<td>102.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)</td>
<td>106.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Hunts Point/Longwood (BX)</td>
<td>108.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Morrisania/Crotona (BX)</td>
<td>108.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1989–1996 Downturn

Along with the rest of the country, New York entered a downturn at the end of the 1980s. Citywide, prices fell by nearly 30%, more than twice the drop witnessed between 1974 and 1980, and even in Manhattan prices fell significantly. There was less variation in price declines across neighborhoods during this downturn than there was during the 1974 to 1980 downturn, and the differences that did exist are harder to explain.

The Bronx and Brooklyn

- Unlike in the 1970s, some of the poorest neighborhoods in the Bronx and Brooklyn fared relatively well. In fact, prices actually rose in three neighborhoods in the Bronx and two in Brooklyn.
- On the whole, Brooklyn saw average price declines (prices in eleven Brooklyn neighborhoods dropped 27–29%).

Manhattan

- Prices in Upper Manhattan experienced the sharpest declines in the borough.¹⁸

Queens

- While Queens was home to four of the ten worst performing neighborhoods, the borough’s average price decline was in line with the City’s.

Staten Island

- Prices in Staten Island suffered the biggest price decline of any borough during the period, with prices in all three of its community districts falling by over 30%.

The neighborhoods that bore the brunt of the 1990s downturn tended to have larger Hispanic populations than the City average. Poverty and educational attainment were in line with the City average, but mean income was lower than average. However, the neighborhoods that suffered the most during the 1990s downturn are remarkably diverse, and there is no clear common link to explain why this group had the largest sale price decreases.

Of the neighborhoods that avoided the worst of the downturn, some even saw price increases. They tended to have relatively large black and Hispanic populations, high poverty rates, low mean incomes, and smaller numbers of high school graduates.¹⁹ Prices in these neighborhoods saw a big drop in the 1970s downturn and had below average increases in the 1980s and 2000s upturns. These trends may indicate emerging sale price stability in these neighborhoods. For greater detail see part two and the case study 1.

¹⁸ Only Greenwich Village/Soho, Upper West Side and Central Harlem fared better than citywide average.
¹⁹ Mean household income in 1990 ranged from about $16,000 to 23,000 for these 10 neighborhoods. The City average was $41,741. Nine of the neighborhoods had more black residents than the City average while the seven neighborhoods that had more Hispanics than average were all majority Hispanic. Poverty was also typically twice the City average.
1996–2006 Boom Times

In the most recent boom, prices soared dramatically in the City, especially in Manhattan and in outer borough neighborhoods close to Manhattan. Citywide, prices rose by 124.2%.

The Bronx
- Prices in most of the Bronx increased relatively little, but once again, the “Manhattan effect” had some impact on prices in the South Bronx.20

Brooklyn
- Neighborhoods closest to Manhattan accounted for three of the ten neighborhoods with the largest increases, but most of Brooklyn experienced below average price appreciation.

Manhattan
- Upper Manhattan neighborhoods really stood out, with price increases from 270 to 500%

Queens
- Areas close to Manhattan (Astoria, Woodside/Sunyside) did better (135–150%).

Staten Island
- Of the five boroughs, prices increased the least in Staten Island; two of its three neighborhoods were among the ten lowest increase areas.

As in the previous upturn, the ten neighborhoods with the smallest increases in the 2000s were solidly middle class with relatively low crime and high levels of educational attainment.21 In 2000, median house prices in these neighborhoods were 12% below the City median, and remained low through 2006. In 2006, foreclosure and subprime rates were both larger than the City average.22

The neighborhoods with the largest price increases, on the other hand, were a more diverse group, including largely immigrant neighborhoods such as Greenpoint/Williamsburg and the Lower East Side/Chinatown, high-poverty neighborhoods in Upper Manhattan like Central and East Harlem, and some more affluent neighborhoods such as Greenwich Village. However, these neighborhoods did share one significant characteristic: eight of the ten were also among the neighborhoods with the largest price increases in the boom of the 1980s.

20 Neighborhoods bordering Manhattan tended to perform better than the City average.
21 Morrisania/Crotona, a high-poverty area, was an exception.
22 The foreclosure rate (defined as number of properties per 1000 receiving a notice of foreclosure) for the ten neighborhoods with the smallest increases went from 75% of the average in 1990 to 110% in 2006; subprime mortgages as a percentage of the mortgage market rose from 93% of the City average in 1990 to 132% in 2006. In this chapter, “subprime” refers to loans originated by lenders who specialized in subprime lending as identified by HUD. In 2004, HMDA began identifying “high-cost” loans that had APRs higher than a benchmark treasury rate. While we use the high-cost definition throughout the rest of the book, we use the subprime definition for this chapter to make historical comparisons. Because of these differing methodologies, the subprime loan numbers in this section are not directly comparable to the high-cost loan numbers in the rest of the book. For more information, see the Indicator Definitions and Rankings and Methods sections of this book.
In this section, we investigate a variety of neighborhood characteristics and explore which, if any, are good predictors of how a neighborhood will fare in different markets. We start by evaluating whether a neighborhood’s housing sale price performance in previous upturns and downturns predicts how it will perform in future booms and busts. In other words, we ask: if a neighborhood fared well in past downturns, is it more likely to do well in future downturns? Next, we look at whether and how a neighborhood’s socioeconomic characteristics affect the price trends in upturns and downturns. Here, we use income as a proxy for the socioeconomic characteristics of a neighborhood because income is closely related to educational attainment and poverty. We evaluate whether wealthy neighborhoods are more or less likely to be insulated from downturns, and whether poor neighborhoods are more or less likely to see big increases in upturns. Finally, and potentially most importantly for policymakers, we explore the association between the City’s investments in affordable housing and neighborhood price appreciation.

Can we predict future sales price performance based on past performance?
The short answer is no, if one is trying to predict performance in a downturn. Neighborhood performance in the downturn of the 1970s and in the upturn of the 1980s were both poor predictors of how a neighborhood fared in the 1990s downturn. In other words, prior price trends had little bearing on how neighborhoods fared in the later downturn. Thus, as enticing as it might be, policymakers and those interested in forecasting how the current downturn will impact New York’s neighborhoods should not simply turn to prior price trends.

**Figure 8** shows, however, that there does appear to be a relationship between performance in prior upturns and performance in future upturns. Neighborhoods that saw strong price appreciation in the 1980s also were more likely to see strong price appreciation in the 2000s. The opposite is also true; neighborhoods with weak performance in the 1980s were more likely to experience weak performance in the 2000s. This implies that sales trends in the upturns were not independent of each other and that neighborhood characteristics may have exerted some influence on sale prices.

**How do socioeconomic characteristics affect neighborhood price trends?**
One might expect to find a relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of a neighborhood and its sale price changes in boom and bust cycles. To test this relationship, we examined the link between a neighborhood’s mean income at the start of a boom or bust and the percent increase or decrease in housing sale prices for that neighborhood for each decade. Mean income is highly correlated with other socioeconomic characteristics such as education, poverty rates, and unemployment rates. We found that in the 1970s neighborhoods with higher average household income tended to experience smaller than average declines in house prices in the 1974–1980 downturn. In the boom of the 1980s and the bust of the early 1990s, richer community districts were less likely than other districts to experience dramatic price increases in the 1980s and were more likely than other districts to see big price drops in the downturn of 1989–1996. Prices in poorer community districts were more likely to have greater increases in the boom of the 1980s and smaller drops in the early 90s downturn. In the most recent upturn (1996–2006), we found no correlation between neighborhood income and price appreciation, suggesting that this latest boom was more widespread than previous price swings had been.
Other researchers have explored the relationship between neighborhood income and housing price changes in other major U.S. cities. For example, as in New York, in the 1980s upturn, poorer neighborhoods in Boston and Chicago experienced greater price increases than richer neighborhoods. However, unlike in New York, poorer neighborhoods in Boston were more likely to see steep declines in the downturn of the 1990s.

Given that the relationship between the income of a neighborhood’s residents and the sales price performance is different for each upturn and downturn, and for other large cities, we must conclude that household income is a poor predictor of future neighborhood price trends.

Is City investment associated with neighborhood price trends?

We analyze the relationship between public investment in a neighborhood’s housing stock and the neighborhood’s price trends by comparing City investment with neighborhood price appreciation in the 1989–1996 downturn and the 1996–2006 upturn.

We find that City investment was strongly correlated with smaller price declines in the 1990s downturn, and less strongly, but still positively, correlated with larger increases in the 2000s upturn. In fact, City investment was more closely related to smaller housing price declines than any other neighborhood characteristic we studied.

Our analysis does not allow us to make a causal connection between City investment and protection from downturns (i.e. we cannot prove that it was the public investment in housing stock that insulated these communities from larger price declines), but it is still worth noting—and should be of interest to policymakers as we begin another downturn—that areas which received greater City investment were less likely to experience price declines in the last downturn. From 1989 to 1996, homes in five otherwise depressed neighborhoods gained value as housing prices plummeted around them. All ten neighborhoods that avoided the worst of the downturn of the early 1990s received well above aver-
Of course, it is possible that what we are measuring here is not the effect of City investment, but rather some other characteristic that neighborhoods which receive City investment all have in common, such as low initial housing prices. We know from previous research however, that public investment in neighborhoods can have strong positive impacts on surrounding properties, and those spillovers may have been part of what stabilized these neighborhoods. Further, prices were not at rock bottom at the beginning of the 1990s downturn in these City investment neighborhoods—in the 1980s, prices in these neighborhoods had increased by over 100%.

Despite their relative insulation from steep price declines, the neighborhoods which received City investment did not see significant improvements in other economic indicators (such as poverty, educational attainment and unemployment) compared to the rest of the City by 2000, and they tended to be the same neighborhoods that were hit hardest by the subprime mortgage and foreclosure crisis. Thus, while investments in the housing stock may have played a role in stabilizing the value of the neighborhood's housing in the short term, it appears to have done little to improve the socioeconomic indicators of the neighborhood.

As housing prices improved citywide in the boom years of 1996–2006, the City continued to invest in largely the same depressed neighborhoods as it had in the 1990s. The amount of City funding—and the number of units being built—was significantly lower in this period than in the 1990s. The relationship between City investment and housing prices was also not as strong. In contrast to the downturn, prices in only two of the neighborhoods receiving the most assistance increased in value notably more than the City average.

For policymakers, the fact that neighborhoods which received significant investment were relatively protected from the past downturn provides an interesting lesson. We do not know whether this relationship will hold up in this next downturn, but direct City investment may offer a powerful counterforce to the current downturn.
CONCLUSION

Reassuringly, despite past price volatility, the overall health of the City’s real estate market remained strong over the past three decades, with the losses from the downturns representing only a fraction of gains from the upturns. While there is no crystal ball to predict how neighborhoods will respond to market forces, our analysis does identify a number of interesting patterns and trends. We found that past downturn price changes are not a reliable predictor of future changes, but great upturns generally signal that a neighborhood will do well again in the next boom.

We found a more complicated story when we evaluated how, if at all, neighborhood characteristics can help us understand how neighborhoods will fare in the future. We found that residing in a higher-income neighborhood provided no shelter from price falls and no guarantee of future gains. Instead, prices in higher-income neighborhoods tended to grow less than the City average in the 1980s upturn and fall further in the 1990s downturn; and in the most recent upturn, there was virtually no correlation between income and sales price performance. On the other hand, poorer neighborhoods that received large City investment in their housing prices fared much better in the 1990s downturn, with a number actually experiencing increases to the value of their housing stock during that time. These neighborhoods were generally protected from repeating the devastation of the 1970s downturn.

It also is heartening to note that even as housing sale prices declined, neighborhoods often still improved in other ways. For example, crime rates fell, while educational attainment shot up in many neighborhoods, and by 2006 these rates along with poverty and unemployment had improved in every borough.

Our retrospective of New York City housing trends ends in 2006 at the peak of the latest housing boom. A recession officially began across the country in December 2007, and the City and state are now facing daunting budget shortfalls. Although the housing crisis hit New York City after the rest of the country, the City has now likely entered its next downturn. Between 2006 and 2007, the number of foreclosure filings increased by 50% across the City, with significant concentrations in some community districts.44 Access to credit was also drastically cut, with financial institutions granting 14% fewer home purchase loans.45 But while these times are hard, there is a note of optimism in our findings: past downturns in house prices have been modest in comparison to the upturns. Evidence suggests that hard won social and economic gains will not be easily given up.

---

34 Schill et al. (2002) similarly confine their analysis to housing units that received City funding.
35 The seven neighborhoods with the most rehabilitation are: Mott Haven/ Melrose, Hunts Point/Longwood, Morrisania/Crotona, Highbridge/Concourse, Fordham/University Heights, Belmont/East Tremont and Central Harlem. In each, 15–29% of units were rehabilitated (based on the total number of units in each district in 2000). The City average was 4.97% of units.
36 See Figure 6.
37 Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights received City capital investment for 15% of units and had the seventh best rise in the 1980s of 242%. Three of the other highest rehabilitation neighborhoods (Hunts Point/Longwood, Morrisania/Crotona, Highbridge/Concourse) were among the smallest gainers in the 1980s.
38 Other researchers have found potential neighborhood spillover effects of direct rehabilitation that contributed to neighborhood regeneration. Specifically, Schill et al. (2002) found that prices of homes within 500 feet of revitalized units increased in value relative to those beyond 500 feet but still in the same neighborhood. In addition, we ran simple regressions to examine the relationship between City capital investment rates and housing price trends from 1989–1996 while controlling for other factors. These regressions indicated that City capital investment had a significant and positive relationship with sales price trends.
39 Prices in these neighborhoods grew between 108% and 215% in the 1980s upturn.
40 Foreclosure rates in the neighborhoods with high City investments increased to twice the City average in 2000 and three times average by 2006. Subprime mortgage rates in these neighborhoods increased in 2000 as the City average fell, and were typically twice the City average by 2006.
41 Of course, it is possible that without the investments, the socioeconomic indicators of the neighborhood would have worsened. More research would be needed to show any causal link. For more information about fears of decreased affordability, see Van Ryzin and Genn (1999).
42 From 1996 to 2006, the City average of rehabilitated or constructed units was only 2.33% compared to 4.97% in the 1990s. R= .33.
43 The best performers were Central Harlem and East Harlem. Central Harlem topped the charts with 18% of its housing stock rehabilitated or constructed and a 270% jump in housing prices. The worst performer was Morrisania/Crotona.
44 For more detailed information see the community districts pages.
Morrisonia/Crotona is a low-income neighborhood that bucked the boom and bust cycle to have four periods of consistent price growth. The neighborhood did not experience either bust—in the 1970s, prices increased 21% compared to a 12% citywide decrease, and in the 1990s, prices shot up 60% while they were falling almost everywhere else. Prices increased much less than the City average, however, during the booms; Morrisonia had one of the smallest increases in the 1980s.

In 1970, Morrisonia/Crotona was a racially diverse, almost exclusively American-born, high-poverty, low-education neighborhood with many children. Black and Hispanic residents shared the area with a small and decreasing white minority. Children accounted for a whopping 44% of the population. Starting in the 80s, Morrisonia gradually became more attractive to immigrants, while the black and white population and the proportion of children declined. By 2006, foreign-born residents made up close to a third of the population, and a majority of residents were Hispanic.

After four periods of price upturns, Morrisonia’s affluence did not increase. Mean income was among the lowest in the City in 1970 and remained so in 2006, and fewer residents had a bachelor’s degree here than in almost any other neighborhood in the City from 1970 to 2000. Between 2000 and 2006, the neighborhood enjoyed some relief. Poverty and unemployment, while still high, decreased. High school and college completion rates also improved: in 1970 only 24% of residents had completed high school, but by 2006 almost half of residents had done so.

However, even these modest improvements may be undermined by trends in other areas. Foreclosure rates and subprime mortgage lending escalated from 1990 to 2006, and by 2006 subprime rates were double the City average. At the end of the period, Morrisonia/Crotona was a neighborhood defined by a still poor and young population, but it had become majority Hispanic with a growing proportion of immigrants.

### Table: Price Appreciation 1974–2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>CD 103</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974–1980</td>
<td>+21.3%</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–1989</td>
<td>+108.7%</td>
<td>+152.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989–1996</td>
<td>+59.7%</td>
<td>-29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–2006</td>
<td>+90.5%</td>
<td>+124.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974–2006</td>
<td>+670.2%</td>
<td>+250.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE STUDY 2:  
CD 201: Greenpoint/Williamsburg, Brooklyn

Greenpoint/Williamsburg is an example of an increasingly well-off neighborhood that had large housing sale price increases. Prices spiked brilliantly in both upturns and did not drop as severely as in most neighborhoods during the 1970s or 1990s downturns.

Demographically, the neighborhood changed dramatically between 1970 and 2006. While Greenpoint/Williamsburg now has a reputation as a young hipster haven, in the 1970s the population was even younger, largely because children accounted for over a third of the population, while few residents were over 65. By 2006, the share of children fell to 27% and that of seniors increased to 12.5%. Over time, these children and other residents were remarkably more likely to complete high school and college. In 1970, three quarters of the neighborhood adult residents had no high school diploma; by 2006, only a third did not. College graduates in the neighborhood jumped from a meager 2% in 1970, to 29.5% in 2006. In the 1990s, the number of felonies decreased, while foreclosures and subprime loan rates were low.

Through 1990, poverty rates were similar to the City average but mean income was considerably lower. However, as talk of gentrification increased in this neighborhood, the economics and demographics of the community shifted. Between 2000 and 2006, mean income improved and unemployment dropped. Up through 2000, white residents were consistently about half the population and Hispanic residents a third. However, from 2000 to 2006 the white population jumped. Suddenly, two thirds of residents were white, while only slightly more than a quarter were Hispanic. Immigrants followed a similar trend. From 1980 to 2000, foreign-born residents were more and more attracted to Greenpoint/Williamsburg, but by 2006 this popularity dropped off.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 201</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>+243.1%</td>
<td>-23.0%</td>
<td>+193.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
<td>+152.2%</td>
<td>-29.3%</td>
<td>+124.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Today, Chinatown markets and hipster bars coexist in the diverse Lower East Side/Chinatown, but the neighborhood was not always so trendy. It was a poor area and experienced large swings in housing sale prices. Huge upturns were followed by major downturns.

In 1970, poverty and unemployment were high, and mean income and educational attainment were low. But from 1970 to 2006, educational attainment rose consistently. Income rose from 1980 to 2006, and by 2006 it had increased substantially relative to the City. For the first time since 1970, unemployment decreased between 2000 and 2006. These improvements brought worries of gentrification.

In 1980, Asian, Hispanic, and white residents each accounted for approximately a third of the inhabitants, and the foreign-born population was larger than the City average. Since then, the Hispanic population decreased, bucking the citywide trend, and between 2000 and 2006 neither the population of foreign-born nor Asians increased. Countering these decreases, the white population rose between 2000 and 2006, after two decades of decline.

Despite these demographic changes and economic improvements, in 2006 the Lower East Side/Chinatown retained its diverse character. The Asian population still made up a larger share of residents than the white population and the Hispanic population remained a significant minority. Economically, the neighborhood was still less well off than the City average, residents without a high school diploma were numerous, and poverty, while falling, was still high.

The share of residents without a high school diploma was 25 percentage points higher than the City average, unemployment 33% higher, and income was only 65% of the average.

Mean income jumped to 76% of the City average in 2000 and reached 81% in 2006. See, e.g., Martinez (2007).

1980/2006 Hispanic population: 36.5%/22%. Immigrants: 1970/00/06: 24%/40%/39.3%. The gap in immigrant population between LES/Chinatown and the City has decreased from about 35% more than average in 1980 to only 6% in 2006. In 2006, population was 35.4% Asian, 33% non-Hispanic white, 22% Hispanic, and 10% black.

Poverty rates were generally stable, but spiked in 1980 before gradually declining to 1970 levels again. 1970–2006: 25%/33%/29%/28%/25%.

* 2006 income data is not directly comparable to previous years.
### CASE STUDY 4:  
**CD 410: South Ozone Park/Howard Beach, Queens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 410</td>
<td>-19.4%</td>
<td>+162.8%</td>
<td>-25.3%</td>
<td>+111.6%</td>
<td>+234.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
<td>+152.2%</td>
<td>-29.3%</td>
<td>+124.2%</td>
<td>+250.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Ozone Park/Howard Beach is representative of the Queens experience demographically and economically. The 1970s downturn in housing sale prices was greater than the City average, but the 1980s upturn was above the City average. The second boom-bust cycle was harsher than the first. In the 1990s, the neighborhood experienced losses of 25%, a bit under the City average of 29%, and in the 2000s it gained only 11% compared to the City average of 124%.

Demographically, residents were generally white and middle income in 1970. But Ozone Park/Howard Beach dramatically illustrates New York City’s increasing diversity: foreign-born, Hispanic, and Asian residents flocked to south Queens after 1970. This influx was so great that from 1970 to 2000, the share of foreign-born residents more than tripled, while the share of white residents fell by well over half.  

In 1970, residents here were likely to have completed high school (although not college) and enjoyed low rates of unemployment and poverty. The decade, however, was hard on the neighborhood: by 1980, poverty and unemployment, while still lower than the City average, were up and poverty rates continued to rise during the busts and fall during the booms. Despite this, many other characteristics of the neighborhood remained stable throughout. The majority of residents owned homes and cars, and the proportion of children was reliably representative of the City.  

There were some ominous signs for the neighborhood. By 2000, while this neighborhood was still middle class, mean household income fell behind the City average. Subprime mortgage lending saw a meteoric rise in the 2000s, and by 2006 the rate was almost twice the City average. The rate of foreclosure filings grew by 40% between 2000 and 2006.  

* The number of immigrants was below the City average in 1970 but above average by 2000. In contrast, non-Hispanic white residents decreased from nearly three quarters of the population in 1980 to 35% in 2000.  
* Homeownership fell from 69% in 1970 to 63% in 2000; percentage of households with no car: 1980/90/00: 25%/21%/24.4%.  
* Foreclosure rate 00/06: 10.4/14.0 per 1,000 properties. Subprime rates 90/00/06: 10.7%/2.9%/34%.  
* 2006 income data is not directly comparable to previous years.
St. George/Stapleton is an example of a middle-class Staten Island neighborhood that experienced below-average housing price changes. Prices here decreased more than the City average in both downturns and failed to strongly recover in the 1980s upturn. From 1996 to 2006, housing sale prices increased only 99%, well below the City’s average increase of 124%. By 2000, the median housing price for single-family homes lagged behind the City average for the first time.

The neighborhood also changed demographically. In 1970, St. George/Stapleton was a relatively well-off, family-friendly, home- and car-owning, majority-white neighborhood. However, poverty and unemployment rates increased from 1970 to 2000, and St. George/Stapleton was poorer compared to the rest of Staten Island from 1974–2006. The number of families with children declined during the 1970s and 1980s, but increased during the 1990s, perhaps bolstered by citywide reductions in crime.

By 2006, St. George/Stapleton, like the City as a whole, had become more demographically diverse. The share of immigrants, blacks and Hispanics increased, as the share of whites continued to decline. In 2006, for the first time, the non-Hispanic white population was not a majority.

St. George/Stapleton was also hit by the subprime lending explosion. Rates of subprime loans soared above the rest of Staten Island and the City. Preliminary evidence shows that St. George/Stapleton also is bearing the brunt of the foreclosure crisis on Staten Island.

66 Poverty rates increased from 7.9% in 1970 to 15.8% in 2000. Unemployment rates increased from 2.3% to 8.2% over that same period.
67 The proportion of population that is under 18: 1970/80/90/00: 31%/28%/25%/27%. By 2006, the rate dropped to 25%. Felonies decreased from 60 per 1000 residents in 1990 to 24/1000 in 2000.
68 1980/2006 non-Hispanic white: 74%/42%; foreign-born: 11%/24%; black: 15%/23%; Hispanic: 8.3%/27.3%.
69 The foreclosure rate was 13.0/1000 here compared to 8.4/1000 for the rest of the Island (City: 12.9/1000) in 2006.
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A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF NEW YORK CITY’S LANDMARK LAW

In 1963, preservationists lost the battle to save Pennsylvania Station, a majestic Beaux-Arts building. But in 1965, their continued efforts won the passage of the New York City Landmarks Law. The law aims to protect, enhance and perpetuate architectural features of special character that “represent...the city’s cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history” by preserving landmarks and historic districts. A landmark is an individual building, structure, place, or object, while a historic district is a larger geographic area comprised of multiple buildings. The Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) designates new landmarks and historic districts, but anyone may suggest a property or district to the LPC so long as part of the property is at least thirty years old. The LPC evaluates proposed districts and landmarks based on their architectural, historical or cultural significance, their relationship to other City development or improvement plans, and public testimony. According to the LPC, as of September 16, 2008 the City was home to 1,194 exterior landmarks, 112 interior landmarks, 10 scenic landmarks, and 106 historic districts.

Where are the City’s Landmarked Buildings?

As shown in FIGURE 1, the vast majority of landmarks and historic districts are in Manhattan. FIGURE 2 shows the share of landmarks in each borough while FIGURE 3 shows the share of new landmark designations by borough over the past four decades. In every decade, Manhattan received the greatest percentage of landmark designations, but its share has been declining since the 1980s. Preservation activity has been second highest in Brooklyn, which is home to 13% of the City’s landmarks. In contrast, the Bronx, Queens and Staten Island each have less than 10% of the City’s landmarks. Overall, preservation activity peaked in the 1980s. Based on the trends below, it is likely that designations will be fewer in the 2000s than in any prior decade since the Landmarks Law was enacted.
What Kinds of Buildings are Landmarked?

Historic districts are largely comprised of residential properties; more than 80% of the buildings in these districts are residential, and more than half are one- to four-family properties. In contrast, landmarked sites tend to represent a wider variety of building types; religious buildings, public assembly and recreation facilities, commercial buildings, and single-family properties each account for at least 10% of landmarked sites. Figure 4 illustrates the composition of landmarks and historic districts by building type.

Table 1 ranks the ten neighborhoods with the highest share of residential units in a historic district. This share attempts to normalize the effects of the LPC’s preservation efforts. For example, although the geographic area covered by historic districts in Jackson Heights is far smaller than in the Upper East Side, a residential unit is much more likely to be in a historic district in Jackson Heights. Despite this standardization, Manhattan neighborhoods still dominate the top 10 with the highest rates of preserved residential housing stock.

For up-to-date information on proposed landmark and historic district designations or applications for alterations to already designated buildings currently before the LPC, visit www.plannyc.com. Present issues include the expansion of St. Vincent’s Hospital in the Greenwich Village Historic District, a proposed Prospect Heights Historic District, and generally, the preservation of religious structures.

Table 1: Community Districts with the Greatest Share of Residential Units within a Historic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage of Units</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Upper West Side (MN)</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK)</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Jackson Heights (QN)</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Financial District (MN)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Morningside Hts/Hamilton Hts (MN)</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Upper East Side (MN)</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Midtown (MN)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Crown Heights/Prospect Heights (BK)</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New York City Department of City Planning MapPLUTO, ed. 07C

Note: The “other” category includes cemeteries, miscellaneous government buildings, hotels, theatres, etc. Unlike the LPC, PLUTO only assigns one landmark designation for each tax lot. Therefore, buildings with both exterior and interior landmarks are counted only once in this data set.

1 NYC, Admin. Code § 25-301.

2 Property owners are obligated to keep designated sites in good repair and apply for permits prior to making alterations, reconstructions, demolitions, or improvements to the location. Owners failing to abide by these rules receive warning letters and an opportunity to address violations, but enforcement can ultimately include criminal or civil penalties. Id. §§ 25-305, 311, 317. The LPC explains that enforcement is used mainly as a deterrent for violations, and violators are given two opportunities to correct the problem before any fine is imposed. Penalties for first time serious violations are up to $5000 and for lesser infractions up to $500.

3 This total number of historic districts includes extensions of previously designated districts. LPC reports interior and exterior landmarks separately even if they are on the same building or structure.

4 Using GIS and the LPC’s address file of all preserved lots, we determined that Jackson Heights has about 126 acres of historic districts while the Upper East Side has about 226 acres.
In the past few years, cities around the world have taken on the challenge of environmental sustainability in a more meaningful way. From the C40 Climate Leadership Group to New York City’s PlaNYC 2030, urban leaders are recognizing the tremendous challenges ahead and responding with new strategies for reducing waste and increasing efficiency. To establish a baseline for how the City and its neighborhoods are performing on various environmental indicators, and to better identify areas where additional resources may be necessary, this year the State of the City includes a number of new environmental measures. Specifically, we find each neighborhood’s proximity to important environmental amenities and disamenities; we evaluate each neighborhood’s access to the subway and its rate of public transportation use; and we examine neighborhood recycling habits and residential waste production.

While this analysis is too brief to serve as an evaluation of the City’s PlaNYC 2030, we hope these indicators are helpful as the City moves forward with its various new initiatives to “green” New York City.

Transit

Adequate access to public transportation is vital to New York City’s vibrancy, livability and environmental sustainability. Recognizing this, PlaNYC 2030 articulates several initiatives to increase mass transit ridership by expanding transit infrastructure, extending coverage, and ensuring that 95% of new housing opportunities are within half a mile of a subway station. To assess each neighborhood’s access to public transportation, we look at both the percentage of residential units in each neighborhood that are presently within a half-mile walk of an MTA subway station entrance and the share of commuters using public transportation. In regard to the first measure, we find that 71.5 percent of citywide residential units are within this distance (including almost every unit in Manhattan). Our second measure, public transportation usage, shows that 56.7 percent of City commuters rely on public transportation for their daily commute. Neighborhoods farther from Manhattan also tend to have fewer residences close to subway stations and are more likely to use private transportation. Figure 2 shows the share of units within a half mile of a subway station entrance for each borough. The vast majority of PlaNYC 2030’s proposed ‘areas of opportunity’ for additional residential capacity are within half a mile of the City’s existing subway stations—a good sign that public transportation use will continue to increase.
Open Space

PlaNYC 2030 tracks accessibility to green space and aims to have 99 percent of New Yorkers within half a mile of a park at least a quarter acre in size by 2030. The City recognizes that for some residents, such as parents with small children and seniors, a 1/4 mile walk is more reasonable. Therefore, the plan aims to have 85 percent of residents within this range by 2030. Our calculations of neighborhood access show that the City has achieved those goals. While our methodology is slightly different from the City’s, we find that almost 99 percent of residents are within a half mile of a park and 88.5 percent of residents are within a quarter mile of a park. Perhaps most importantly, our estimates show striking disparities in open space accessibility across the City. In both the Bronx and Manhattan, eleven out of twelve community districts have over 85 percent of residential units near a park, while 13 of the 18 CDs with less than 85 percent accessibility are in Brooklyn and Queens. The neighborhoods with the lowest park accessibility are outlined in Table 1. The percentage of residential units within a quarter mile of a park is reported on every community district page throughout the State of the City.

Table 1: Community Districts with the Smallest Share of Residential Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage of Units</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>S. Ozone Park/Howard Bch (QN)</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Bensonhurst (BK)</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Kew Gardens/Woodhaven (QN)</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights (BK)</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>East Flatbush (BK)</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Flatbush/Midwood (BK)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Queens Village (QN)</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Borough Park (BK)</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, New York City Department of City Planning MapPLUTO, Furman Center

1 A half mile is considered a ten minute walk for an able-bodied adult. We simulated this buffer around every subway station entrance using maps of the New York City street grid and GIS techniques. By taking into account actual street geography, our mapping improves on the traditional “as the crow flies” method and calculates a more accurate estimate of walking distance. We use the New York City Department of City Planning’s MapPLUTO database to count residential units. We use data provided by the MTA-New York City Transit for 2005 to locate subway entrances for all the boroughs except Staten Island. Staten Island subway entrances were interpolated by the Furman Center.

2 Subway, commuter rail, bus, and ferry data come from American Community Survey (2007).


4 We do not have data on the location of the entrances to parks, and therefore must use “as the crow flies” measurements from each residence to a park’s perimeter. As a result, our estimates are likely overstating accessibility.
Air

Reliable information on local air quality is difficult to obtain, but several existing indicators provide a rough measure of the differences in air quality and exposure to pollutants throughout the City’s neighborhoods. We report the ten community districts that have the highest and lowest percentages of residential units within a quarter mile of an EPA-registered major discharger of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and/or a large quantity generator (LQG) of hazardous waste. Eight of the community districts with the highest percentage of units within a quarter mile of a major discharger of HAPs or an LQG are in Manhattan (TABLE 2). The majority of polluting facilities in Manhattan are LQG sites in midtown and downtown and are located in large institutional buildings such as universities, hospitals and Con Edison facilities. In addition, one quarter of Manhattan’s residential units—twice the City average—are within a quarter mile of a major discharger of HAPs. The Bronx has the second highest proportion of residential units close to these facilities, while Staten Island has the lowest.

Proximity to sources of pollutants is an imperfect measure of exposure because not all pollutants are equally problematic, and wind patterns and other factors determine whether the pollution stays in a neighborhood or disperses over other areas. We expect that the local air quality study planned by the City as part of PlaNYC 2030 will provide a more direct measure of variations in air quality across neighborhoods and over time. Such data would enable the City to better track the impact of developments and infrastructure improvements on communities.

---

**Table 2: Community Districts with the Greatest Share of Residential Units within a Quarter Mile of a Major Discharger of HAPs or an LQG (2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage of Units</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>East Harlem (MN)</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Clinton/Chelsea (MN)</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Midtown (MN)</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Financial District (MN)</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Morningside Hts/Hamilton Hts (MN)</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Community Districts with the Smallest Share of Residential Units within a Quarter Mile of a Major Discharger of HAPs or an LQG (2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Percentage of Units</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>S. Crown Hts/Lefferts Gardens (BK)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Bayside/Little Neck (QN)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Kew Gardens/Woodhaven (QN)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Ridgewood/Maspeth (QN)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Jackson Heights (QN)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>S. Ozone Park/Howard Bch (QN)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights (BK)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Bensonhurst (BK)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 A site is considered a major discharger of HAPs if actual or potential emissions are above the applicable major source thresholds, actual or potential controlled emissions are greater than 100 tons/year, or unregulated pollutant actual or potential controlled emissions are greater than 100 tons/year. An LQG is a site that "generate[s] 1,000 kilograms per month or more of hazardous waste, or more than 1 kilogram per month of acutely hazardous waste." For more see: http://epa.gov/osw/hazard/generation/lqg.htm.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulated Facility Data, New York City Department of City Planning, Furman Center
**Waste**

Perhaps one of the most widely recognized environmental sustainability activities is household-level recycling and waste reduction. Despite this, PlaNYC 2030 does not explicitly address residential waste or recycling patterns. In order to better track New Yorkers’ progress in reducing the residential waste stream, we have added a new indicator to each community district page: the net daily residential waste per capita after accounting for waste diverted to recycling. **Figure 3** compares these post-diversion totals with the gross amount of waste collected daily in each neighborhood. On average, each City resident disposes of 2.9 pounds of waste per day. After recycling, this drops to 2.4 pounds net waste per capita. Residents in Staten Island dispose of the most residential waste per capita, but they also recycle a greater proportion of waste (20.5 percent compared to the 16.5 percent City average). While the Bronx has a typical rate of waste per capita, it has a below-average recycling rate (only 10 percent), so net waste disposal rates are above average. In contrast, although Manhattan residents dispose of more waste per capita than residents of either Brooklyn or Queens, their high recycling rate results in the lowest net disposal rate in the City.

---

**Figure 3: Recycling and Waste in New York City (FY 2008) by Sub-borough Area**

**Gross Waste Before Recycling**

- **Recycling Diversion Rate**
  - Bottom Quartile
  - Top Quartile

**Daily Pounds of Waste Per Capita***

- <= 2.0
- 2.1 - 2.5
- 2.6 - 3.0
- 3.1 - 3.5
- >= 3.6

---

**Net Waste After Recycling**

- **Recycling Diversion Rate**
  - Bottom Quartile
  - Top Quartile

**Daily Pounds of Waste Per Capita***

- <= 2.0
- 2.1 - 2.5
- 2.6 - 3.0
- 3.1 - 3.5

---

*Curbside and containerized residential waste stream.

Source: New York City Department of Sanitation, American Community Survey (2007), New York City Department of City Planning
Notes on the 2008 Edition

GEOGRAPHIC DEFINITIONS

This report presents information for the entire City of New York, for the five boroughs, and for the neighborhoods within each borough. The City divides the boroughs into a total of 59 community districts; the United States Census Bureau, however, divides the boroughs into 55 sub-borough areas. We have included reference maps for community districts and sub-borough areas on pages 144 and 145. This report provides data for community districts where available but uses data at the sub-borough level for indicators not available for community districts.

BOROUGH

New York City consists of five boroughs—the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens and Staten Island. Each New York City borough is also a county. Counties are legal entities with boundaries defined by state law. The Census Bureau uses boroughs as the major geographic entities in its data products for New York City.

COMMUNITY DISTRICT

Community districts are political units unique to New York City. Each of the 59 community districts has a Community Board whose members are appointed by the Borough President of that district; half of the members are nominated by the City Council members who represent the district. The Community Boards review applications for zoning changes and other land use proposals and make recommendations for budget priorities.

SUB-BOROUGH AREA

Sub-borough areas are geographic units created by the Census Bureau for the administration of the New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. They are designed to approximate New York’s community districts. However, because sub-borough areas are constructed from census tracts, their boundaries do not coincide precisely with community district boundaries. There are 59 community districts in New York City but only 55 sub-borough areas. The Census Bureau combined four pairs of community districts in creating the sub-borough areas to improve sampling and protect the confidentiality of respondents. These pairs are Mott Haven/Melrose (CD 101) and Hunts Point/Longwood (CD 102) in the Bronx, Morrisania/Crotona (CD 103) and Belmont/East Tremont (CD 106) in the Bronx, the Financial District (CD 301) and Greenwich Village/Soho (CD 302) in Manhattan, and Clinton/Chelsea (CD 304) and Midtown (CD 305) in Manhattan. For the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey, the Census Bureau has defined Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs) of at least 100,000 people. In New York City, these PUMAs are co-terminus with the sub-borough areas, so we are able to use the two interchangeably.

RANKINGS

The 2008 edition of this report includes rankings of the five boroughs and all 59 community districts or 55 sub-borough areas for each indicator. The neighborhood ranked first has the highest number or percentage for the measure at issue, even if the measure is for a quality that one might think is “best” if lower. Because data for several indicators—including all indicators drawn from United States Census Sources—are only available at the sub-borough level, these indicators are ranked out of 55 total neighborhoods. In addition, a few indicators were not available for all neighborhoods and therefore are ranked out of a subset of neighborhoods. For instance, the Furman Center only calculates the index of housing price appreciation and the median price per housing unit at the community district level for the predominant housing type in that district. Therefore these rankings are out of a substantially reduced subset of the community districts. We note where this is true throughout the book.

INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS

When reporting dollar-based indicators, we adjust amounts for all years to 2007 dollars. This allows for more consistent comparisons across years for individual indicators. The inflation-adjusted values include median monthly rent, median rent burden, median household income, and home sales prices for the index of housing price appreciation and for median price per unit.
METHODOLOGICAL CHANGES

We have revised the methodology we use to derive several indicators in this edition of the State of the City as compared to past editions. Mortgage lending and foreclosures have been at the forefront of recent news coverage and also have been a research priority for the Furman Center. The Furman Center has written several reports on these subjects including Declining Credit & Growing Disparities: Key Findings from HMDA 2007 (October 2008), Neighboring Effects of Concentrated Mortgage Foreclosures (2008), and The Impacts of Foreclosure on Renters (2008). Please visit http://furmancenter.org/ to access these reports.

As we gained a more thorough understanding of the data and research questions involved we refined some of our methodology for mortgage and foreclosure indicators. When reporting on home purchase mortgage lending, we now include first lien home purchase loans. In the past we also had included junior lien (“piggyback”) loans in these rates which double counts borrowers who obtain both types of loans. By looking just at first lien loans we can focus on the number of households originating home purchase mortgages, rather than the number of loans being issued, which we believe is a more meaningful indicator of lending activity. We have also switched from reporting subprime loan rates to high-cost loan rates. This reflects a switch from identifying lenders who specialize in subprime lending (regardless of information about the individual loans) to identifying loans whose interest rate was greater than a given threshold (regardless of the lender). Finally, we have modified the way we talk about notices of foreclosure. In the past, we tried to use the lis pendens data to estimate how many loans were entering foreclosure. We have now modified this indicator to reflect the number of properties that received at least one notice of foreclosure at any time in a given calendar year.

ABOUT NYCHANIS

The New York City Housing and Neighborhood Information System (NYCHANIS) is an interactive website that allows users to obtain data and information about New York City neighborhoods and to create custom tables, charts, graphs, rankings and maps. Created by the Furman Center in 2004 and updated on a regular basis, NYCHANIS provides housing organizations, community development groups and the general public with the data they need to assess neighborhood conditions, plan programs that will improve their housing and neighborhoods, and monitor the progress of those programs. NYCHANIS is available at www.nychanis.com.

Some features of NYCHANIS include:

The most up-to-date information available on New York City’s housing stock, neighborhood conditions and residential population

- Easily accessible and searchable web-based interface
- Ability to zero in on geographical areas of interest, from boroughs and community districts all the way down to census tracts, police precincts and school districts

All of the data in this book, and more, is available on NYCHANIS. New data is updated on NYCHANIS as soon as it is available.

Please visit www.nychanis.com.
Indicators Definitions and Rankings

In this section, we define each data indicator used in this report and provide the source of the data, the level of geography for which it is available, the years for which data are reported, and the five neighborhoods with the highest or lowest totals for that indicator. Rankings are provided for the most recent year data are available for each indicator. In the event of a tie, rank numbers are repeated. Although community districts and sub-borough areas may share some boundaries, they often have slightly different names. In the rankings, we use the name appropriate to the level of geography for which data are available. In addition, because there are 59 community districts and 55 sub-borough areas, indicator ranks fluctuate accordingly. Refer to “Notes on the 2008 Edition” on page 32 for more information on rankings and geographies.

**Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)**

This indicator measures the number of people incarcerated who listed the City or borough as their last address before incarceration per 100,000 residents aged 15 years and older. Incarcerations include state prison, county jail and jail plus probation sentences. In New York State, people who are 16 years or older at the time of arrest serve their sentence in the adult criminal justice system, but data about the entire population is broken into age groups that require us to compare the number of those 16 and older who are incarcerated to the total population of people 15 and older. Thus, the incarceration rate is somewhat understated.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.


*Geography: City, Borough

*Years Reported: 2000, 2005, 2006, 2007*

**Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)**

This indicator measures the number of asthma-related hospital admissions per 1,000 residents, and is reported by the zip code of the residence of the admitted patient. The Furman Center aggregates these rates to the sub-borough area using a population-weighting formula. For more information on our population-weighting method, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

*Source: Infoshare, New York State Department of Health, Furman Center

*Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

*Years Reported: 2000, 2005, 2006, 2007*

**_five highest**

1. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
2. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
3. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
4. East Harlem (MN), Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)

**Five Lowest**

51. Bay Ridge (BK), Borough Park (BK), South Shore (SI)
54. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN), Upper East Side (MN)
Born in New York State (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of all residents who were born in New York State.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for borough and sub-borough area level data.

Geography: City

Five Highest
1. South Shore (SI)
2. Throgs Neck/Co-op City (BX)
3. Mid-Island (SI)
4. Rockaways (QN)
5. North Shore (SI)

Five Lowest
51. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
52. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)
53. Sunnyside/Woodside (QN)
54. Jackson Heights (QN)
55. Elmhurst/Corona (QN)

Disabled Population (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of the civilian non-institutionalized population aged 16 through 64 that has disabilities that impair physical mobility, sensory perception, cognitive functioning, or ability to exercise self-care, leave the home, or find employment. Only 2006 and 2007 data are comparable, because question construction and sampling was different in 2005. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for borough and sub-borough area level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City

Five Highest
1. East Harlem (MN)
2. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
3. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
4. Coney Island (BK)
5. Central Harlem (MN)

Five Lowest
51. 2 tied: Upper West Side (MN), S. Crown Heights (BK)
52. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
53. Upper East Side (MN)
54. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
55. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)

Educational Attainment: Bachelor’s Degree and Higher (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of the population aged 25 and older with a bachelor’s degree or higher, including master’s, professional, and doctorate degrees.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for borough and sub-borough area level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City

Five Highest
1. Upper East Side (MN)
2. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
3. Upper West Side (MN)
4. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
5. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)

Five Lowest
51. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
52. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
53. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
54. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
55. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)

Educational Attainment: No High School Diploma (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of the population aged 25 and older with less than a high school diploma or GED.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for borough and sub-borough area level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City

Five Highest
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
2. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
3. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
4. Bushwick (BK)
5. Sunset Park (BK)

Five Lowest
51. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
52. Upper West Side (MN)
53. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
54. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
55. Upper East Side (MN)
Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)

This indicator measures the rate of new diagnoses of elevated blood lead levels among tested children under the age of 18. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention has defined elevated blood lead levels as a blood level of 10µg/dL (micrograms per deciliter) or above. Calculated rates by community district may be higher than actual rates because a significant number of negative test records were missing community district identifiers and accordingly, could not be assigned to a CD. For 2000, 9% of test records were not assigned, and for 2005, 2006 and 2007 16% of test records were not assigned.

We report the share of elevated blood lead levels by race in our State of New Yorkers section.

Source: New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Five Highest
1. Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)
2. Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)
3. Flatbush/Midwood (BK)
4. Midtown (MN)
5. Borough Park (BK)

Five Lowest
55. Mott Haven/Melrose (BX)
56. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
57. Financial District (MN)
58. South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)
59. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)

Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)

The New York City Police Department (NYPD) collects data on a variety of reported crimes for each of the 76 police precincts in the City. The felony crime rate refers to the seven major felonies that the police track: assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, murder, rape, and robbery. Rates are calculated as the number of crimes committed in a precinct per 1,000 people residing in the precinct in 2000. Because we use the residential population to calculate rates (as opposed to the number of people living in, working in or visiting an area), the crime rate may be skewed in neighborhoods that have a large number of people passing through them each day (such as Midtown Manhattan). The NYPD provides population data from the Census at the police precinct level. The Furman Center aggregates the rates to the community district level using a population-weighting formula. For more information on our population-weighting method, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Source: New York City Police Department, United States Census (2000), Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Five Highest
1. Midtown (MN)
2. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
3. Financial District (MN)
4. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
5. Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)

Five Lowest
55. Bensonhurst (BK)
56. South Beach/Willowbrook (QN)
57. Bayside/Little Neck (SI)
58. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)
59. Borough Park (BK)
Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued
The New York City Department of Buildings requires a certificate of occupancy (C of O) before any newly constructed housing unit can be occupied. Rehabilitated housing units generally do not require a C of O unless the rehabilitation is so significant that the floor plan of the unit is changed. This indicator measures the total number of final C of Os approved by the Department of Buildings each year.

Source: New York City Department of City Planning
Geography: City, Borough, Community District
Five Highest
1. Midtown (MN)
2. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
3. Financial District (MN)
4. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
5. Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)

Five Lowest
55. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
56. Mott Haven/Melrose (BX)
57. Morris Park/Bronxdale (BX)
58. Flatbush/Midwood (BK)
59. Upper East Side (MN)

Foreign-Born Population (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of the total population not born in the United States or Puerto Rico (P.R.). Foreign-born includes all those born outside the U.S. or P.R., regardless of whether they currently are U.S. citizens, with the exception of children born abroad to parents who were then American citizens.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area
Five Highest
1. Elmhurst/Corona (QN)
2. Jackson Heights (QN)
3. Sunnyside/Woodside (QN)
4. Flushing/Whitestone (QN)
5. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)

Five Lowest
51. East Harlem (MN)
52. 2 tied: Upper West Side (MN), Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
54. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
55. Upper East Side (MN)

High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of all first-lien home purchase loans that were reported as high cost under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA). HMDA requires lenders to report when the spread between the annual percentage rate (APR) of a loan and the rate of Treasury securities of comparable maturity is greater than three percentage points for first-lien loans. In this report, all home purchase loans with APRs above this threshold are referred to as high-cost loans. For more information on HMDA data, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area
Five Highest
1. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
2. Jamaica (QN)
3. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
4. Bushwick (BK)
5. Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)

Five Lowest
51. East Harlem (MN)
52. 2 tied: Upper West Side (MN), Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
54. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
55. Upper East Side (MN)
**High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)**

This indicator measures the percentage of all refinance loans that were reported as high cost under HMDA. HMDA requires lenders to report when the spread between the annual percentage rate (APR) of a loan and the rate of Treasury securities of comparable maturity is greater than three percentage points for first-lien refinance loans and five percentage points for junior-lien refinance loans. In this report, all refinance loans with APRs above this threshold are referred to as high-cost loans. For more information on HMDA data, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

*Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, Furman Center*

*Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area*

*Years Reported: 2005, 2006, 2007*

**Five Highest**
1. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
2. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
3. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
4. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
5. Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)

**Five Lowest**
51. 2 tied: Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN), Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
53. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)
54. Upper East Side (MN)
55. Upper West Side (MN)

---

**Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)**

The rate of home purchase lending is measured using HMDA data. The Furman Center calculates the home purchase loan rate by dividing the number of first-lien home purchase loans for 1–4 family buildings, condos or co-ops by the total number of 1–4 family buildings, condos or co-ops in the given geography and then multiplying by 1,000 to establish a rate per 1,000 properties. For more information on HMDA data, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

We report the share of home purchase loans by race in our State of New Yorkers section.

*Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, Department of Finance Real Property Assessment Data, Furman Center*

*Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area*

*Years Reported: 2005, 2006, 2007*

**Five Highest**
1. Central Harlem (MN)
2. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene (BK)
3. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
4. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)
5. Sunset Park (BK)

**Five Lowest**
51. S. Crown Heights (BK)
52. Borough Park (BK)
53. East Harlem (MN)
54. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
55. Coney Island (BX)
Homeownership Rate
This indicator measures the number of owner-occupied units divided by the total number of currently occupied units. We are not able to distinguish between types of owner-occupied housing (e.g., single-family homes, condominiums, or cooperatives) using the Census and American Community Survey data.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.
Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. South Shore (SI)
2. Queens Village (QN)
3. Mid-Island (SI)
4. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)
5. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)

Five Lowest
51. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
52. East Harlem (MN)
53. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
54. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
55. University Heights/Fordham (BX)

Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of households that include children under 18 years old. Households are counted if they include any children under 18, regardless of the child’s relationship to the householder.
Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
2. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
3. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
4. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
5. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)

Five Lowest
51. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)
52. Upper East Side (MN)
53. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
54. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
55. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)

Housing Units
The Census Bureau defines a housing unit as a house, apartment, mobile home, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied (or, if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and that have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. They do not include dormitories or other group quarters.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for sub-borough area level data.
Geography: City, Borough

Five Highest
1. Upper East Side (MN)
2. Upper West Side (MN)
3. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
4. Flushing/Whitestone (QN)
5. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)

Five Lowest
51. Bushwick (BK)
52. East Harlem (MN)
53. Rockaways (QN)
54. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)
55. S. Crown Heights (BK)
Income Diversity Ratio
The Furman Center calculates the income diversity ratio for each borough and the City by dividing the income earned by the 80th percentile household by the income earned by the 20th percentile household. For example if the 80th percentile income is $75,000 and the 20th percentile income is $15,000, then the income diversity ratio is 5. A higher ratio indicates a broader spread of incomes in a given area, not necessarily a uniform distribution. Each page also includes a chart showing the percentage of households in a given geographic area that fall into each of the income quintiles for New York City. The percentages in the charts may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Source: United States Census iPUMA Micro Data, American Community Survey PUMS Micro Data, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN)
2. Upper West Side (MN)
3. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)
4. N. Crown Heights/Prospect Heights (BK)
5. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene (BK)

Five Lowest
48. 4 tied: Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX), Flatlands/Canarsie (BK), Middle Village/Ridgewood (QN), South Shore (SI)
52. Sunnyside/Woodside (QN)
53. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)
54. Queens Village (QN)
55. Elmhurst/Corona (QN)

Index of Housing Price Appreciation
This indicator, also called the repeat sales index, measures average price changes in repeated sales of the same properties. Because it is based on price changes for the same properties, the index captures price appreciation while controlling for variations in the quality of the housing sold in each period. Sale prices used in the repeat sales index are adjusted for inflation, thus the index measures the rate of price appreciation above and beyond inflation. The index is available for different types of properties: single-family homes, 2–4 family buildings, five or more family buildings (including co-op buildings), and condominiums. The index shown in each community district is the index for the type of housing that is most prevalent (i.e., with most sales) in that community district. The index is set to 100 in 2000.

The rate of appreciation (or depreciation) between any two years can be calculated as the percentage change in the index between the two years. For example, if the price index for 2–4 family buildings in 2005 is 150 and the index for 2006 is 165, this suggests that quality-controlled prices rose, on average, by 10 percent \((165-150)/150\) between the two years. To compare appreciation between two different areas or housing types, first determine the time range of interest and calculate the percent changes between the start and end years for each. Index values alone should not be used when making such comparisons. Comparisons should only be made between the percent changes in index values between two years.

Rankings for 2007 are relative to other community districts with the same predominant housing type and compare appreciation since 2000. Rankings require comparison to a prior year, so 2000 rankings are omitted. The numbers on these pages may not align with those in the “Trends in New York City Housing Price Appreciation” chapter due to modified methods developed specifically for that analysis. See that chapter for details.

Source: New York City Department of Finance, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District
### Single Family (Out of 14 CDs)

**Highest**
1. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)
2. Flatbush/Midwood (BK)
3. Queens Village (QN)

**Lowest**
12. South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)
13. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
14. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)

### 2-4 Family (Out of 33 CDs)

**Highest**
1. Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)
2. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
3. Mott Haven/Melrose (BX)

**Lowest**
31. Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights (BK)
32. Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)
33. Bensonhurst (BK)

### 5+ Family (Out of 5 CDs)

**Highest**
1. East Harlem (MN)
2. Central Harlem (MN)
3. Morningside Heights/Hamilton (MN)

**Lowest**
4. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
5. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)

### Condominium (Out of 7 CDs)

**Highest**
1. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
2. Upper West Side (MN)
3. Midtown (MN)

**Lowest**
5. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
6. Financial District (MN)
7. Upper East Side (MN)

---

### Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

New York City's Department of Health and Mental Hygiene collects data on infant mortality reported by the community district of residence of the mother. We report the number of infant deaths per 1,000 live births.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for community district level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

*Source: New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene "Summary of Vital Statistics" Report*

**Geography:** City, Borough

**Years Reported:** 2000, 2005, 2006, 2007

**Five Highest**
1. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
2. Jamaica/Hollis (QN)
3. Brownsville (BK)
4. Coney Island (BK)
5. East Harlem (MN)

**Five Lowest**
55. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
56. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
57. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
58. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
59. Upper East Side (MN)

---

### Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)

This indicator measures the number of babies who were born weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds) per 1,000 live births. The geography reported refers to the residence of the mother.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for community district level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

*Source: New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene "Summary of Vital Statistics" Report*

**Geography:** City, Borough

**Years Reported:** 2000, 2005, 2006, 2007

**Five Highest**
1. Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)
2. Brownsville (BK)
3. Jamaica/Hollis (QN)
4. East New York/Starrett City (MN)
5. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)

**Five Lowest**
55. Sunset Park (BK)
56. South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)
57. Borough Park (BK)
58. Elmhurst/Corona (QN)
59. Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)
Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)
This indicator measures the mean commute time in minutes for commuters residing in the geographic area. The mean is calculated by dividing the aggregate commute time in minutes for each area by the number of workers 16 years old and older who do not work from home. The Census Bureau notes that comparisons between 2005 and other years should be made with caution. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for sub-borough area level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City, Borough

Five Highest
1. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
2. Bushwick (BK)
3. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
4. Sunset Park (BK)
5. Jamaica (QN)

Five Lowest
51. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)
52. Upper East Side (MN)
53. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)
54. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
55. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)

Median Age of Housing Stock
This indicator measures the median age of all housing units in a geographic area. The age for each housing unit within a building is calculated as the number of years since that building’s construction. The median is calculated from the universe of all housing units in a given geographic area.

Source: Department of Finance Real Property Assessment Data, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District
Years Reported: 2007

Five Highest
1. Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)
2. 4 tied: Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK), Sunset Park (BK), Morningside Heights/Hamilton (MN), Central Harlem (MN)

Five Lowest
54. 2 tied: Throgs Neck/Co-op City (BX), Coney Island (BK)
56. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
57. South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)
58. Financial District (MN)
59. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)


**Median Household Income**

Household income is the income of all members of a household aged 15 years or older. The Census Bureau advises against comparisons of income data between the Census and the ACS due to differences in question construction and sampling. Because of these comparability concerns, we present median household income only for 2007 at the sub-borough area level. The median household income for the boroughs and the City are presented for all years, and all figures have been adjusted to 2007 dollars. Even at these larger geographic levels, comparisons between Census years (2000) and ACS years (2005, 2006, 2007) are discouraged. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for historic sub-borough area level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
2. Upper East Side (MN)
3. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
4. Upper West Side (MN)
5. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)

Five Lowest
51. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
52. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
53. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
54. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
55. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)

**Median Monthly Rent**

The monthly contract rent is the rent agreed to or specified in the lease, even if furnishings, utilities, or services are included or if the unit is subject to rent regulation. Rent is expressed in constant 2007 dollars. Compilation of this data was significantly different in Census 2000 compared to ACS years, therefore, we do not include 2000 for this indicator. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
2. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
3. Upper East Side (MN)
4. Upper West Side (MN)
5. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)

Five Lowest
51. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
52. Central Harlem (MN)
53. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
54. East Harlem (MN)
55. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)

**Median Life Span by Gender (Males, Females)**

This indicator measures the median age at death of men and women in New York City. This includes all deaths occurring in New York City, regardless of the residence of the decedent.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Source: New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
"Summary of Vital Statistics" Report
Geography: City
Median Price per Unit
For single family homes, price per unit is the sale price of the home. For multifamily buildings, the price per unit is calculated by dividing the sale price of a residential building by the number of units contained within the building. For condominium buildings, the sale price is available for each apartment. Prices are expressed in constant 2007 dollars. In this report we provide the median price per unit for the predominant housing type at the community district level. For each housing type, CDs are ranked against all CDs with the same predominant housing type. The median price should be used to compare sale prices for a given year across geographies. The Index of Housing Price Appreciation is a better measure of housing price changes over time.

Source: New York City Department of Finance, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Single Family (Out of 14 CDs)

Highest
1. Flatbush/Midwood (BK)
2. Riverdale/Fieldston (BX)
3. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)

Lowest
12. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)
13. Jamaica/Hollis (QN)
14. St. George/Stapleton (SI)

2–4 Family (Out of 33 CDs)

Highest
1. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK)
2. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
3. Borough Park (BK)

Lowest
31. Hunts Point/Longwood (BX)
32. Highbridge/Concourse (BX)
33. Morrisania/Crotona (BX)

5+ Family (Out of 5 CDs)

Highest
1. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)
2. East Harlem (MN)
3. Morningside Heights/Hamilton (MN)

Lowest
4. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
5. Central Harlem (MN)

Condominium (Out of 7 CDs)

Highest
1. Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)
2. Midtown (MN)
3. Upper West Side (MN)

Lowest
5. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
6. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
7. Financial District (MN)
**Median Rent Burden (renter households)**
This indicator measures the median percentage of income spent on gross rent (rent plus electricity and heating fuel costs) by New York City renter households. Compilation of this data was significantly different in Census 2000 compared to ACS years, therefore, we do not include 2000 for this indicator. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

*Source: American Community Survey (2005, 2006, 2007)*
*Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area*
*Years Reported: 2005, 2006, 2007*

**Five Highest**
1. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
2. Borough Park (BK)
3. Kingsbridge Heights/Moshulu (BX)
4. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
5. Sunset Park (BK)

**Five Lowest**
51. Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene (BK)
52. Upper West Side (MN)
53. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
54. Throgs Neck/Co-op City (BX)
55. Upper East Side (MN)

---

**Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)**
This indicator measures the total pounds of residential waste per person, not including recycled material, that is sent daily to transfer stations for disposal. The Department of Sanitation (DSNY) reports the amount of recycling in tons collected from city residences, public schools, and institutions daily, as well as the percentage of the residential waste stream diverted to recycling (recycling diversion rate), by community district. We apply the recycling diversion rate to the amount of recycling collected daily to derive the tons of total residential waste collected per day. We then subtract the tons of recycled material from the total waste. To calculate the per capita net waste, we use 2007 ACS population estimates for SBAs. We aggregate the total residential waste collected by CDs up to SBAs where necessary and divide by the ACS population estimates to get the per capita figures reported. Waste data is reported by the Department of Sanitation on a fiscal year basis. In this report, data reported for 2007 refers to the fiscal year running from July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008.

*Source: New York City Department of Sanitation, American Community Survey (2007), Furman Center*
*Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area*
*Years Reported: 2005, 2006, 2007*

**Five Highest**
1. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
2. 3 tied: Morriseania/Belmont (BX), Mid-Island (SI), South Shore (SI)
5. Williamsburg/Greenpoint (BK)

**Five Lowest**
48. 4 tied: Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK), Stuyvesant Town/ Turtle Bay (MN), Jackson Heights (QN), Middle Village/ Ridgewood (QN)
52. 2 tied: Sunset Park (BK), Sunnyside/Woodside (QN)
54. 2 tied: N. Crown Heights/Prospect Heights (BK), Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)

This indicator measures the total number of properties in New York City (single and multi-family buildings and condominium and co-op units) that had mortgage foreclosure actions initiated. In order to initiate a mortgage foreclosure, the foreclosing party must file a legal document, called a *lis pendens*, in county court. In many cases, the filing of a *lis pendens* does not lead to a completed foreclosure; instead, the borrower and lender work out some other solution to the borrower’s default or the borrower sells the property prior to foreclosure. If a property received multiple *lis pendens* within the same year, that property is only counted once in this indicator. For a more detailed description of our *lis pendens* methodology, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for community district level data.

Source: Public Data Corporation and New York City, Department of Finance
Real Property Assessment Data, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough

Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)

This indicator measures the rate of mortgage foreclosure actions initiated in New York City per 1,000 1–4 family properties. For this indicator, we report the number of 1–4 family properties that have had a mortgage-related *lis pendens* filed in the given calendar year per 1,000 1–4 family properties. Condos and co-ops are not included in this rate. If a property received multiple *lis pendens* within the same year, that property is only counted once in this rate. For a more detailed description of our *lis pendens* methodology, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Source: Public Data Corporation and New York City, Department of Finance
Real Property Assessment Data, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Five Highest
1. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
2. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
3. Bushwick (BK)
4. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
5. Jamaica (QN)

Five Lowest
50. Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN)
51. Bay Ridge (BK)
52. Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)
53. Upper East Side (MN)
54. 5 tied: Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN), Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN), Chelsea/Clinton/Midtown (MN), Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN), Upper West Side (MN)
Population
The Census defines “population” as all people, both children and adults, living in a given geographic area. Population estimates for the City and boroughs for 2000–2007 are obtained from the Census Bureau’s *Annual Estimates of the Population for Counties of New York* released March 20, 2008. Because these official estimates are not available at the sub-borough area level, we use the ACS for this geography and only report 2007. Comparisons of ACS population data across years are discouraged. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section. We do not present rankings for this indicator because sub-borough areas were designed to have roughly similar populations.


*Geography:* City, Borough, Sub-borough Area


Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of residents who are aged 65 years or older.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.


*Geography:* City, Borough, Sub-borough Area


Five Highest
1. Coney Island (BK)
2. Bensonhurst (BK)
3. Throgs Neck/Co-op City (BX)
4. Bay Ridge (BK)
5. Flushing/Whitestone (QN)

Five Lowest
51. Kingsbridge Heights/Moshulu (BX)
52. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
53. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
54. Bushwick (BK)
55. University Heights/Fordham (BX)

Population Density
(1,000 persons per square mile)
Population density is calculated by dividing a geographic area’s population (as defined in this section) by its land area and is reported in thousands of persons per square mile. At the sub-borough area level, we present the population density for 2007 only. Population figures are derived from the 2000 Census and from the 2005, 2006 and 2007 ACS. Comparisons of population density estimates across years are discouraged. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.


*Geography:* City, Borough, Sub-borough Area


Five Highest
1. Upper East Side (MN)
2. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)
3. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN)
4. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
5. Central Harlem (MN)

Five Lowest
51. Throgs Neck/Co-op City (BX)
52. Queens Village (QN)
53. Rockaways (QN)
54. South Shore (SI)
55. Mid-Island (SI)
Poverty Rate
This indicator measures the number of households below the poverty threshold divided by the number of households for whom poverty status was determined. Due to concerns about comparability, the poverty rate is only presented for 2007 at the sub-borough area level. At the borough and City level, the poverty rate is presented for 2000, 2006 and 2007. As with the income data, comparisons are discouraged between years. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.
This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
2. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
3. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
4. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
5. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)

Five Lowest
51. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
52. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
53. Queens Village (QN)
54. Upper East Side (MN)
55. South Shore (SI)

Poverty Rate by Age
(Population 65 and Older, Population Under 18)
The poverty rate for the population aged 65 years and older is the number of people aged 65 years and older living below the poverty line divided by the total population 65 years old and older for whom poverty status was determined. The poverty rate for the population under 18 years old is the number of people under 18 living below the poverty line divided by the total population under 18 years old for whom poverty status was determined. Due to limitations in the income data, comparisons between years are discouraged. For more information on comparisons across years, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.
Refer to www.nychanis.com for borough and sub-borough area level data. These indicators are disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City

Poverty: Under 18
Five Highest
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
2. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
3. 2 tied: Morrisania/Belmont (BX), University Heights/Fordham (BX)
4. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)

Five Lowest
51. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
52. Queens Village (QN)
53. South Shore (SI)
54. Upper East Side (MN)
55. Rego Park, Forest Hills (QN)

Poverty: Over 65
Five Highest
1. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
2. Coney Island (BK)
3. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
4. Highbridge/South Concourse (BX)
5. Sunset Park (BK)

Five Lowest
51. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
52. Queens Village (QN)
53. Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)
54. South Shore (SI)
55. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
Public Transportation Rate

This indicator measures the percentage of workers over the age of 16 who do not work at home and who commute using public transportation. The types of transportation included as “public transportation” are bus, subway, railroad, and ferry boat. Taxi cabs are not included.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for borough and sub-borough area level data. This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. N. Crown Heights/Prospect Heights (BK)
2. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK)
3. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN)
4. Sunnyside/Woodside (QN)
5. East Harlem (MN)

Five Lowest
51. North Shore (SI)
52. Queens Village (QN)
53. Mid-Island (SI)
54. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
55. South Shore (SI)

Racial Diversity Index

The Racial Diversity Index (RDI) measures the probability that two randomly chosen people in a given neighborhood will be of a different race. The Furman Center uses the categories of Asian (non-Hispanic), black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic, and white (non-Hispanic) to calculate the index. These groups make up 97.7% of New York City’s population. People identifying as American Indian and Alaskan Native, some other race or reporting more than one race are excluded from this calculation. A higher number indicates a more racially diverse neighborhood. For instance, if a neighborhood is made up entirely of just one racial/ethnic group, the RDI would be 0.0. If the population of a neighborhood is perfectly evenly distributed among the four groups (25% of residents are Asian, 25% black, 25% Hispanic and 25% white), the maximum RDI would be 0.75. In practice, in neighborhoods with a large share of residents who do not fall into any of the four groups, the RDI may be slightly greater than 0.75.

\[ RDI = 1 - (P_{\text{Asian}}^2 + P_{\text{Black}}^2 + P_{\text{Hispanic}}^2 + P_{\text{White}}^2) \]

This indicator is ranked out of 54 sub-borough areas because race data were not reported in CD 215 in 2007.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)
2. Ozone Park/Woodhaven (QN)
3. Tied: Pelham Parkway (BX), Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN), Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows (QN)

Five Lowest
50. 2 Tied: S. Crown Heights, Mid-Island (SI)
52. Upper East Side (MN)
53. South Shore (SI)
54. East Flatbush (BK)
Racial/Ethnic Share (Asian, Black, Hispanic, White)

This indicator measures the percentage of the total population made up of each of the following racial/ethnic groups: Asian (non-Hispanic), black (non-Hispanic), Hispanic (of any race) and white (non-Hispanic). On the community district profile pages, you can find this data in the “Racial and Ethnic Composition” charts. The percentages of the four groups may not add up to 100% because people of other races or two or more races are not included.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)

The rate of loan refinance originations is measured using Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data. The Furman Center calculates the refinance loan rate by dividing the number of refinance loans for 1–4 family buildings or condos by the total number of 1–4 family buildings or condos in the given geography and then multiplying by 1,000 to establish a rate per 1,000 properties. For more information on HMDA data, see the Methods chapter of this book.

Refer to www.nychanis.com for sub-borough area level data. We report the share of refinance loans by race in our State of New Yorkers section.

Source: Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, Department of Finance Real Property Assessment Data, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough

Five Highest
1. East Flatsbush (BK)
2. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
3. Jamaica (QN)
4. Bushwick (BK)
5. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)

Five Lowest
51. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
52. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
53. Upper East Side (MN)
54. East Harlem (MN)
55. Lower East Side/Chinatown (MN)

Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage)

This indicator measures the percentage of all rental units that are rent stabilized, rent-controlled or loft board regulated. Rent control laws were initially enacted during World War II but now govern just 2% of the City’s rental units. Because rent-controlled apartments generally are converted to rent stabilization or become unregulated upon vacancy, most tenants in the few remaining rent-controlled apartments have occupied their apartments since 1974 or earlier. Rent stabilization laws were first enacted in 1969 and provide for a less stringent form of rent regulation than rent control. For more information on rent regulation, see the New York City Rent Guidelines Board website at www.housingnyc.com.

Source: New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey
Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area
Years Reported: 2005

Five Highest
1. Kingsbridge Heights/Moshulu (BX)
2. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
3. S. Crown Heights (BK)
4. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
5. University Heights/Fordham (BX)

Five Lowest
51. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
52. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)
53. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
54. Flatlands/Canarsie (BK)
55. Mid-Island (SI)
Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of the City’s total housing units that are either owned by the City, in public housing developments maintained by the New York City Housing Authority or are in developments receiving some form of governmental subsidy to promote affordable housing (for example, Mitchell Lama rental units and HUD-regulated units).

Source: New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey
Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area
Years Reported: 2005

Five Highest
1. East Harlem (MN)
2. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
3. Coney Island (BK)
4. Brownsville/Ocean Hill (BK)
5. East New York/Starrett City (BK)

Five Lowest
50. 6 tied: Bensonhurst (BK), Middle Village/Ridgewood (QN), Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN), Ozone Park/Woodhaven (QN), S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN), Bayside/Little Neck (QN)

Rental Vacancy Rate
The percentage of all rental apartments that are vacant is calculated by dividing the number of vacant, habitable for-rent units by the number of renter-occupied units plus vacant, habitable for-rent units. This calculation excludes housing units in group quarters, such as hospitals, jails, mental institutions, and college dormitories as well as units that are rented but not occupied. Because of data limitations, on the community district pages we report an average rental vacancy rate for 2005–2007 rather than separate data for each year. For more information on this three-year average, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book. This indicator is ranked out of 53 sub-borough areas because rental vacancy data were not reported in CDs 105 and 209 for 2005–2007.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. North Shore (SI)
2. South Shore (SI)
3. Brownsville/Ocean Shore (BK)
4. Bayside/Littleneck (QN)
5. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)

Five Lowest
49. 2 tied: East Harlem (MN), Hillcrest/Fresh Meadows (QN)
51. Jackson Heights (QN)
52. Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN)
53. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)
The New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development investigates housing code complaints from tenants and issues code violations if housing inspections reveal problems. Serious code violations are class C (immediately hazardous). Data on housing violations are reported as rates—the number of violations per 1,000 rental units.

Source: New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, Department of Finance Real Property Assessment Data
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Five Highest
1. Bushwick (BK)
2. Fordham/University Heights (BX)
3. Hunts Point/Longwood (BX)
4. Belmont/East Tremont (BX)
5. Highbridge/Concourse (BX)

Five Lowest
55. Midtown (MN)
56. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
57. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
58. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)
59. Financial District (MN)

Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)
A severely crowded household is defined as one in which there are more than 1.5 persons for each room in the unit. We report the rate of crowded households as a percentage of all renter households.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. Jackson Heights (QN)
2. Borough Park (BK)
3. Sunset Park (BK)
4. Elmhurst/Corona (QN)
5. University Heights/Fordham (BX)

Five Lowest
48. 4 tied: Throgs Neck/Co-op City (BX), Middle Village/Ridgewood (QN), Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN), Rockaways (QN)
52. 2 tied: Bay Ridge (BK), Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
54. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
55. South Shore (SI)
Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading and Math (percentage)
The New York City Department of Education’s Division of Assessment and Accountability develops and administers city and state tests and compiles data on students’ performance on those tests. These education indicators report the percentage of students performing at or above grade level for grades three through eight. The Department of Education provides these data at the school district level. The Furman Center aggregates these data to the community district level using a population-weighting formula. For more information on our population-weighting method, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book. For this indicator, the year 2007 refers to the school year 2006–2007.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section.

Source: New York City Department of Education, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Reading
Highest
1. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
2. 6 tied: Financial District (MN), Greenwich Village/Soho (MN), Clinton/Chelsea (MN), Midtown (MN), Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN), Upper East Side (MN)

Lowest
55. Parkchester/Soundview (BX)
56. Highbridge/Concourse (BX)
57. Morrisania/Crotona (BX)
58. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
59. Mott Haven/Melrose (BX)

Math
Highest
1. Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
2. Flushin/Whitestone (QN)
3. 6 tied: Financial District (MN), Greenwich Village/Soho (MN), Clinton/Chelsea/Clinton (MN), Midtown (MN), Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN), Upper East Side (MN)

Lowest
55. S. Crown Heights/Lefferts Gardens (BK)
56. Fordham/University Heights (BX)
57. Morrisania/Crotona (BX)
58. Highbridge/Concourse (BX)
59. Mott Haven/Melrose (BX)

Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)
A property is considered delinquent for one year or more if the tax payment for the property was not received within one year of the due date. This report only includes delinquencies of more than $500. The percentage is calculated by dividing the number of delinquent properties by the total number of properties.

Source: New York City Department of Finance Open Balance File and Real Property Assessment Data
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Five Highest
1. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
2. Highbridge/Concourse (BX)
3. Bedford Stuyvesant (BK)
4. Fordham/University Heights (BX)
5. Bushwick (BK)

Five Lowest
53. 4 tied: Upper East Side (MN), Woodside/Sunnyside (QN), Rego Park/Forest Hills (QN), Bayside/Little Neck (QN)
57. Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)
58. 2 tied: Financial District (MN), Midtown (MN)
Unemployment Rate

This indicator measures the number of people aged 16 years and older in the civilian labor force who are unemployed, divided by the total number of people aged 16 years and older in the civilian labor force. People are considered to be “unemployed” if they meet the following criteria: they have not worked during the week of the survey; they have been looking for a job during the previous four weeks; and they were available to begin work. The unemployment rates shown are annual averages and are self-reported figures. At the City and borough level, the unemployment rates reported by the ACS may differ from the rates reported by the Local Area Unemployment Statistics program because of differences in the job search questions, the timing and mode of data collection and the population controls used in each survey. The Census Bureau advises using caution when comparing the 2000 Census unemployment rate to the ACS figures because of differences in question construction and sampling.

This indicator is disaggregated by race in the State of New Yorkers section. This indicator is ranked out of 53 sub-borough areas because unemployment data were not reported in CDs 110 or 206 in 2007.

Geography: City, Borough, Sub-borough Area

Five Highest
1. University Heights/Fordham (BX)
2. Mott Haven/Hunts Point (BX)
3. Morrisania/Belmont (BX)
4. East Harlem (MN)
5. Central Harlem (MN)

Five Lowest
49. Flatlands/Canarsie (BK)
50. Mid-Island (SI)
51. Upper East Side (MN)
52. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
53. South Shore (SI)

Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits

The number of units authorized by new residential building permits is derived from the building permit statistics of the New York City Department of Buildings. Permit renewals are not included. Not all building permits will result in actual construction, but the number of units authorized by new permits is the best available indicator of how many units are under construction. Comparisons between the years prior to 2005 and the more recent years should be made with caution due to improvements in the recently available data that facilitates more accurate estimates of the number of new units attached to each building permit. The figures for 2000 may be an underestimate.

Source: New York City Department of Buildings
Geography: City, Borough, Community District

Five Highest
1. Clinton/Chelsea (MN)
2. Greenpoint/Williamsburg (BK)
3. Financial District (MN)
4. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
5. Upper West Side (MN)

Five Lowest
55. Flatlands/Canarsie (BK)
56. Kingsbridge Heights/Bedford (BX)
57. Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)
58. Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights (BK)
59. Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN)
Units in a Historic District (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of residential units in the given geography that are within a historic district. Since the inception of the New York City Landmarks Law in 1965, the Landmarks Preservation Commission has had the ability to designate new historic districts. Once designated, a property owner is obligated to keep the site in good repair and apply for a permit prior to making alterations, reconstructions, demolitions, or improvements to the structure.
Refer to www.nychanis.com for community district level data. Only the five highest ranked community districts are presented here. There are 28 community districts that have no units located within historic districts.

Source: New York City Department of City Planning MapPLUTO, ed. 07C, New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough
Year Reported: 2007

Five Highest
1. Greenwich Village/Soho (MN)
2. Fort Greene/Brooklyn Heights (BK)
3. Upper West Side (MN)
4. Park Slope/Carroll Gardens (BK)
5. Jackson Heights (QN)

Units within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)
This indicator measures the percentage of residential units in the given geography that are within a half-mile walk of a subway station entrance. For the average able-bodied adult, a half mile represents about a ten-minute walk. For a more detailed description of how this indicator was calculated, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.

Source: New York City Department of Transportation, New York City Department of City Planning MapPLUTO, ed. 07C, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District
Year Reported: 2007

Five Highest
1. 7 tied: Financial District (MN), Greenwich Village/Soho (MN), Midtown (MN), Upper West Side (MN), Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN), Central Harlem (MN), Washington Heights/Inwood (MN)

Five Lowest
55. Flushing/Whitestone (QN)
56. St. George/Stapleton (SI)
57. Flatlands/Canarsie (BK)
58. 2 tied: Bayside/Little Neck (QN), Queens Village (QN)
Units within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)
This indicator measures the total share of residential units in the given geography that are within a quarter mile of a park that is larger than one quarter of an acre (including parks in the “Greenstreets” program). As part of PlaNYC 2030, the City has a goal of having 99% of residents within a half mile of a park and 85% of residents within a quarter mile of a park by 2030. For a more detailed description of how this indicator was calculated, please refer to the Methods chapter of this book.
Source: New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, New York City Department of City Planning MapPLUTO, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District
Years Reported: 2007

Five Highest
1. 10 tied: Hunts Point/Longwood (BX), Morrisania/Crotona (BX), Highbridge/Concourse (BX), Fordham/University Heights (BX), Belmont/East Tremont (BX), Upper West Side (MN), Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights (MN), Central Harlem (MN), East Harlem (MN), Washington Heights/Inwood (MN),

Five Lowest
55. Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights (BK)
56. Williamsbridge/Baychester (BX)
57. Kew Gardens/Woodhaven (QN)
58. Besonhurst (BK)
59. S. Ozone Park/Howard Beach (QN)

Vacant Land Area Rate
This indicator measures the percentage of total buildable land area in a given geographic area made up of privately owned vacant lots. We calculate the vacant land area rate by dividing the total area of privately owned vacant lots by the total area of all residential, commercial, and manufacturing zoned lots in a given geographic area.
Source: Department of Finance Real Property Assessment Data, Furman Center
Geography: City, Borough, Community District.

Five Highest
1. Tottenville/Great Kills (SI)
2. South Beach/Willowbrook (SI)
3. Rockaway/Broad Channel (QN)
4. East New York/Starrett City (BK)
5. Coney Island (BK)

Five Lowest
55. Sunset Park (BK)
56. Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay (MN)
57. Greenwich Village/Financial District (MN)
58. Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights (BK)
59. Upper East Side (MN)
New York City saw the first signs of a declining real estate market in 2007. The number of residential units authorized by new building permits dropped by 20% from 2006 to 2007, indicating a considerable slowdown in what had been a robust development pipeline. This was the first significant decline we have seen in the past decade. Although the 25,189 new building permits issued in 2007 marked a fall from the boom years of 2005 and 2006, this number was still much higher than in 2000, when only 15,544 were issued.

Between 2006 and 2007, in addition to a slowdown in new construction, New York City also saw a dramatic reduction in the number of mortgages issued, both for home purchases and refinancings. As shown in Table 1, between 2006 and 2007, 14% fewer borrowers took out home purchase loans in New York City. While steep, this drop was smaller than that experienced by the principal cities of the next nine largest U.S. metropolitan areas, with the exception of Washington, D.C. The New York City drop also was much smaller than the 25% decrease that occurred nationally. The reduction in home purchase mortgage originations in 2007 in the City was due almost entirely to the disintegration of the subprime lending industry. The number of high-cost home purchase loans issued to New Yorkers declined by 63 percent between 2006 and 2007 (from 12,517 to 4,593). As a result, the share of all home purchase loans that were high cost dropped from 23% in 2006 to just 10% in 2007.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Stock and Land Use</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>3,200,912</td>
<td>3,275,412</td>
<td>3,311,119</td>
<td>3,325,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>12,409</td>
<td>17,468</td>
<td>19,312</td>
<td>22,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits</td>
<td>15,544</td>
<td>27,430</td>
<td>31,453</td>
<td>25,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Prices & Affordability

| Index of Housing Price Appreciation (condominium) | 100.0 | 174.8 | 185.3 | 193.2 |
| Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building) | 100.0 | 165.8 | 173.4 | 170.1 |
| Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building) | 100.0 | 171.5 | 186.6 | 179.8 |
| Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building) | 100.0 | 193.0 | 202.3 | 213.3 |
| Median Price per Unit (condominium)             | $323,897  | $562,138  | $621,635  | $682,227  |
| Median Price per Unit (1 family building)       | $264,897  | $451,063  | $467,959  | $470,496  |
| Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)     | $143,753  | $247,897  | $266,891  | $270,000  |
| Median Price per Unit (5+ family building)      | $47,421   | $100,858  | $112,562  | $101,780  |
| Median Monthly Rent                             | –         | $877      | $884      | $898      |
| Median Rent Burden (renter households)          | –         | 31.0%     | 30.5%     | 29.9%     |
The decline in home purchase mortgage origination in New York City was heavily concentrated among blacks and Hispanics, who were much more likely to originate high-cost loans than borrowers of other races or ethnicities in recent years. The number of home purchase loans issued to blacks in 2007 fell 44% from 2006, and the number of home purchase loans issued to Hispanics fell 34%. The number of home purchase loans issued to white borrowers, in contrast, declined only slightly, and the number issued to Asians actually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lending Indicators</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)</td>
<td>7,148</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>9,295</td>
<td>14,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Quality</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social, Demographic &amp; Income Indicators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>8,017,506</td>
<td>8,213,839</td>
<td>8,250,567</td>
<td>8,274,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in New York State (percentage)</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$46,108</td>
<td>$46,112</td>
<td>$47,804</td>
<td>$48,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Population 65 and Older</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Population Under 18</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>1,341.6</td>
<td>857.3</td>
<td>893.1</td>
<td>1,008.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment: No High School Diploma (percentage)</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment: Bachelor's Degree and Higher (percentage)</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health &amp; Environmental Indicators</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Life Span: Males</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Life Span: Females</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
increased slightly. Particularly worrisome was the fact that even the number of prime home purchase loans issued to black and Hispanic New Yorkers in 2007 dropped significantly.¹

The decline in lending activity means fewer homebuyers were making investments in neighborhoods and fewer households were receiving the rewards (and assuming the risks) of homeownership. But, to the extent that the slowdown reflects a decline in high-cost or otherwise risky lending (which it does very closely in New York City), it could result in fewer homeowners facing foreclosure down the road.

The number of properties receiving notices of foreclosure citywide more than doubled between 2005 and 2007, from 6,658 to 14,106. The properties that entered the foreclosure process were not distributed evenly across the City, however. Bedford Stuyvesant, Brownsville and Bushwick were hit especially hard by foreclosures, experiencing the highest rates in the City in 2007, while many Manhattan neighborhoods seemed to be virtually immune. As would be expected, high rates of notices of foreclosure in 2007 correlate strongly with high rates of high-cost lending in 2006 (FIGURE 1).

The homeownership rate in New York City, 33.6% in 2007, is significantly lower than the homeownership rate nationally or in other large cities (TABLE 1). However, there are huge differences across the boroughs: the homeownership rate ranges from a high of 71.2% in Staten Island (in line with much of the rest of the country) to a low of 21.4% in the Bronx.

After a decade of housing price appreciation, outlined in detail in the chapter “Trends in New York City Housing Price Appreciation,” sale prices fell in 2007 in parts of the City. However, patterns were different in each borough. In the Bronx, Queens and Staten Island, housing prices declined for all building types. In Brooklyn, housing prices began to plateau after several years of steady growth, while in Manhattan prices only declined in 2–4 family buildings. All other housing types defied the trends and prices continued to rise in 2007 at a rate consistent with recent years’ growth. Although the 2007 data we report in the State of the City do not yet show a drop in Brooklyn and Manhattan, quarterly figures supplied by Miller Samuel Inc.² show that prices in those boroughs began to decline in 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>-28.7%</td>
<td>-60.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>-19.5%</td>
<td>-64.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>-26.9%</td>
<td>-59.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>-20.3%</td>
<td>-55.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>-23.2%</td>
<td>-57.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>-31.0%</td>
<td>-70.4%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>-46.3%</td>
<td>-64.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td><strong>-14.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-63.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>-43.7%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>-61.8%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S.</strong></td>
<td><strong>-25.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-58.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: American Community Survey, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, Furman Center
Renters experienced some relief from the steady and significant rent increases that have marked recent years. Although median rent increased modestly (1.5%) across New York City, the median rent burden decreased slightly (-0.6%) in 2007 compared to 2006. In fact, renters in New York City spend a similar share of their income on rent as renters in other large cities (TABLE 1). Of the principal cities of the next nine largest U.S. metropolitan areas, six had higher median rent burdens.

Despite the recent shifts in the housing market, finding affordable housing remains a persistent challenge to New Yorkers. In 2003, Mayor Bloomberg put forward his New Housing Marketplace Plan to create or preserve 165,000 affordable homes over ten years in order to house half a million low- and moderate-income New Yorkers. By September 30, 2008, five years into the plan, the City had financed 82,509 units, on track with its goal.

In 2007, New York continued to improve its performance in a variety of quality of life measures. The poverty rate decreased from 21.2% in 2000 to 18.5% in 2007. Felony crimes dropped from an annual rate of 36 per 1,000 residents in 2000 to 25 per 1,000 residents in 2007, though the rate of decline slowed in the most recent years. The City’s children greatly improved their performance in reading and mathematics. In 2000, only 39.8% of students in grades 3–8 were performing at grade level in reading and 33.7% in math. By 2007, these numbers increased to 50.8% for reading and 65.1% for math. Further, the share of adults with a bachelor’s degree or higher increased from 27.4% in 2000 to 32.9% in 2007 while the share with no high school diploma decreased from 27.7% to 21.1%. The unemployment rate steadily declined in the City and across all the boroughs. Health outcomes continued to improve with small declines seen in the incidence of elevated blood lead levels, infant mortality and low birth weight.

Overall, the first few years of the 21st century treated New York City well: real estate development boomed and housing prices appreciated dramatically throughout the boroughs. But while this housing price appreciation helped those selling their homes, it also made homeownership or renting unaffordable to many. Additionally, while decreases in crime and poverty and consistent gains in educational attainment and health outcomes improved the quality of life for many New Yorkers, increasing foreclosures and declining housing prices may make 2007 a turning point for the City. The challenge for government and community leaders in the near future will be to prevent a reversal of the positive trends of the past few years despite stretched resources.

---


2 http://www.millersamuel.com/


While the *State of the City* traditionally evaluates health, housing and demographic data at the neighborhood level, we recognize that race or ethnicity also influences these quality of life outcomes. Neighborhood data sometimes serve as a proxy for how different racial and ethnic groups fare in New York City because neighborhoods often are segregated (as revealed by our racial diversity indices). Given the inexactness of that proxy, and New York City’s tremendous diversity, we think it is important to understand how health, housing and demographic outcomes vary for New Yorkers of different backgrounds.

Black and Hispanic residents of New York City have poorer health outcomes and lower levels of educational attainment than white and Asian New Yorkers. Blacks consistently have much higher rates of low birth weight and infant mortality than other City residents. Further, both blacks and Hispanics have strikingly higher rates of new cases of elevated blood lead levels than their white and Asian counterparts. The differences in the median life span across racial and ethnic groups and genders are especially stark, ranging from a low of 64 years for black and Hispanic men to 84 years for white women. Although the gap has narrowed in recent years, black and Hispanic students still lag behind their white and Asian peers in their performance in reading and math.

Of the population 25 years old and older in each group, whites have the highest levels of education, followed by Asians, blacks and finally, Hispanics. Nearly 38% of Hispanic adults do not have a high school diploma, while the corresponding rate for whites is only 9.8%. These differences in educational attainment appear to be highly correlated with disparities in the poverty rate, unemployment rate and the median household income across racial groups.

In 2007 we saw disparate trends in home purchase lending between different racial and ethnic groups. In the most recent years before 2007, the different racial and ethnic groups were taking out loans roughly in line with their proportion of the population. In 2006, for example, blacks made up 24.3% of the population and 23.1% of the home purchase borrowers. But beginning in 2007, as the credit market began to contract, blacks and Hispanics were increasingly underrepresented, making up 24% and 27% of the population, respectively, but only 12.9% and 12.5% of home purchase loan borrowers. Asians, the only group to take out more home purchase loans in 2007 than in 2006, significantly increased their share of home purchase loan borrowers. These home purchase lending trends may further exacerbate the disparities that already exist in the homeownership rates across different racial and ethnic groups: nearly 44% of white and 40% of Asian households are homeowners, while just 28% of blacks and 17% of Hispanics are.
The table below provides key indicators for New York City disaggregated by race and ethnicity. Data are provided only for whites, blacks, Hispanics and Asians, the racial and ethnic groups that make up the vast majority of the City’s population.

Data are for the year 2007, unless otherwise noted. The population share reports the percentage of the total New York City population that each racial and ethnic group constitutes. Indicators listed as “percentage” or “rate” report the percentage of the racial or ethnic group that has the designated characteristic. For example, the population under 18 reports the percentage of each racial or ethnic group that is under the age of 18. Indicators listed as a “share” report the percentage of all cases that could be attributed to the given racial or ethnic group. For instance, the Share of Home Purchase Loans for blacks reports that out of all the home purchase loans originated in 2007, 12.9% went to blacks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>965,830</td>
<td>1,948,183</td>
<td>2,269,972</td>
<td>2,903,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of the New York City Population</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged Under 18 (percentage)*</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)*</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)*</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing &amp; Affordability</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income*</td>
<td>$51,125</td>
<td>$39,554</td>
<td>$34,390</td>
<td>$66,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate*</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Home Purchase Loans</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Refinance Loans</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (rental units) (2005)</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (rental units) (2005)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty, Education, Employment &amp; Disability Status</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate*</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Population Under 18*</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate: Population 65 and Older*</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment: No High School Diploma (percentage)*</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment: Bachelor’s Degree and Higher (percentage)*</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate*</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate*</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)*</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population (percentage)*</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>37^2</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicators</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 births)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (share of all new cases by race)^3</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Life Span: Males (years)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Life Span: Females (years)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1 Derived from a sample of less than 2000. ^2 For this indicator, "Asian" also includes all "other races". ^3 In this section only, Elevated Blood Lead Levels refers to levels at or above the Environmental Intervention Blood Lead Level of 15 µ/dL (micrograms per deciliter). *It is not possible to disaggregate the data for black/African Americans and Asians by Hispanic ethnicity therefore some double counting may occur.
THE BRONX

Mott Haven / Melrose   CD 101   68
Hunts Point / Longwood  CD 102   69
Morrisania / Crotona    CD 103   70
Highbridge / Concourse  CD 104   71
Fordham / University Heights CD 105   72
Belmont / East Tremont  CD 106   73
Kingsbridge Heights / Bedford CD 107   74
Riverdale / Fieldston   CD 108   75
Parkchester / Soundview CD 109   76
Throgs Neck / Co-op City CD 110   77
Morris Park / Bronxdale CD 111   78
Williamsbridge / Baychester CD 112   79
The recent downturn in the real estate market has hit the Bronx particularly hard: residents are taking out fewer home loans, foreclosure rates are increasing, new construction is declining, and housing prices, as measured by our repeat sales index, are falling. The number of properties receiving a notice of foreclosure has nearly doubled in the past two years, from 801 in 2005 to 1,592 in 2007. The rate of home purchase lending decreased by 25% from 2006 to 2007 and continues to be the lowest rate in the City. Units authorized by new residential building permits dropped by 64.6% last year, indicating that new home building in the Bronx also has suffered under a tight credit market.

The situation for renters in the Bronx has been fairly consistent since 2005. While the median rent is the lowest in the City, the median rent burden remains relatively high (second only to Staten Island in 2007). The Bronx also has the highest rate of serious housing code violations and the second-highest percentage of severely crowded rental households, a rate that has hovered around 4% since 2005. The homeownership rate remains the lowest in the City at just over 21%.

The borough has the City’s highest percentage of households with children under 18 and the lowest percentage of population aged 65 years and older. Although both poverty and unemployment fell between 2006 and 2007, the Bronx continues to have the highest rates of all the boroughs.

Public school student performance in the Bronx continues to lag behind the rest of the City with fewer students performing at or above grade level in both math and reading. While performance in math has improved substantially since 2000 (by 31.2 percentage points), improvement in reading has been more modest (11.6 percentage points since 2000). These trends are consistent with the City as a whole.

Substantial investment presently underway in parks, retail development, and other areas promises to impact the quality of life of Bronx residents. In July, the City Council approved a rezoning plan for Hunts Point in the South Bronx which will create a buffer zone of commercial development between residential areas and a large industrial food distribution plant. The rezoning is part of the larger Hunts Point Vision plan, which also includes the development of waterfront parks, the completion of an 8-mile greenway project, and improvements to freight and other transportation infrastructure. The borough also has seen significant private-sector investment in projects such as the Gateway Center Mall at Bronx Terminal Market, which is scheduled to open in 2009 and will provide a reported 4,000 new jobs. For more information on this project, please visit www.plannyc.org.
### Housing Stock & Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>490,659</td>
<td>502,211</td>
<td>506,396</td>
<td>508,570</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building permits</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>7,046</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Prices & Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (condominium)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>211.9</td>
<td>263.6</td>
<td>261.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>172.3</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>157.7</td>
<td>174.9</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>217.5</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td>221.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (1 family building)</td>
<td>$240,815</td>
<td>$376,995</td>
<td>$411,393</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>$122,214</td>
<td>$198,189</td>
<td>$222,838</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rent</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$735</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social, Demographic & Income Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,333,965</td>
<td>1,364,566</td>
<td>1,371,353</td>
<td>1,373,659</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$33,246</td>
<td>$31,030</td>
<td>$32,391</td>
<td>$34,156</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>2,232.2</td>
<td>1,133.2</td>
<td>1,039.1</td>
<td>1,230.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health & Environmental Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
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Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 101 versus New York City
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Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)

Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)

2007 Rank

Population

150,667 –

Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)

36.0 26

Median Household Income

$20,827 54

Income Diversity Ratio

6.5 10

Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (‘05)

51.6% 2

Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (‘05)

42.4% 32

Median Age of Housing Stock

51 51

Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)

99.9% 11

Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)

98.7% 9

CD 101 in 2000

$63,041 - $103,814

CD 101 in 2007

$103,814 +

Income Diversity Ratio

90% of the housing stock in CD 101, compared to only 45% citywide. Just 6% of the housing stock in CD 101 is owner occupied.

CD 101 ranks lowest in the City for student performance in math and reading. Although test scores have improved since 2000, gains in performance have not kept pace with recent City improvements.

2007 Rank

2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007.

4 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).

5 Price index should be treated with caution due to low number of observations.

6 Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
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Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)
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Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)
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Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)
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Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)
**Hunts Point / Longwood – CD 102**

- All residential units in Hunts Point/Longwood are within a quarter mile of a park.
- Despite CD 102 having one of the higher percentages of vacant land in the City (5.9%), it ranks among the lowest in units authorized by new residential building permits in 2007. In 2007, units authorized by new residential building permits declined to 2000 levels.
- Despite a significant increase in notices of foreclosure (+40.7%) since 2000, the homeownership rate in CD 102 has remained relatively stable.
- While the unemployment rate in CD 102 is still higher than that of the Bronx as a whole, it has decreased significantly, from 23.6% in 2000 to 13.2% in 2007.
- CD 102 has the sixth highest net per capita daily waste stream in the City.
- In January of 2008, the Department of City Planning approved the plans to rezone 33 blocks in Hunts Point as part of a larger “Hunts Point Vision Plan” designed to improve the area’s open space, transportation, and economic opportunities. For more information about this project, please visit www.plannyc.org.

### Households in CD 102 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 102 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community District Profiles: The Bronx

1. Community districts 101 and 102 both fall within sub-borough 101. Data at the sub-borough area level for these two CDs are identical.
3. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
4. Price index should be treated with caution due to low number of observations.
5. Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented.
6. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 103 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notices of Foreclosure in CD 103 (2007)

- In CD 103, 81 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 42.6 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
The New York Yankees are constructing a new stadium in Highbridge/Concourse. The project has attracted intense media scrutiny because the new construction destroyed parkland, City officials gave concessions in exchange for a luxury box for the City, which they ultimately sold for cash, and construction costs have run considerably over budget. In December 2008, the City announced that it would be issuing over $300 million in new bonds to cover additional costs of construction. For more information about this project, please visit www.plannyc.org.

While CD 104 has consistently ranked among the lowest in student performance in math and reading, students have made significant gains. The percentage of students performing at grade level in math has nearly tripled since 2000.

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD 104</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 2000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 2007</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2000</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2007</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population 139,445  Rank –
Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile) 75.8  Rank 7
Median Household Income $24,819  Rank 52
Income Diversity Ratio 5.7  Rank 17
Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (‘05) 12.0%  Rank 26
Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (‘05) 79.9%  Rank 6
Median Age of Housing Stock 79  Rank 16
Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage) 100.0%  Rank 1
Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage) 95.0%  Rank 16

Community district 104 matches sub-borough area 103. The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). Price index should be treated with caution due to low number of observations. Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
NYC in 2000
NYC in 2000
NYC in 2000
NYC in 2007
NYC
NYC
NYC
NYC in 2007

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 105 versus New York City

Close to 80% of housing units in CD 105 are rent controlled or rent stabilized, compared to only 35% citywide. Only 2% of the housing stock is owner occupied, the lowest rate in the City.

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

Students in CD 105 have made significant gains in performance at grade level in both math and reading. However, students still lag behind citywide performance by 13 percentage points in math and 11 percentage points in reading.
BELMONT / EAST TREMONT – CD 106

Population
Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)
Median Household Income
Income Diversity Ratio
Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) ('05)
Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) ('05)
Median Age of Housing Stock
Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)
Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)

Housing Stock Composition of CD 106 versus New York City (2005)
- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

Only 8% of the housing stock in CD 106 is owner occupied, compared to 33% citywide. The majority of housing units in CD 106 are non-market rate rental units.

Residents of CD 106 are less likely to drive or walk to work than residents in the City as a whole. However, bus ridership is more common with 29% of commuters in CD 106 riding the bus, compared to only 13% citywide.

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)
- CD 106
- NYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>55 53</td>
<td>55 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>44 43</td>
<td>44 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk / Bike</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>55 53</td>
<td>55 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>24 6</td>
<td>24 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>9 10</td>
<td>9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level 1 in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>55 53</td>
<td>55 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54 52</td>
<td>54 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>34 35</td>
<td>34 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Community districts 103 and 106 both fall within sub-borough 102. Data at the sub-borough area level for these two CDs are identical.
2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 4 Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 5 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

- **Reading 2000**:
  - CD 107: 27.6%
  - NYC: 29.8%

- **Reading 2007**:
  - CD 107: 34.2%
  - NYC: 36.4%

- **Math 2000**:
  - CD 107: 4.1%
  - NYC: 4.9%

- **Math 2007**:
  - CD 107: 7.4%
  - NYC: 7.8%

Students in CD 107 have made significant gains toward closing the gap between their performance and the City average. Gains were particularly strong in reading, where 44% of students are now performing at grade level, up from 28% in 2000.

### Housing Stock Composition of CD 107 versus New York City (2005)

- **Owner Occupied**: CD 107: 45%, NYC: 51%
- **Market-rate Rent**: CD 107: 35%, NYC: 35%
- **Public Housing**: CD 107: 10%, NYC: 9%
- **Rent Control / Stabilized**: CD 107: 10%, NYC: 5%
- **Other Rent Subsidized**: CD 107: 10%, NYC: 5%

84% of the housing units in CD 107 are rent controlled or rent stabilized, compared to only 35% citywide. Just 6% of housing stock is owner occupied.
In CD 108, 0.7% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.

In CD 108 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>CD 108 2007</th>
<th>NYC 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 108 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In CD 108, 0.7% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.

Historic Preservation in CD 108

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Preservation in CD 108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In CD 108, 0.7% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.
### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 109 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notices of Foreclosure in CD 109 (2007)

In CD 109, 241 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 27.3 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was slightly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.

### Education Graph Title Goes Here

- Modal Share Chart

### Housing Stock Graph Title Goes Here

- Units Authorized by New Residential Building permits
- Median Age of Housing Stock

### Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)

### Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)

### Median Age of Housing Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$33,564</td>
<td>$33,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Monthly Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$778</td>
<td>$778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rental Vacancy Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$105,536</td>
<td>$105,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Rent Burden (renter households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notice of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Foreign-Born Population (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial Diversity Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Populations in CD 109 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

- $0 - $18,302: 30%
- $18,302 - $38,536: 26%
- $38,536 - $63,041: 21%
- $63,041 - $103,814: 18%
- $103,814+: 6%

### Income Diversity Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NYC in 2000</th>
<th>CD 109 in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 109 versus New York City

3. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
4. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
**Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 110 versus New York City**

- **CD 110 in 2000**
  - Asian: 17%
  - Black: 20%
  - Hispanic: 21%
  - White: 21%

- **NYC in 2000**
  - Asian: 0.0%
  - Black: 0.0%
  - Hispanic: 0.0%
  - White: 0.0%

- **CD 110 in 2007**
  - Asian: 17%
  - Black: 20%
  - Hispanic: 21%
  - White: 21%

- **NYC in 2007**
  - Asian: 0.0%
  - Black: 0.0%
  - Hispanic: 0.0%
  - White: 0.0%

**Housing Stock Composition of CD 110 versus New York City (2005)**

- **Owner Occupied**
  - CD 110: 71%
  - NYC: 71%

- **Market-rate Rent**
  - CD 110: 12%
  - NYC: 12%

- **Public Housing**
  - CD 110: 8%
  - NYC: 8%

- **Rent Control / Stabilized**
  - CD 110: 8%
  - NYC: 8%

- **Other Rent Subsidized**
  - CD 110: 7%
  - NYC: 7%

Nearly 65% of the housing stock in CD 110 is owner occupied compared to 33% citywide. There are very few rent regulated or subsidized housing units.

**Means of Transportation to Work (2007)**

- **Subway**: 35%
- **Bus**: 25%
- **Car**: 20%
- **Walk / Bike**: 10%

A much higher percent of residents in CD 110 drive to work than in the City as a whole, 55% compared to 30%. The public transit rate is nearly the lowest in the City.

---

1 Community district 110 matches sub-borough area 108. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building). 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
MORRIS PARK / BRONXDALE – CD 111

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

Students in CD 111 kept pace with students in the rest of the City in both math and reading. However, the gap in performance between students in CD 111 and the City has grown slightly since 2000.

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

Fewer residents ride the subway or bus, bicycle or walk to work in CD 111 than citywide. 45% of commuters drive to work compared to 30% throughout the City.

### 2007 Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CD 111 vs. NYC

#### Racial and Ethnic Composition

- **Asian:** 24% in CD 111, 17% in NYC
- **Black:** 19% in CD 111, 28% in NYC
- **Hispanic:** 28% in CD 111, 28% in NYC
- **White:** 14% in CD 111, 14% in NYC

### Housing Stock Graph

- **Median Age of Housing Stock:**
  - **CD 111 in 2000:** 32
  - **NYC in 2000:** 30
- **Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage):** 93.5% in CD 111, 77.3% in NYC
- **Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage):** 100% in CD 111, 100% in NYC

### Population

- **Population:** 126,978 in 2007
- **Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile):** 33.1 in 2007
- **Median Household Income:** $44,335 in 2007
- **Income Diversity Ratio:** 5.5 in 2007

### Rental Units

- **Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (‘05):** 17.0% in CD 111, 18% in NYC
- **Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (‘05):** 54.2% in CD 111, 21% in NYC

### Income Quintiles

- **Households in CD 111 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007):**
  - $0 - $18,302: 24%
  - $18,302 - $38,536: 19%
  - $38,536 - $63,041: 28%
  - $63,041 - $103,814: 17%
  - $103,814 +: 14%

### Means of Transportation to Work

- **Subway:** 20%
- **Bus:** 40%
- **Car:** 40%
- **Walk / Bike:** 10%

### Notes

3. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
**Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 112 versus New York City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notices of Foreclosure in CD 112 (2007)**

In CD 112, 501 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 29.2 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.

1 Community district 112 matches sub-borough area 110. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenpoint / Williamsburg</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Greene / Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford Stuyvesant</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushwick</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East New York / Starrett City</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Slope / Carroll Gardens</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Heights / Prospect Heights</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Crown Heights / Lefferts Gardens</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Ridge / Dyker Heights</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensonhurst</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Park</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coney Island</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatbush / Midwood</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepshead Bay</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Flatbush</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatlands / Canarsie</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brooklyn is the second most racially diverse borough in the City (behind Queens), and has the highest percentage of black residents (33.4%). This percentage has remained relatively stable since 2000. While Brooklyn’s poverty rate dropped 3.1 percentage points from 25.1% in 2000 to 21.9% in 2007, the rate remains the second highest in the City (behind the Bronx). The borough is also the second most densely populated in the City. Out of the five boroughs, residents of Brooklyn rely most heavily on public transportation and they experience the longest mean travel time to work (roughly 44 minutes).

Housing indicators suggest that the Brooklyn housing market fared relatively well through 2007. In Brooklyn, the only housing type to experience a drop in prices in 2007 was 2–4 family buildings. Brooklyn has the City’s second most expensive single-family housing stock. Brooklyn was one of only two boroughs to see a rise in new residential building permits in 2007. Homeownership in Brooklyn declined slightly from 32.3% in 2006 to 30.6% in 2007.

Despite its resilience in 2007, Brooklyn may not be immune to the effects of the housing market downturn in the coming years. Lending and foreclosure trends in Brooklyn are much the same as in the rest of the City: the borough experienced declines in all lending activities and increases in notices of foreclosure. Brooklyn had the second highest foreclosure rate of all the boroughs, with 22.4 notices of foreclosure per 1,000 1–4 family properties in 2007. Brooklyn also had the second highest rate of serious housing code violations: 61.4 per 1,000 rental units.

The borough experienced the largest drop in households with children in the City, dropping 3.8 percentage points from 38.2% in 2000 to 34.4% in 2007. Since 2000, Brooklyn students have outperformed Bronx and Manhattan students in reading and math, but they still lag behind students in Queens and Staten Island. In 2007, 50.1% and 64.6% of students performed at or above their grade level in reading and math, respectively. Brooklyn had the City’s highest rate of elevated blood lead level diagnoses in children, in part because its housing stock is the oldest in the City (tied with Manhattan).

The recent economic downturn has affected the controversial Atlantic Yards development in Brooklyn, a 22-acre site at the intersection of Atlantic and Flatbush Avenues. Plans include housing, a hotel, retail space and a basketball arena. It has been hit by legal challenges, high construction costs and a falling demand for office and retail space. By the end of 2008, the developer, Forest City Ratner Companies, appeared to be running out of funding and some plans for the development were being scaled back. For more up to date information on this project, please visit www.plannyc.org.
## Housing Stock & Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>930,866</td>
<td>947,632</td>
<td>954,382</td>
<td>959,465</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>7,544</td>
<td>7,959</td>
<td>8,170</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing Prices & Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (condominium)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>186.5</td>
<td>207.1</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>168.6</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>187.9</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>180.7</td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (1 family building)</td>
<td>$270,917</td>
<td>$483,055</td>
<td>$488,529</td>
<td>$511,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>$136,462</td>
<td>$240,572</td>
<td>$258,663</td>
<td>$266,925</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rent</td>
<td>- $837</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$856</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (renter households)</td>
<td>- 31.4%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Lending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>- 49.2</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>- 23.8%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>- 56.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>- 33.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>- 2.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social, Demographic & Income Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,466,340</td>
<td>2,511,408</td>
<td>2,523,047</td>
<td>2,528,050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$38,693</td>
<td>$39,634</td>
<td>$41,543</td>
<td>$41,406</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>853.8</td>
<td>681.8</td>
<td>802.3</td>
<td>975.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Health & Environmental Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)</td>
<td>- 2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
**GREENPOINT / WILLIAMSBURG – CD 201**

### 2007 Rankings

- Population: 146,456
- Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile): 35.2
- Median Household Income: $40,836
- Income Diversity Ratio: 5.5
- Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (‘05): 20.0%
- Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (‘05): 54.6%
- Median Age of Housing Stock: 79
- Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage): 95.0%
- Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage): 93.9%

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 201 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

- Subway: 27%
- Bus: 6%
- Car: 27%
- Walk / Bike: 3%

**Housing Stock Composition of CD 201 versus New York City (2005)**

- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

Only 17% of the housing stock in CD 201 is owner occupied, compared to 33% citywide. Rent controlled or rent stabilized units make up nearly half of the total housing stock.

### Households in CD 201 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>Households in CD 201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

Though the percentage of residents of CD 201 who walk or bicycle to work is comparable to the City average, the share of residents who use the subway is 20 percentage points higher than the citywide share.

---

1. The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3. Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 4. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
In CD 202, 41.5% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.
NYC in 2000

NYC

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 203 versus New York City

Housing Stock

Rent Control / Stabilized

Public Housing

In CD 203, 746 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 64.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1–4 family 1,000 properties and it is the highest rate in the City.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
• Bushwick continues to exhibit signs of neighborhood distress: it has the highest rate of serious housing code violations and the rate of notices of foreclosure, 57.8 per 1,000 properties, has nearly tripled since 2000.

• The poverty rate is 32% in CD 204, ranking it 7th highest citywide.

• Despite the low homeownership rate, CD 204 ranked fourth in the rate of high cost home purchase lending in 2007.

• More than half of the households in CD 204 earn incomes in the lowest two New York City income quintiles.

• CD 204 is ranked 9th in the City for the asthma hospitalization rate, though the rate has dropped slightly since 2000.

• Less than 10% of the population of CD 204 is aged 65 or older, one of the smallest shares in the City. At the same time, almost half of the households include children 18 years old or younger, ranking it 11th in the City.

• The rate of severely crowded households has risen in recent years to 4% in 2007.

• Students are showing improvement in math performance, with 58% of students performing at grade level compared to 48% last year. Reading performance has fallen slightly in the past two years.

---

**Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 204 versus New York City**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>4/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>45/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>2/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Households in CD 204 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $18,302</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $103,814</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**2000 2005 2006 2007 Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$31,531</td>
<td>$63,041</td>
<td>$103,814</td>
<td>$18,302</td>
<td>0–18,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden</td>
<td>– $1,454</td>
<td>– $2,883</td>
<td>– $4,310</td>
<td>– $6,738</td>
<td>0–6,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Price</td>
<td>– $100,340</td>
<td>$207,024</td>
<td>$235,238</td>
<td>$233,333</td>
<td>1–233,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden</td>
<td>– 33.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>– 4/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Home Price</td>
<td>– $100,340</td>
<td>$207,024</td>
<td>$235,238</td>
<td>$233,333</td>
<td>1–233,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden</td>
<td>– 33.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>– 4/4</td>
<td>4/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Renters by Housing Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued**

- 225
- 650
- 490
- 343
- 22

---

**Unemployment Rate**

- 17.2%
- 12.7%
- 7.1%
- 8.0%
- 8

---

**Poverty Rate**

- 38.2%
- 32.9%
- 32.0%
- 6

---

**Public Transportation Rate**

- 58.1%
- 63.9%
- 66.7%
- 63.5%
- 26

---

**Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)**

- 8.7
- 8.6
- 5.9
- 5.8
- 3

---

**Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)**

- 226.1
- 207.2
- 173.6
- 193.2
- 1

---

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
NYC in 2000

Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage) 88
Units Within 1/4 Mile of a park (percentage) 80%
Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) ('05) 20%
Income Diversity Ratio 5.3
Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) ('05) 39.1%
Median Age of Housing Stock 77
Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage) 93.2%
Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage) 75.4%

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.

Notices of Foreclosure in CD 205 (2007)

In CD 205, 841 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 54.4 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 206 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% of the housing stock in CD 205 is made up of market rate rental units, compared to only 22% citywide. Just 7.7% of the housing stock is public housing.

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

Nearly 70% of residents ride the subway to work, one of the highest rates in the City. Only 13% of residents commute by car.
Students in CD 207 continue to outperform their peers citywide in both math and reading. The percentage of students performing at grade level in math has almost doubled since 2000.
### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 208 versus New York City

- **CD 208 in 2000**
  - Asian: 20%
  - Black: 40%
  - Hispanic: 19%
  - White: 18%

- **NYC in 2000**
  - Asian: 13%
  - Black: 31%
  - Hispanic: 20%
  - White: 32%

### Households in CD 208 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814+</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notices of Foreclosure in CD 208 (2007)

- **2000**: 11238
- **2005**: 11213
- **2006**: 11214
- **2007**: 11216

- **Rank (2000)**: 19
- **Rank (2007)**: 11

### In CD 208, 196 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 44.9 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 209 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial Diversity Index

CD 209 in 2000: 23%
NYC in 2000: 26%
CD 209 in 2007: 21%
NYC in 2007: 26%

Housing Stock Composition of CD 209 versus New York City (2005)

- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

Close to 75% of the housing stock in CD 209 is either rent regulated or subsidized, 30 percentage points higher than the City’s share. Only 10% of the housing stock in CD 209 is made up of market rate rental units.

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

Although student performance has improved markedly since 2000, students in CD 209 still lag behind the City. Only 52% are performing at grade level in math, one of the lowest rates in the City.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
## Bay Ridge / Dyker Heights – CD 210

### Population and Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>126,730</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$49,228</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (’05)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (’05)</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age of Housing Stock</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- White

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

- CD 210 vs. NYC

- Students in CD 210 have consistently outperformed their peers throughout the City in both reading and math, though improved citywide performance decreased this spread in 2007.

### Key Facts

- Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights continues to have very little development activity, ranking 58 out of 59 community districts in units authorized by new residential building permits.
- Only 67% of residents live within 1/4 mile walk of a park, one of the lowest percentages in the City.
- The demographic make-up of CD 210 is much different from the City’s composition, with a higher percentage of white residents and a much lower percentage of black and Hispanic residents. Additionally, the share of Asians has increased 6 percentage points since 2000.

### Rental Vacancy Rate

- 2000: 2.0%
- 2005: 4.2%
- 2006: 4.0%
- 2007: 4.2%

### Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued

- 2000: 90
- 2005: 178
- 2006: 100
- 2007: 104

### Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits

- 2000: 99
- 2005: 91
- 2006: 145
- 2007: 41

### Homeownership Rate

- 2000: 33.6%
- 2005: 39.9%
- 2006: 40.0%
- 2007: 40.4%

### Vacant Land Area Rate

- 2000: 0.5%
- 2005: 0.3%
- 2006: 0.4%
- 2007: 0.4%

### Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)

- 2000: 100.0
- 2005: 176.2
- 2006: 172.2
- 2007: 163.6

### Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)

- 2000: $198,673
- 2005: $350,321
- 2006: $337,856
- 2007: $325,000

### Median Monthly Rent

- 2000: $915
- 2005: $964
- 2006: $950
- 2007: $52

### Median Rent Burden (renter households)

- 2000: 27.5%
- 2005: 28.5%
- 2006: 29.9%
- 2007: 21%

### Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)

- 2000: 11.9
- 2005: 12.3
- 2006: 19.3
- 2007: 51

### Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)

- 2000: 2.6%
- 2005: 0.6%
- 2006: 0.7%
- 2007: 1.0%

### Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)

- 2000: 41.2
- 2005: 33.8
- 2006: 31.1
- 2007: 38

### High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)

- 2000: 4.3%
- 2005: 4.5%
- 2006: 2.8%
- 2007: 42

### High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)

- 2000: 12.3%
- 2005: 15.5%
- 2006: 15.3%
- 2007: 36

### Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)

- 2000: 1.9
- 2005: 2.1
- 2006: 2.3
- 2007: 3.1

### Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)

- 2000: 2.0%
- 2005: 2.9%
- 2006: 0.9%
- 2007: 52

### Foreign-Born Population (percentage)

- 2000: 36.5%
- 2005: 34.5%
- 2006: 36.4%
- 2007: 35.3%

### Racial Diversity Index

- 2000: 0.49
- 2005: 0.54
- 2006: 0.52
- 2007: 0.52

### Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)

- 2000: 26.3%
- 2005: 26.2%
- 2006: 27.5%
- 2007: 27.8%

### Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)

- 2000: 16.2%
- 2005: 13.9%
- 2006: 15.8%
- 2007: 17.9%

### Poverty Rate

- 2000: 13.9%
- 2005: 13.7%
- 2006: 14.1%
- 2007: 40

### Unemployment Rate

- 2000: 6.1%
- 2005: 9.0%
- 2006: 8.2%
- 2007: 4.7%

### Public Transportation Rate

- 2000: 50.2%
- 2005: 56.8%
- 2006: 53.6%
- 2007: 55.3%

### Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)

- 2000: 23.4
- 2005: 18.0
- 2006: 18.8
- 2007: 17.7

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)

- 2000: 50.6%
- 2005: 64.5%
- 2006: 62.6%
- 2007: 59.0%

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)

- 2000: 48.6%
- 2005: 66.4%
- 2006: 70.6%
- 2007: 77.7%

### Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)

- 2000: 1.3
- 2005: 1.0
- 2006: 0.9
- 2007: 0.9

### Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)

- 2000: 18.1
- 2005: 6.3
- 2006: 4.2
- 2007: 3.9

### Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)

- 2000: 2.3
- 2005: 2.1
- 2006: 2.2
- 2007: – 38

---

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
BENSONHURST – CD 211

Population
- Population: 184,258
- Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile): 53.7
- Median Household Income: $41,494
- Income Diversity Ratio: 5.5

CD 211 in 2000
- NYC 2000
- NYC 2007

- Bensonhurst has one of the lowest felony crime rates in the City, at 15.4 felonies per 1,000 residents in 2007.
- CD 211 has one of the largest senior populations. Residents 65 years and older made up 19% of the population.
- Only 56.4% of residents live within 1/4 mile walk of a park, the second lowest percentage in the City.
- Though it is ranked just 38th, serious housing code violations have risen consistently since 2000, from 14.5 to nearly 20 violations per 1,000 rental units.
- CD 211 has the 6th highest median rent burden with the median household spending 35% of their income on rent.
- New residential building permits have dropped sharply since 2005, from 483 to 131, ranking CD 211 48th in the City.

- Population in CD 211 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

- CD 211 in 2000
- NYC in 2000
- CD 211 in 2007
- NYC in 2007

- Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 211 versus New York City

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- White

- NYC 2000
- NYC 2007

- Racial Diversity Index
- Homeownership Rate
- Vacant Land Area Rate
- Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)
- Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)
- Median Monthly Rent
- Median Rent Burden (renter households)
- Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)
- Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)
- Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)
- High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)
- High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)
- Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)
- Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)
- Foreign-Born Population (percentage)
- Racial Diversity Index
- Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)
- Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)
- Poverty Rate
- Unemployment Rate
- Public Transportation Rate
- Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)
- Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)
- Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)
- Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)
- Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)
- Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)

- CD 211
- NYC

- Market rate rental units make up almost 40% of the housing stock in CD 211, compared to 22% citywide. There are no public housing units.
Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 212 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Stock Composition of CD 212 versus New York City (2005)

- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

Market rate rental units make up almost a third of the housing stock in CD 212, compared to 22% citywide. There are no public housing units in CD 212.

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

Subway: 40%, Bus: 20%, Car: 20%, Walk / Bike: 10%

Residents in CD 212 use the subway less to get to work than the citywide average. The percentage of individuals that walk or ride a bicycle to work is almost double that of the citywide average.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Investments in Coney Island, such as the construction of the Brooklyn Cyclones’ KeySpan Park, restoration of the Stillwell Avenue Terminal, and development of substantial amounts of infill housing within the community, have all laid the groundwork for further development of the community district. In 2003, the City mobilized the Coney Island Development Corporation to plan and implement economic and development strategies like developing vacant property for commercial and residential use, including housing, retail stores and a community center. For more information on this development, please visit www.plannyc.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of students performing at grade level in math has improved by more than 20 percentage points since 2000, while the percentage of students performing at grade level in reading improved by only 4 percentage points.

| Rental Vacancy Rate | 1.6% | – | – | 3.1% | 52 | 34 |
| Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued | 36 | 230 | 383 | 400 | 51 | 20 |
| Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits | 250 | 284 | 303 | 192 | 16 | 38 |
| Homeownership Rate | 23.3% | 22.5% | 28.5% | 22.6% | 34 | 39 |
| Vacant Land Area Rate | 12.5% | 9.6% | 9.8% | 9.8% | 5 | 5 |
| Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building) | 100.0 | 187.7 | 221.4 | 194.7 | 11 |
| Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building) | $120,408 | $265,415 | $264,320 | $253,333 | 17 | 17 |
| Median Monthly Rent | – | $685 | $678 | $707 | – | 49 |
| Median Rent Burden (renter households) | – | 29.8% | 32.1% | 31.5% | – | 25 |
| Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units) | 22.5 | 18.2 | 19.5 | 22.8 | 39 | 34 |
| Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year) | 4.6% | 1.3% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 32 | 25 |
| Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties) | – | 32.0 | 22.8 | 22.3 | – | 55 |
| High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage) | – | 10.6% | 17.9% | 6.9% | – | 27 |
| High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage) | – | 21.5% | 29.8% | 16.6% | – | 33 |
| Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties) | 9.0 | 5.2 | 7.1 | 11.6 | 30 | 32 |
| Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households) | – | 2.1% | 4.7% | 2.4% | – | 29 |
| Foreign-Born Population (percentage) | 47.6% | 53.8% | 54.0% | 51.7% | 12 | 8 |
| Racial Diversity Index | 0.62 | – | 0.55 | 0.56 | 20 | 26 |
| Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage) | 29.3% | 23.4% | 21.8% | 23.0% | 44 | 49 |
| Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage) | 20.7% | 22.6% | 26.1% | 25.9% | 1 | 1 |
| Poverty Rate | 28.5% | – | 22.0% | 23.8% | 16 | 20 |
| Unemployment Rate | 10.4% | 6.6% | 4.9% | 6.1% | 23 | 32 |
| Public Transportation Rate | 54.0% | 54.4% | 59.0% | 56.2% | 32 | 33 |
| Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents) | 37.3 | 25.4 | 23.6 | 24.1 | 21 | 29 |
| Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage) | 56.6% | 65.3% | 62.5% | 60.1% | 9 | 14 |
| Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage) | 52.6% | 66.9% | 69.8% | 75.7% | 9 | 12 |
| Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people) | 2.8 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 27 | 24 |
| Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children) | 22.5 | 9.0 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 15 | 6 |
| Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita) | – | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.1 | – | 44 |

2. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
3. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
FLATBUSH / MIDWOOD — CD 214

In CD 214, 0.9% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.

Historic Preservation in CD 214

Commuter Characteristics

In CD 214,

- 24% of commuters travel by automobile.
- 18% travel by bicycle.
- 22% travel by public transportation.
- 6% walk.

Households in CD 214 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

- 20% of households in CD 214 fall into the lowest income quintile ($0 - $18,302).
- 23% fall into the second quintile ($18,302 - $38,536).
- 22% fall into the third quintile ($38,536 - $63,041).
- 18% fall into the fourth quintile ($63,041 - $103,814).
- 13% fall into the highest quintile ($103,814+).

In CD 214, 0.9% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.

State of New York City’s Housing & Neighborhoods 2008

97
Students in CD 215 consistently outperform the City average in both reading and math. However, student performance is rising across the board, so the gap is closing between citywide and CD 215 performance.
In CD 216, 331 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 60.1 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties and was the second highest of any community district.
### Household in CD 217 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>CD 217 in 2007</th>
<th>NYC in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814+</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 217 versus New York City


### Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued

- NYC in 2007: 14,425
- CD 217 in 2007: 1,249

### Notices of Foreclosure in CD 217 (2007)

- 491 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007.
- Equal to a rate of 32.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
- This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.

### Rental Vacancy Rate (2007)

- NYC: 3.6%
- CD 217: 6.0%

### Homeownership Rate (2007)

- NYC: 32.1%
- CD 217: 33.2%

### Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building) (2007)

- NYC: $111,377
- CD 217: $193,222

### Median Monthly Rent (2007)

- NYC: $877
- CD 217: $864

### Unemployment Rate (2007)

- NYC: 12.5%
- CD 217: 9.1%

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (2007)

- NYC: 41.3%
- CD 217: 49.8%

### Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)

- NYC: 0.0
- CD 217: 0.2

---

2. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
3. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 218 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Stock Composition of CD 218 versus New York City (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD 218</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-rate Rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Control / Stabilized</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rent Subsidized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 60% of the housing stock in CD 218 is owner occupied, compared to 33% throughout the City. Only 5% of the housing stock in CD 218 is rent regulated or rent subsidized.

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD 218</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/Bike</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residents travel to work via subway less in CD 218 than throughout the City. The percentage of residents who use cars to commute to work is close to 20 percentage points higher than the citywide average.

---

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
The shifting real estate market did not affect Manhattan in 2007, as evidenced by continued high rates of new construction. While the City as a whole saw a 20% decline in new units authorized by residential building permits in the past year, Manhattan experienced a 15% increase. In addition, more finished units came on the market in 2007: final certificates of occupancy were issued for 6,584 units in 2007, the most in any year since 2002. For most housing types, price appreciation continued at a fast clip with condominium prices increasing by 85% from 2000 to 2007. However, slight price depreciation in 2–4 family buildings in 2007 was an initial sign of the current downturn.

Manhattan continues to lead the boroughs with the highest median monthly rent. However, because of their relatively high median income, Manhattan residents also have the lowest median rent burden. Demand for Manhattan rental units remained strong in 2007; the rental vacancy rate dropped below 3%, the lowest rate of the five boroughs.

In contrast to the City as a whole, Manhattan saw an increase in home purchase lending in 2007. However, it remains the borough with the second lowest homeownership rate after the Bronx. Manhattan had the lowest rate of notices of foreclosure in the City; it was probably somewhat protected by its low rate of high cost lending in the past.

The number of households with children 18 years old or younger is the lowest in the City. Public school students in Manhattan perform below their peers in all other boroughs, except the Bronx, in reading and math.

The acreage of parkland in Manhattan increased during the year. By the end of 2008, 50% of the Hudson River Park had been completed. On the west side, the High Line Park is on schedule to open in Spring 2009. Because of extended hours and additional activities, more New York City residents were able to spend time at Governors Island during the summer of 2008 than in past seasons.

The City moved forward with several rezoning efforts in Manhattan in 2008, including a large rezoning of the 125th Street Corridor in Harlem and areas of the Lower East Side and Chinatown. Another significant development in Manhattan was the selection of a bid team to redevelop land over and surrounding the Hudson Rail Yards on the far west side. The impact of these planning decisions will likely be seen for years to come. For more information about these projects, please visit www.plannyc.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stock &amp; Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>798,144</td>
<td>819,796</td>
<td>840,443</td>
<td>844,349</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>4,479</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>8,427</td>
<td>7,727</td>
<td>8,875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Prices &amp; Affordability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (condominium)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>168.9</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>185.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>166.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>192.8</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>241.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>232.8</td>
<td>243.1</td>
<td>273.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (5+ family building)</td>
<td>$58,379</td>
<td>$187,643</td>
<td>$474,601</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (condominium)</td>
<td>$606,853</td>
<td>$881,042</td>
<td>$853,640</td>
<td>$967,419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,008</td>
<td>$1,039</td>
<td>$1,055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (renter households)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, Demographic &amp; Income Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,540,934</td>
<td>1,606,275</td>
<td>1,612,630</td>
<td>1,620,867</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$56,628</td>
<td>$59,424</td>
<td>$61,726</td>
<td>$64,217</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>2,742.3</td>
<td>1,640.9</td>
<td>1,648.3</td>
<td>1,775.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Environmental Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita) 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
In CD 301, 12.2% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.
In CD 302, 45.8% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.
CD 303 has fewer owner-occupied and market rate rental units than the rest of the City. Public housing makes up 21% of its housing stock, compared to only 5% citywide.

Though subway usage among commuters living in CD 303 is comparable to overall City usage, the share of residents who walk or bicycle to work is 20 percentage points higher than workers throughout the City.
**Community District Profiles: Manhattan**

**CLINTON / CHELSEA – CD 304**

### Population
- 2007: 133,169

### Housing Stock Composition of CD 304 versus New York City (2005)
- Owner Occupied: CD 304 vs. NYC
- Market-rate Rent: CD 304 vs. NYC
- Public Housing: CD 304 vs. NYC
- Rent Control / Stabilized: CD 304 vs. NYC
- Other Rent Subsidized: CD 304 vs. NYC

Over 46% of the housing stock in CD 304 is rent controlled or stabilized, compared to 35% citywide. Less than 25% is owner occupied.

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)
- CD 304 vs. NYC
- Subway: 40%
- Bus: 20%
- Car: 30%
- Walk / Bike: 20%

In CD 304, 37% of resident walk or ride a bicycle to work, compared to just 11% citywide. Fewer than 5% of commuters rely on a car.

---

1 Community districts 304 and 305 both fall within sub-borough 303. Data at the sub-borough area level for these two CDs are identical. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 7 community districts with the same predominant housing type (condominium). 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Demographics

#### Median Household Income
- **2000**: $79,388
- **2007**: $950,000

#### Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (‘05)
- **2000**: 8.3%
- **2007**: 7.3%

#### Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (‘05)
- **2000**: 61.5%
- **2007**: 42.5%

#### Median Age of Housing Stock
- **2000**: 30 years
- **2007**: 46 years

#### Rental Vacancy Rate
- **2000**: 3.7%
- **2007**: 2.2%

#### Homeownership Rate
- **2000**: 76.7%
- **2007**: 75.9%

#### Median Price per Unit (condominium)
- **2000**: $754,022
- **2007**: $950,000

#### Median Monthly Rent
- **2000**: $1,467
- **2007**: $1,392

#### Median Rent Burden (renter households)
- **2000**: 26.5%
- **2007**: 25.3%

#### Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)
- **2000**: 16.6
- **2007**: 13.7

#### Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent >– 1 year)
- **2000**: 4.0%
- **2007**: 2.6%

#### High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)
- **2000**: 10.0%
- **2007**: 8.4%

#### Indices
- **Housing Price Appreciation (condominium)**
  - **2000**: 152.8
  - **2007**: 102.1

#### Education
- **2000 Reading in 2000**:
  - Asian: 19%
  - Black: 25%
  - Hispanic: 25%
  - White: 24%

- **2007 Reading in 2007**:
  - Asian: 25%
  - Black: 25%
  - Hispanic: 26%
  - White: 24%

#### Transportation
- **Modal Share Chart**
  - **CD 305**: 10%
  - **NYC**: 20%

#### Housing
- **Rental Housing (percentage)**
  - **2000**: 61.5%
  - **2007**: 51.7%

#### Foreign-Born Population (percentage)
- **2000**: 25.3%
- **2007**: 24.1%

#### Racial Diversity Index
- **2000**: 0.55
- **2007**: 0.54

#### Poverty Rate
- **2000**: 13.6%
- **2007**: 14.7%

#### Unemployment Rate
- **2000**: 7.3%
- **2007**: 6.6%

#### Public Transportation Rate
- **2000**: 49.5%
- **2007**: 51.7%

#### Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)
- **2000**: 152.8
- **2007**: 109.1

#### Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)
- **2000**: 66.2%
- **2007**: 75.1%

#### Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)
- **2000**: 0.0
- **2007**: 0.0

#### Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)
- **2000**: 0.0
- **2007**: 0.0

#### Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)
- **2000**: 2.0
- **2007**: 2.0

---

**Factors: Community districts 304 and 305 both fall within sub-borough 303. Data at the sub-borough area level for these two CDs are identical.**

---

**Footnotes:**
1. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
3. Ranked out of 7 community districts with the same predominant housing type (condominium).
### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 306 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>CD 306</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk / Bike</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In CD 306, fewer residents commute by subway than do residents of the rest of the City. Almost 40% of commuters walk or bicycle to work.

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CD 306</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 2000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 2007</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public school students in CD 304 have consistently outperformed their peers throughout the City. However, student performance is rising across the board and the gap is closing between the City and CD 306.

---

1 Community district 306 matches sub-borough area 304. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 7 community districts with the same predominant housing type (condominium). 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Historic Preservation in CD 307

In CD 307, 31.3% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.
In CD 308, 9.8% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.
Morningside Heights/Hamilton Heights is the site of a controversial expansion plan by Columbia University. Over the next fifteen to twenty years, Columbia plans to develop approximately 17 additional acres near its 36-acre campus in CD 309 in order to meet a pressing need for space. In order to proceed, Columbia requested a zoning change for the area which was granted by the City Council in December 2007. Columbia hopes to begin construction by spring of 2009. Over the past decade, there has also been an effort to designate the Morningside Heights neighborhood an historic district. For more information on these projects, please visit www.plannyc.org.

In CD 309, more residents walk, bicycle or use the subway to get to work than in the rest of the City. Fewer than 10% of residents commute by car.
### Central Harlem – CD 310

#### Historic Preservation in CD 310

In CD 310, 3.0% of residential units are located within historic districts (indicated in blue on the map). Each dot represents a designated landmark.

#### Community District Profiles: Manhattan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>224.5</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>328.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (5+ family building)</td>
<td>$30,736</td>
<td>$153,941</td>
<td>$99,274</td>
<td>$123,913</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rent</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$642</td>
<td>$619</td>
<td>$644</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Community district 310 matches sub-borough area 308. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 5 community districts with the same predominant housing type (5+ family building). 4 Price index should be treated with caution due to low number of observations. 5 Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 6 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Housing Stock Composition of CD 311 versus New York City (2005)

- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

35% of the housing stock in CD 311 is made up of public housing units, compared to only 5% citywide. Only 8% of the housing stock is owner occupied.

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

In CD 311, more commuters walk, bicycle or use the subway to get to work than in the rest of the City. Fewer than 9% of residents commute by car.

1 Community district 311 matches sub-borough area 309. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 5 community districts with the same predominant housing type (5+ family building). 4 Price index should be treated with caution due to low number of observations. 5 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Households in CD 312 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>CD 312</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 312 versus New York City

- **Asian in CD 312 2000**: 26%  
- **Asian in NYC 2000**: 27%  
- **Black in CD 312 2000**: 22%  
- **Black in NYC 2000**: 27%  
- **Hispanic in CD 312 2000**: 24%  
- **Hispanic in NYC 2000**: 24%  
- **White in CD 312 2000**: 26%  
- **White in NYC 2000**: 27%  
- **Asian in CD 312 2007**: 26%  
- **Asian in NYC 2007**: 27%  
- **Black in CD 312 2007**: 22%  
- **Black in NYC 2007**: 27%  
- **Hispanic in CD 312 2007**: 24%  
- **Hispanic in NYC 2007**: 24%  
- **White in CD 312 2007**: 26%  
- **White in NYC 2007**: 27%

### Housing Stock Composition of CD 312 versus New York City (2005)

- **Owner Occupied**: CD 312 2005: 63%, NYC 2005: 63%
- **Market-rate Rent**: CD 312 2005: 33%, NYC 2005: 37%
- **Public Housing**: CD 312 2005: 3%, NYC 2005: 1%
- **Rent Control / Stabilized**: CD 312 2005: 7%, NYC 2005: 0%
- **Other Rent Subsidized**: CD 312 2005: 10%

The vast majority (80%) of the housing stock in CD 312 is rent controlled or stabilized. Citywide, only 35% of housing units fall into this category.

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

- **Reading 2000**: CD 312 2000: 58%, NYC 2000: 64%
- **Reading 2007**: CD 312 2007: 60%, NYC 2007: 67%
- **Math 2000**: CD 312 2000: 49%, NYC 2000: 54%
- **Math 2007**: CD 312 2007: 54%, NYC 2007: 58%

Student performance in CD 312 has consistently lagged behind that of the City. Students have not kept pace with recent City gains in reading scores; CD 312 now ranks second to last in reading.

---

1 Community district 312 matches sub-borough area 310. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 5 community districts with the same predominant housing type (5+ family building). 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
QUEENS

Astoria CD 401 122
Woodside / Sunnyside CD 402 123
Jackson Heights CD 403 124
Elmhurst / Corona CD 404 125
Ridgewood / Maspeth CD 405 126
Rego Park / Forest Hills CD 406 127
Flushing / Whitestone CD 407 128
Hillcrest / Fresh Meadows CD 408 129
Kew Gardens / Woodhaven CD 409 130
S. Ozone Park / Howard Beach CD 410 131
Bayside / Little Neck CD 411 132
Jamaica / Hollis CD 412 133
Queens Village CD 413 134
Rockaway / Broad Channel CD 414 135
Queens is the most racially and ethnically diverse of all the boroughs. It has the City’s highest percentage of Asians (21.3%), the highest share of foreign-born residents (48.4%), and the highest share of people aged 65 and older (13.2%). Income data indicate a large middle class population in Queens: its income diversity ratio is the lowest in the City and residents are evenly spread out among the City income quintiles. Queens enjoys the second lowest poverty and unemployment rates of all the boroughs, 12% and 6.6% respectively.

Health and education data paint a positive picture for families living in Queens. Students in Queens continue to perform well in both reading and math; the borough has the City’s highest percentage of students performing at or above grade level in math (74.5%) and the second highest percentage for reading (59.5%). Consistent with trends throughout the City, the incidence of elevated blood lead levels and the infant mortality rate have been decreasing steadily since 2000.

Lending and foreclosure activity in Queens is relatively consistent with citywide trends. Both home purchase and refinance lending rates have recently declined while notices of foreclosure have continued to rise since 2000. In just the last year, Queens experienced a 66% jump in the number of properties receiving notices of foreclosures, bringing the foreclosure rate to 20.8 notices per 1,000 1–4 family properties. Our repeat sales index shows that sale prices dropped for all housing types over the past year in Queens. Since 2000, condos in Queens have seen the lowest average appreciation in prices of all the boroughs.

As was the case in four out of five boroughs, units authorized by new residential building permits decreased in Queens from 2006 to 2007. For renter households, Queens has consistently been the borough with the most severe crowding; 3.8% of renter households were severely crowded in 2007.

One of the most significant and controversial new developments to be approved in the City this year was the Willets Point Redevelopment Plan. The City plans to redevelop 13 acres of land in the Flushing area of Queens for a project that will include about one million square feet of commercial area for retail, hotel and convention center space. Plans are also expected to include nearly 2,000 units of affordable housing. The redevelopment efforts have met continued resistance from business owners and landowners in the area, who will be forced to relocate. For more information on this project, please visit www.plannyc.org.
### Housing Stock & Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>817,250</td>
<td>831,819</td>
<td>832,545</td>
<td>835,538</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building permits</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>7,792</td>
<td>5,166</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Prices & Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (condominium)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>181.8</td>
<td>191.3</td>
<td>185.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>164.8</td>
<td>177.9</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>190.5</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>197.2</td>
<td>212.0</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (1 family building)</td>
<td>$270,917</td>
<td>$469,529</td>
<td>$488,529</td>
<td>$499,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>$151,112</td>
<td>$275,324</td>
<td>$295,174</td>
<td>$292,500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,011</td>
<td>$1,007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (renter households)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>3,538</td>
<td>5,874</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social, Demographic & Income Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,230,847</td>
<td>2,256,576</td>
<td>2,264,661</td>
<td>2,270,338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index¹</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$51,100</td>
<td>$51,058</td>
<td>$52,648</td>
<td>$53,171</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>510.4</td>
<td>449.8</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>458.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health & Environmental Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Racial Diversity Index is greater than 0.75 in Queens because a large share of the population (3% in 2007) identifies as “some other race” or “two or more races.”

² The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 401 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households in CD 401 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

- $0 - $18,302: 21%
- $18,302 - $36,536: 21%
- $36,536 - $63,041: 23%
- $63,041 - $103,814: 20%
- $103,814+: 15%

Housing Stock Composition of CD 401 versus New York City (2005)

- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

CD 401 has very high subway ridership, with 62% of commuters taking the subway to work. However, only 5% of residents ride the bus to work, compared to 13% citywide.

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

- Subway: 40%
- Bus: 20%
- Car: 20%
- Walk / Bike: 10%

Means of Transportation to Work (2007) in CD 401 and NYC:

- Subway: CD 401: 40%, NYC: 20%
- Bus: CD 401: 20%, NYC: 30%
- Car: CD 401: 20%, NYC: 40%
- Walk / Bike: CD 401: 10%, NYC: 5%

Rental Vacancy Rate:

- 2000: 1.0%
- 2005: 2.8%
- 2006: 2.8%
- 2007: 2.8%

Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued:

- 2000: 197
- 2005: 374
- 2006: 310
- 2007: 337

Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits:

- 2000: 242
- 2005: 488
- 2006: 838
- 2007: 698

Homeownership Rate:

- 2000: 20.0%
- 2005: 22.3%
- 2006: 20.3%
- 2007: 23.2%

Vacant Land Area Rate:

- 2000: 2.4%
- 2005: 1.9%
- 2006: 2.0%
- 2007: 2.1%

Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building):

- 2000: 100.0
- 2005: 189.9
- 2006: 205.1
- 2007: 185.0

Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building):

- 2000: $162,550
- 2005: $302,573
- 2006: $318,829
- 2007: $325,000

Median Monthly Rent:

- 2000: $979
- 2005: $983
- 2006: $960
- 2007: $960

Median Rent Burden (renter households):

- 2000: 32.3%
- 2005: 29.6%
- 2006: 28.8%
- 2007: 28.8%

Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units):

- 2000: 17.4
- 2005: 18.2
- 2006: 14.2
- 2007: 14.9

Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year):

- 2000: 3.0%
- 2005: 0.6%
- 2006: 1.0%
- 2007: 1.1%

Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties):

- 2000: 32.7
- 2005: 33.3
- 2006: 33.0
- 2007: 34.0

High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage):

- 2000: 12.2%
- 2005: 15.2%
- 2006: 6.6%
- 2007: 28%

High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage):

- 2000: 17.6%
- 2005: 23.1%
- 2006: 15.3%
- 2007: 36%

Net Wast After Recycling (pounds per capita):

- 2000: 1.0%
- 2005: 2.8%
- 2006: 3.4%
- 2007: 2.8%

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007.
2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Woodside/Sunnyside – CD 402

Development in Woodside/Sunnyside has continued to occur at a rapid pace, mostly due to projects in the Long Island City area. The City Council approved the Hunters Point South project in Long Island City by unanimous vote. The project will redevelop a 30 acre waterfront site into the largest affordable housing complex in New York.

- Construction on the 3.5 million square foot Gotham Center located on Queens Plaza began in November. The New York City Health Department is expected to move into the center in 2011. For more information on these projects visit www.plannyc.org.

### Housing Stock Composition of CD 402 versus New York City (2005)

- **Owner Occupied**: CD 402
- **Market-rate Rent**: CD 402
- **Public Housing**: CD 402
- **Rent Control/Stabilized**: CD 402
- **Other Rent Subsidized**: CD 402

Over half of the housing stock in CD 402 is made up of rent-controlled or stabilized units, compared to 35% citywide. There are no public housing units.

---

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 403 versus New York City

- **CD 403 in 2000**
- **NYC in 2000**
- **CD 403 in 2007**
- **NYC in 2007**

#### In CD 403, 330 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 27.3 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was slightly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.

### Household in CD 403 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$18,302</td>
<td>$20,200</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$22,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Diversity Ratio

- **CD 403 in 2000**: 20%
- **NYC in 2000**: 24%
- **CD 403 in 2007**: 40%
- **NYC in 2007**: 44%

### Median Household Income

- **CD 403 in 2000**: $18,302
- **NYC in 2000**: $18,800
- **CD 403 in 2007**: $48,638
- **NYC in 2007**: $44,250

### Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits

- **2000**: 114
- **2005**: 303
- **2006**: 385
- **2007**: 199

### Homeownership Rate

- **CD 403 in 2000**: 33.1%
- **NYC in 2000**: 35.6%
- **CD 403 in 2007**: 41.1%
- **NYC in 2007**: 44.2%

### Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)

- **CD 403 in 2000**: $160,142
- **NYC in 2000**: $333,725
- **CD 403 in 2007**: $297,265
- **NYC in 2007**: $323,971

### Median Rent Burden (renter households)

- **CD 403 in 2000**: $1,027
- **NYC in 2000**: $1,002
- **CD 403 in 2007**: $1,037
- **NYC in 2007**: $1,037

### Notices of Foreclosure in CD 403 (2007)

- **2000**: 113
- **2005**: 570
- **2006**: 303
- **2007**: 199

---

2. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
3. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Elmhurst / Corona — CD 404

- Elmhurst/Corona has the largest proportion of foreign-born residents in the City.
- The foreclosure rate in CD 404 spiked in 2007, more than doubling the 2006 rate, but is still average when compared to the City as a whole.
- CD 404 saw a 5% decrease in its felony crime rate from 2006 to 2007, and has seen close to a 14% decrease since 2000. The corresponding drops for the City were 2.7% and 40.7%.
- CD 404 has a strong middle class: nearly 30% of its households are within the middle quintile of New York City income quintiles. There is very little disparity between the highest earners and the lowest earners as reflected in the income diversity ratio.
- The percentage of households with children under the age of 18 has increased over the past couple of years to 44%—the ninth highest percentage in the City.
- Unlike in the rest of the City, home purchase mortgage lending dropped just slightly in 2007, to 55 loans per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
- CD 404 has one of the highest rates of severely crowded housing, at 7.4%.
- The rate of serious housing code has dropped from 24 per 1,000 rental units in 2000 to 15.9 per 1,000 rental units in 2007.

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 404 versus New York City

#### 2000

- **Asian**: 17%
- **Black**: 25%
- **Hispanic**: 29%
- **White**: 19%
- **Other**: 8%

#### 2007

- **Asian**: 18%
- **Black**: 24%
- **Hispanic**: 30%
- **White**: 21%
- **Other**: 7%

### Community District Profiles: Queens

- **Population**: 140,182
- **Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)**: 35.4
- **Median Household Income**: $44,584
- **Income Diversity Ratio**: 3.3
- **Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage)``: 20%
- **Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage)``: 4.5%
- **Median Age of Housing Stock**: 48
- **Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)**: 84.7
- **Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)**: 74.2

### Households in CD 404 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>CD 404 in 2007</th>
<th>NYC in 2007</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2007 Rank

- **Community District**: 17
- **Vacant Land**
- **Rental vacancy Rate**: 1.6%
- **Homeownership Rate**: 21.8%
- **Median Price per Unit**: $146,496
- **Median Rent**: $1,020
- **Median Rent Burden**: 33.7%
- **Median Rent Burden (renter households)**: 33.7%
- **Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)**: 24.0
- **Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)**: 3.3%
- **Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)**: 57.3
- **High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)**: 20.4%
- **High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)**: 29.8%
- **Notice of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)**: 4.5
- **Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)**: 7.1%
- **Foreign-Born Population (percentage)**: 66.8%
- **Racial Diversity Index**: 0.66
- **Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)**: 41.8%
- **Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)**: 8.6%
- **Poverty Rate**: 19.2%
- **Unemployment Rate**: 9.3%
- **Public Transportation Rate**: 62.8%
- **Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)**: 24.2
- **Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)**: 42.1%
- **Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)**: 35.9%
- **Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)**: 1.8
- **Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)**: 19.7
- **Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)``: 2.5

2. Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
3. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Households in CD 405 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $13,820</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13,830 - $38,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,836 - $63,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 405 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD 405</td>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>CD 405</td>
<td>NYC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation</th>
<th>CD 405</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk / Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the City average, a larger percent of residents in CD 405 commuted to work by car (45% vs. 30%). Only 35% commuted via subway.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007.
2 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
REGO PARK / FOREST HILLS – CD 406

Housing Stock Composition of CD 406 versus New York City (2005)

- Owner Occupied
- Market-rate Rent
- Public Housing
- Rent Control / Stabilized
- Other Rent Subsidized

Nearly half of the housing units in CD 406 are owner occupied, compared to 33% citywide. Market rate rentals make up only 10% of the housing stock.

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

Public school students in CD 406 have outperformed their peers throughout the City since 2000. 73% of students performed at grade level in math in 2007.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building). 3 Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
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Flushing/Whitestone was the center of much controversy due to current and planned development at Mets Stadium and Willet’s Point.

- CitiGroup agreed to pay $20 million a year for the naming rights of the new Mets Stadium in Flushing Meadows. The stadium is still on track to be ready for Opening Day 2009, however, the Mets have recently asked the City for additional tax-exempt public bonds.
- In November 2008, the City Council approved plans to convert 62 acres of industrial Willet’s Point into a development containing housing units, retail space, and a convention center.

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

Half of residents in CD 407 commuted to work by car, compared to only 30% citywide. CD 407 ranks 55th in percentage of units within 1/2 mile of a subway entrance, and only 27% of commuters use the subway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation to Work (2007)</th>
<th>CD 407</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk / Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 407 versus New York City

- **Asian**: 15% (CD 407), 22% (NYC)
- **Black**: 22% (CD 407), 24% (NYC)
- **Hispanic**: 22% (CD 407), 18% (NYC)
- **White**: 20% (CD 407), 20% (NYC)

The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
Hillcrest / Fresh Meadows – CD 408

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 408 versus New York City

- CD 408 in 2000
- NYC in 2000
- CD 408 in 2007
- NYC in 2007

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic
- White

- 2007
- Rank

Population
151,246
47

Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)
19.8
31

Median Household Income
$55,294
16

Income Diversity Ratio
5.0
27

Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (’05)
10.4
12

Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (’05)
68.3
38

Median Age of Housing Stock
57
40

Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)
89.4
38

Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)
28.0
52

Over half of the housing units in CD 408 are owner occupied, compared to 33% citywide. Just 10% of units are market rate rentals.

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

- CD 408
- NYC

- Reading 2000
- Reading 2007
- Math 2000
- Math 2007

- 2000
- 2005
- 2006
- 2007
- Rank (2000)
- Rank (2007)

Students in CD 408 performed well above the City average. The share of students performing at grade level in both reading and math has increased from 2000 to 2007.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2 Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
NYC in 2000
NYC in 2007

Households in CD 409 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

- $0 - $10,381
- $10,382 - $18,302
- $18,302 - $38,536
- $38,536 - $63,041
- $63,041 - $103,814

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 409 versus New York City

- CD 409 in 2000
- NYC in 2000
- CD 409 in 2007
- NYC in 2007

2007 Rank
Population: 146,114 - 38
Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile): 30.4 - 50
Median Household Income: $52,071 - 20
Income Diversity Ratio: 3.9 - 47
Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (’05): 0.0% - 50
Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (’05): 34.2% - 41
Median Age of Housing Stock: 82 - 9
Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage): 62.1% - 57
Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage): 86.8% - 28

Rental Vacancy Rate:
Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued:
Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits:
Homeownership Rate:
Vacant Land Area Rate:
Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building):
Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building):
Median Monthly Rent:
Median Rent Burden (renter households):
Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units):
Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year):
Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties):
High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage):
High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage):
 Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties):
Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households):
Foreign-Born Population (percentage):
Racial Diversity Index:
Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage):
Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage):
Poverty Rate:
Unemployment Rate:
Public Transportation Rate:
 Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents):
 Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage):
 Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage):
 Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people):
 Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children):
 Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita):

In CD 409, 519 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 29.8 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was slightly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.

1 A large share of the population in CD 409 identifies as “some other race” or “two or more races.” Those groups are not included in this chart. 2 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 3 Ranked out of 33 community districts with the same predominant housing type (2–4 family building).
4 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
## S. Ozone Park / Howard Beach – CD 410

### Population and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>138,052</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$59,863</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Diversity Ratio

| Income Diversity Ratio | 3.6 | 53 |

### Housing Stock Composition of CD 410 versus New York City (2005)

- **Owner Occupied**
- **Market-rate Rent**
- **Public Housing**
- **Rent Control / Stabilized**
- **Other Rent Subsidized**

64% of the housing units in CD 410 are owner occupied, compared to 33% citywide. Just 5% of units are rent controlled or stabilized.

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

Over 50% of residents in CD 410 commute to work by car, compared to 30% citywide. Only 44% use the subway or bus systems.

### Rental Vacancy Rate

2.4% in CD 410 versus 4.5% citywide.

### Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued

- CD 410: 41
- NYC: 161

### Units Authorized by New Residential Building Permits

- CD 410: 107
- NYC: 127

### Homeownership Rate

63.0% in CD 410 versus 68.8% citywide.

### Vacant Land Area Rate

6.1% in CD 410 versus 4.0% citywide.

### Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building)

- CD 410: 100.0
- NYC: 167.5

### Median Price per Unit (1 family building)

$239,611 in CD 410 versus $460,000 citywide.

### Median Monthly Rent

- CD 410: $1,098
- NYC: $1,077

### Median Rent Burden (renter households)

- CD 410: 36.7%
- NYC: 34.5%

### Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)

- CD 410: 19.7
- NYC: 23.4

### Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)

- CD 410: 5.5%
- NYC: 0.9%

### Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)

- CD 410: 58.9
- NYC: 66.2

### High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)

- CD 410: 37.5%
- NYC: 42.4%

### High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)

- CD 410: 31.1%
- NYC: 35.5%

### Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)

- CD 410: 10.4
- NYC: 8.6

### Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)

- CD 410: 0.9%
- NYC: 1.6%

### Foreign-Born Population (percentage)

- CD 410: 39.4%
- NYC: 46.1%

### Racial Diversity Index

- CD 410: 0.80
- NYC: 0.80

### Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)

- CD 410: 41.7%
- NYC: 44.9%

### Poverty Rate

- CD 410: 11.5%
- NYC: 9.6%

### Unemployment Rate

- CD 410: 7.0%
- NYC: 10.4%

### Public Transportation Rate

- CD 410: 40.0%
- NYC: 45.9%

### Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)

- CD 410: 31.8
- NYC: 20.4

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)

- CD 410: 36.5%
- NYC: 53.4%

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)

- CD 410: 32.5%
- NYC: 56.4%

### Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)

- CD 410: 2.0
- NYC: 2.2

### Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)

- CD 410: 13.7
- NYC: 5.8

### Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)

- CD 410: 2.6
- NYC: 2.2

---

1. A large share of the population in CD 409 identifies as “some other race” or “two or more races.” Those groups are not included in this chart.
3. Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building).
4. The Racial Diversity Index is greater than 0.75 in CD 410 because a large share of the population (15% in 2007) identifies as “some other race” or “two or more races.”
## Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 411 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Households in CD 411 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

- **$0 - $18,302**: 9%
- **$18,302 - $38,536**: 17%
- **$38,536 - $63,041**: 20%
- **$63,041 - $103,814**: 24%
- **$103,814 +**: 30%

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

- **Subway**: 20%
- **Bus**: 40%
- **Car**: 60%
- **Walk / Bike**: 80%

### Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

- **CD 411**: 80%
- **NYC**: 60%

CD 411 ranked number one in the city for both math and reading performance. Over 90% of students perform at grade level in math, and 82% perform at grade level in reading.

### Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

- **Subway**: 20%
- **Bus**: 40%
- **Car**: 60%
- **Walk / Bike**: 80%

65% of residents in CD 411 commute to work by car. Only 22% use the subway, perhaps because CD 411 has the lowest subway coverage in the City.

### Additional Data

2. Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building).
3. Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented.
4. The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.

---

### Household Income

- **2007 Median Household Income**: $70,099
- **2007 Income Diversity Ratio**: 4.0
- **2007 Housing Stock Graph Title Goes Here**

### Education

- **Reading 2000**: 20%
- **Reading 2007**: 40%
- **Math 2000**: 60%
- **Math 2007**: 80%

### Transportation

- **2007 Means of Transportation to Work**: 20%
- **2007 Means of Transportation to Work**: 40%
- **2007 Means of Transportation to Work**: 60%
- **2007 Means of Transportation to Work**: 80%

### Race and Ethnicity

- **2007 Racial Composition**: 20%
- **2007 Racial Composition**: 40%
- **2007 Racial Composition**: 60%
- **2007 Racial Composition**: 80%

### Income

- **2007 Income Range**: $0 - $18,302
- **2007 Income Range**: $18,302 - $38,536
- **2007 Income Range**: $38,536 - $63,041
- **2007 Income Range**: $63,041 - $103,814
- **2007 Income Range**: $103,814 +

### Environment

- **2007 Environment**: 10, 20, 30, 40, 50
- **2007 Environment**: 10, 20, 30, 40, 50

---

**THE FURMAN CENTER FOR REAL ESTATE & URBAN POLICY**
In CD 412, 1,838 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 31.5 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. CD 412 had the greatest number of properties receiving foreclosure filings in 2007; it ranks only 5th because of its large stock of 1–4 family homes.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2006–2007. 2 Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building). 3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
In CD 413, 1,038 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 25.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was slightly higher than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties; it would be higher if not for its large stock of 1–4 family properties.

1 The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007.
2 Ranked out of 14 community districts with the same predominant housing type (1 family building).
3 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
ROCKAWAY / BROAD CHANNEL – CD 414

- CD 414 is one of the least dense community districts and has the third highest vacant land area rate.
- The notice of foreclosure rate in Rockaway/Broad Channel increased 66% from 2006 to 2007, while housing prices decreased nearly 7% in the same period.
- The income distribution in CD 414 is very similar to that of the City as a whole.
- Certificates of occupancy issued have increased consistently from 266 in 2000 to 835 in 2007, ranking it 6th in the City.
- The felony crime rate has decreased markedly in CD 414 relative to the rest of the City, from 30 crimes per 1,000 people in 2000 to 16.7 in 2007, ranking it 51st among community districts.

Students in CD 414 saw marked improvement in both reading and math from 2000 to 2007. Although it lagged behind the City in 2000, students in CD 414 surpassed the City average in 2007.

Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading (2007)

- The rental vacancy rate presented for 2007 is an average rate for 2005–2007. 2
- Building).
- Sample size is less than 20 newly identified cases in at least one year presented. 4
Staten Island

St. George / Stapleton   CD 501  140
South Beach / Willowbrook   CD 502  141
Tottenville / Great Kills   CD 503  142
While Staten Island is the least populous borough, its population has increased by over 8% since 2000, the greatest percentage increase in the City. Although the white share of the population in Staten Island decreased by 4.5 percentage points since 2000, it is the least racially diverse borough in the City. Residents of Staten Island as a whole fare well on health indicators, with the lowest rates of asthma hospitalizations, infant mortality, and newly identified cases of elevated blood lead levels in children. The borough ranks second to the Bronx in the number of households with children under 18 years old. In 2007, Staten Island had the highest share of public school students perform at or above grade level in reading and the second highest share in math. Staten Island’s poverty rate is the lowest in the City, although it increased slightly from 2006 to 2007. Households in the borough have a higher median income than any other borough. The felony crime rate is the lowest in the City.

Despite this relative prosperity, Staten Island’s housing market has fared poorly in comparison to the housing market in other boroughs in recent years. As early as 2006, Staten Island experienced declines in the price of single family homes, as measured by our repeat sales index. In 2007, the sale price of single family homes and condominiums fell faster here than in any other borough. Following the broader City trend, the sale price for 2–4 family buildings in Staten Island also declined in 2007. Despite falling house prices, homeownership and refinace loan rates remained higher in Staten Island than in the rest of the City.

New housing construction in Staten Island continued to slow in 2007, following a downward trend from previous years. The number of housing units authorized by new building permits declined by 82% since 2000, while increasing across the City by 62%. Staten Island was also the only borough where fewer final certificates of occupancy were issued in 2007 than in 2000.

Staten Island has the highest rental vacancy rate in the City and it has nearly doubled from 4.1% in 2000 to 7.4% in 2007. Staten Island was also the only borough in which people paid a greater share of their income toward rent in 2007 than in 2006.

In Staten Island, plans are moving forward to turn the Fresh Kills landfill into a 2,200-acre park including sports fields, nature trails and possibly a wind farm. Also, funding has been secured for a study on land use and transportation on the Island’s north shore. A study assessing the feasibility, impacts and costs of extending the Hudson-Bergen Light Rail system to the southern and western portions of the Island is due in 2009. For more information about these projects, please visit www.plannyc.org.
### Housing Stock and Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>163,993</td>
<td>173,954</td>
<td>177,353</td>
<td>177,980</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Certificates of Occupancy Issued</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units Authorized by New Residential Building permits</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land Area Rate</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Prices & Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (condominium)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>192.3</td>
<td>193.3</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (1 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>162.3</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>164.0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Housing Price Appreciation (5+ family building)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (1 family building)</td>
<td>$252,928</td>
<td>$419,355</td>
<td>$429,682</td>
<td>$415,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price per Unit (2–4 family building)</td>
<td>$161,872</td>
<td>$254,798</td>
<td>$254,549</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Rent</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$904</td>
<td>$928</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent Burden (renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lending Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Purchase Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Home Purchase Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinance Loan Rate (per 1,000 properties)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Refinance Loans (percentage)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure (all residential properties)</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Foreclosure Rate (per 1,000 1–4 family properties)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Housing Code Violations (per 1,000 rental units)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquencies (percentage delinquent ≥ 1 year)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Crowding Rate (percentage of renter households)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social, Demographic & Income Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>445,420</td>
<td>475,014</td>
<td>478,876</td>
<td>481,613</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-Born Population (percentage)</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Asian</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Hispanic</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent White</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Diversity Index</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$66,271</td>
<td>$66,909</td>
<td>$70,574</td>
<td>$66,985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children under 18 Years Old (percentage)</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Aged 65 and Older (percentage)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Rate</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime Rate (per 1,000 residents)</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Incarceration Rate (per 100,000 people aged 15 or older)</td>
<td>472.8</td>
<td>430.9</td>
<td>497.4</td>
<td>561.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Reading (percentage)</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Performing at Grade Level in Math (percentage)</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health & Environmental Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asthma Hospitalizations (per 1,000 people)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Blood Lead Levels (incidence per 1,000 children)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Birth Weight Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Waste After Recycling (pounds per capita)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The figures presented for each year refer to the City fiscal year beginning on July 1 of that year.
### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>182,833</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$55,996</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Diversity Ratio</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 501 versus New York City

#### CD 501 in 2000

- Asian: 20%
- Black: 13%
- Hispanic: 23%
- White: 24%

#### NYC in 2000

- Asian: 19%
- Black: 14%
- Hispanic: 25%
- White: 42%

#### CD 501 in 2007

- Asian: 20%
- Black: 13%
- Hispanic: 23%
- White: 24%

#### NYC in 2007

- Asian: 19%
- Black: 14%
- Hispanic: 25%
- White: 42%

### Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage) in CD 501

- 2000: 40%
- 2005: 50%
- 2006: 60%
- 2007: 70%

### Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) in CD 501

- 2000: 20%
- 2005: 25%
- 2006: 30%
- 2007: 35%

### Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile) in CD 501

- 2000: 5,100
- 2005: 5,200
- 2006: 5,300
- 2007: 5,400

### Median Household Income in CD 501

- 2000: $38,536
- 2005: $42,000
- 2006: $45,000
- 2007: $48,000

### Median Age of Housing Stock in CD 501

- 2000: 29
- 2005: 30
- 2006: 31
- 2007: 32

### In CD 501, 554 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 16.9 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was slightly lower than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
S. BEACH / WILLOWBROOK – CD 502

Households in CD 502 in Each New York City Income Quintile (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Quintile</th>
<th>CD 502 2007</th>
<th>NYC 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $18,302</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,302 - $38,536</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,536 - $63,041</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,041 - $103,814</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$103,814 +</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 502 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means of Transportation to Work (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation</th>
<th>CD 502</th>
<th>NYC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subway</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk / Bike</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subway use among commuters living in CD 502 is much lower than the City’s. Bus usage appears to provide public transportation in light of low subway coverage in the area.
Housing Stock Data

### Population
- **2007:** 164,592

### Population Density (1,000 persons per square mile)
- **2007:** 7.2

### Median Household Income
- **2007:** $78,392

### Income Diversity Ratio
- **2007:** 3.8

### Rental Units that are Subsidized (percentage) (05)
- **2007:** 0.2%

### Rental Units that are Rent-Regulated (percentage) (05)
- **2007:** 18.2%

### Median Age of Housing Stock
- **2007:** 27

### Units Within 1/4 Mile of a Park (percentage)
- **2007:** 74.1%

### Units Within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance (percentage)
- **2007:** 29.0%

### Economic Indicators

#### Racial and Ethnic Composition of CD 503 versus New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Market Rate</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income diversity ratio</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Housing Stock Graph Title Goes Here

In CD 503, 353 properties received notices of foreclosure in 2007, equal to a rate of 8.2 per 1,000 1–4 family properties. This notice of foreclosure rate was significantly lower than the citywide rate of 19.7 per 1,000 1–4 family properties.
# Index of Community Districts

**The Bronx**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD #</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Mott Haven / Melrose</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Hunts Point / Longwood</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Morrisania / Crotona</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Highbridge / Concourse</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Fordham / University Heights</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Belmont / East Tremont</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Kingsbridge Hghts / Bedford</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Riverdale / Fieldston</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Parkchester / Soundview</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Throgs Neck / Co-op City</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Morris Park / Bronxdale</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Williamsbridge / Baychester</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brooklyn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD #</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Greenpoint / Williamsburg</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Fort Greene / Brooklyn Heights</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Bedford Stuyvesant</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Bushwick</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>East New York / Starrett City</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Park Slope / Carroll Gardens</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Sunset Park</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Crown Heights / Prospect Heights</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>S. Crown Heights / Lefferts Gardens</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Bay Ridge / Dyker Heights</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Bensonhurst</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Borough Park</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Coney Island</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Flatbush / Midwood</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Sheephead Bay</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Brownsville</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>East Flatbush</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Flatlands / Canarsie</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manhattan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD #</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Financial District</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Greenwich Village / Soho</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Lower East Side / Chinatown</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Clinton / Chelsea</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Stuyvesant Town / Turtle Bay</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Upper West Side</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Upper East Side</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Morningside Heights / Hamilton Heights</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Central Harlem</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>East Harlem</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Washington Heights / Inwood</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Queens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD #</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Astoria</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Woodside / Sunnyside</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Jackson Heights</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Elmhurst / Corona</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Ridgewood / Maspeth</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Rego Park / Forest Hills</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Flushing / Whitestone</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Hillcrest / Fresh Meadows</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Kew Gardens / Woodhaven</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>South Ozone Park / Howard Beach</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Bayside / Little Neck</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Jamaica / Hollis</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Queens Village</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Rockaway / Broad Channel</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staten Island**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD #</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DISTRICT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>St. George / Stapleton</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>South Beach / Willowbrook</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Tottenville / Great Kills</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New York City Community Districts

Source: New York City Planning Department, 2007
New York City Sub-borough Areas

Source: Census Data, 2006
Methods

UNITED STATES CENSUS SOURCES

A number of the indicators presented in the State of the City are derived from four data sources collected by the United States Census Bureau. These sources are described below along with a discussion of issues of comparability across sources.

Decennial Census (Census)

In recent decades, the Census has consisted of two parts: the 100% “short form” that collects information from every person and about every housing unit in the country, and the “long form” of additional questions asked of a sample of people and households. The “short form” collects information on age, race, Hispanic or Latino origin, household relationship, gender, tenure, and vacancy status. The “long form” provides more in-depth information about personal and housing characteristics such as income, employment status, and housing costs. In this edition of the State of the City, we use data from the 2000 Census short and long forms to derive demographic, economic, and housing measures for the year 2000. To create most of these indicators, we use summary census data reported at the City, borough and sub-borough area levels.

American Community Survey (ACS)

The American Community Survey is a relatively new annual survey that collects data similar to that collected by the Census “long form” described above. As with the long form, the ACS covers only a sample of individuals and housing units. However, the ACS uses a smaller sample: the Census “long form” covered 1-in-6 housing unit addresses while the ACS only covers 1-in-40 housing unit addresses each year. The Census Bureau began developing the ACS in 1996, but reliable annual estimates for geographic areas with a population of 65,000 only became available in 2005. In 2008, the Census Bureau began releasing 3-year rolling estimates for all geographic areas with populations of 20,000 or more. In this edition of the State of the City, we use ACS data to generate the same statistics as the Decennial Census data, but for the years 2005, 2006, and 2007. Going forward, the ACS is intended to replace the Census “long form,” providing annual data that were previously available only at ten-year intervals.

Most of the indicators in this edition are derived from summary-level data reported by the Census for Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs). A PUMA contains at least 100,000 people, and the geographic boundaries of PUMAs are almost identical to those of New York City’s sub-borough areas. Summary-level data is also reported at the borough and city levels. Because each PUMA in New York City has at least 100,000 residents, reliable annual estimates are available for each PUMA from the ACS. In this edition of State of the City we use annual estimates for all of data we get from the ACS except for the rental vacancy rate, for which we use the 3-year estimate (see the section below for more details).

Census and American Community Survey Microdata

In order to calculate our income diversity ratios, we determine the quintile distribution of incomes for the various geographies in New York City; to do this we use microdata1 (data reported at the individual- and household-level). The smallest level of geography reported in the microdata is the PUMA.

New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS)

The Housing and Vacancy Survey (HVS) is conducted every three years by the U.S. Census Bureau under contract with the City of New York. The New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) sponsors and supervises the HVS. The primary purpose of the HVS is to satisfy the City’s statutory requirement to measure the rental vacancy rate in order to determine if rent regulations should be continued. In addition to the housing unit and household information, a limited set of data also is collected for each person in the household.

In this edition of the State of the City, we use HVS data to construct two indicators that are specific to New York City and therefore not captured in the ACS—the percentage of rental units that are subsidized and the percentage of rental units that are rent-regulated.

Notes on Sampling

Because both the ACS and HVS are sample surveys, not censuses, all data derived from the surveys are estimates, not exact counts. The ACS sample includes approximately 3 million housing unit addresses nationwide including about 66,000 in New York City; 18,000 housing unit addresses are sampled for the HVS. The sample for the HVS is designed primarily to achieve acceptable reliability in estimating the “vacant available for rent” rate for the entire City, so estimates for smaller geographic units such as sub-borough areas are subject to potentially large sampling errors. Readers should treat these estimates with some skepticism and be aware that the true value may differ significantly from the reported estimate.

Comparisons between the Decennial Census and American Community Survey Years

The Census Bureau makes continual adjustments to the Decennial Census and the American Community Survey to improve the coverage of the surveys and accuracy of the results. These adjustments often make cross-year comparisons difficult. Below is a discussion of the key areas where changes in sampling, question construction, or other methodology might affect the comparability of indicators that we report in the State of the City over time.

Group Quarters

Group quarters are places that are not classified by the Census Bureau as housing units, such as correctional facilities, nursing homes, hospitals, and other types of institutions. Group quarters populations were surveyed in the 2000 Census, as well as in the 2006 and 2007 ACS. Although the definition of group quarters facilities used for the ACS is slightly different than that used for the Census, this difference should not affect data reported in the State of the City. The 2005 ACS did not include group quarters. Because group quarters populations may have social and demographic characteristics that are significantly different than those of populations in housing units, the exclusion of group quarters populations in 2005 may affect some indicators reported in the State of the City and complicate comparisons between 2005 and other years.

The indicators that may be affected by the exclusion of group quarters populations from the 2005 ACS are: Disabled Population, Educational Attainment, Foreign-Born Population, Mean Travel Time to Work, Population, Population Aged 65 and Older, Poverty Rate, Poverty Rate by Age, Public Transportation Rate, Race and Racial Diversity Index, and Unemployment Rate.

Income

The question construction and data collection for income information differs between the Decennial Census and the ACS. The 2000 Census asked for the respondent’s 1999 income; thus incomes reported in 2000 are all for one fixed period of time (calendar year 1999). The ACS, by contrast, asks for the respondent’s income over the “past 12 months” and this information is collected on an on-going monthly basis. Therefore these figures are not directly comparable. The Census Bureau notes that a comparison study of the 2000 Census income data and the 2000 ACS data found that incomes reported in the Census were about 4% higher than the incomes reported in the ACS.

Because of these data collection methods, adjacent years of ACS data may have reference months in common; thus comparisons of income data between ACS years (2005, 2006, and 2007) should not be interpreted as precise comparisons of economic conditions in those years.

Indicators affected by the income methodology issues are: Income Diversity Index, Median Household Income, Poverty Rate, and Poverty Rate by Age.

Note that for comparison purposes, we adjust all dollar amounts reported in this book to 2007 dollars—the most recent year for which income data exists from the ACS—using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (Current Series) from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for all major expenditure classes.
Poverty Indicators
Estimates of poverty rates are likely to be affected both by the inclusion or exclusion of the group quarters population and by the treatment of income. With the 2000 Census, the Census Bureau included a count of people living in group quarters. The group quarters population was not surveyed in the 2005 ACS, but was surveyed in the 2000 Census and the 2006 and 2007 ACS. The inclusion of the group quarters population has a significant effect on estimates of the poverty rate. Therefore, the poverty rate is not presented for 2005. Comparisons between years should be made with caution.

Rental Vacancy Rate
Nearly two-thirds of the SBAs in New York City lacked enough sample observations to calculate a rental vacancy rate for at least one year of ACS data. However, all but two of the SBAs had sufficient observations to calculate a 3-year average of the rental vacancy rate. Thus, on the community district pages, for the rental vacancy rate only, we report a 3-year average rental vacancy rate for 2005–2007. We still report annual rental vacancy rates on the borough and City pages, however, the 2005–2007 average for community districts cannot be directly compared to any one year of borough or City data.


HOUSING PRICE APPRECIATION INDICES
The index of housing price appreciation, also called the repeat sales index, is a measure of relative change in property values over time. We construct housing price appreciation indices for four different property types (condominiums, single-family homes, 2–4 family homes, and 5+ unit apartment buildings) for New York City as a whole and for each borough. Estimating price indices separately for different types of properties allows for different market valuations and fluctuations within each property type. Due to insufficient data, we report the price indices only for the most representative building type at the community district level.

The primary data set used to construct the price index was obtained under an exclusive arrangement with the New York City Department of Finance. This data set contains information on address, price, and date of sale for all transactions involving sales of apartment buildings, condominium apartments and single- and multi-family homes in New York City between 1974 and 2007. We used roughly 239,000 pairs of sales in the estimation.

The repeat sales price indices are created using statistical regression techniques. Economists use two basic approaches to estimate housing price indices: the hedonic regression and the repeat sales method. Both of these approaches estimate temporal price movement controlling for the variation in the types of homes sold from period to period. Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses.

The repeat-sales methodology controls for housing characteristics by using data on properties that have sold more than once. An attractive feature of this method is that, unlike the hedonic approach, it does not require the measurement of house quality; it only requires time invariance of the quality of individual houses in the sample. The most important drawback of the repeat sales method is that it fails to use the full information available in the data. In most data sets, only a small proportion of the housing stock is sold more than once; the data on single sales cannot be used. Moreover, properties that transact more than once may not be representative of all properties in the market, raising concerns about sample selection bias. However, as the index period lengthens, more houses have changed hands more than once. This reduces sample selection bias but exacerbates a heteroskedasticity problem; Case and Shiller (1989) show evidence that price change variability is positively related to the interval of time between sales.

Most of the problems associated with the repeat sales method are overcome in this report. Specifically, the data set used here is quite large so that we lose little precision by eliminating properties that sold only once. Moreover, the time period of 30 years is long enough that we capture a fairly large proportion of the housing stock. Finally, we use the three-step procedure suggested by Case and Shiller (1989) and modified by
Quigley and Van Order\(^3\) (1995) to account for the possibility of time-dependent error variances.

In the first stage, the difference between the log price of the second sale and the log price of the first sale is regressed on a set of dummy variables, one for each time period in the sample (a year, in this case) except for the first. The dummy variables have values of +1 for the year of the second sale, -1 for the year of the first sale, and zeros otherwise.

In the second stage, the squared residuals from the first stage are regressed on a constant term, the time interval between sales, and the time interval squared. The fitted value in the stage-two regression is a consistent estimate of the error variance in the stage-one regression. In the third stage, the stage-one regression is re-estimated by generalized least squares, using the inverses of the square root of the fitted values from the stage-two regression as weights.

**HMDA**

The Federal Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) requires mortgage lending institutions meeting specific minimum criteria to report information on mortgage loan applications and originations. The threshold for coverage is low, so the HMDA data captures the vast majority of residential mortgage lending activity.\(^4\)

All figures in our analysis are based on conventional, owner-occupied, one to four family, non business-related loans. We exclude from our analysis any government sponsored loans (such as FHA insured or VA guaranteed), any loans for properties that the owner acknowledged he or she did not occupy as a principle dwelling, any loans for manufactured or multifamily housing (5 or more families), and any loans deemed to be business related (classified as those loans for which a lender reports an applicant’s ethnicity, race and sex all as “not applicable”). Conventional, owner occupied, one to four family, and non business-related loans constituted more than 89% of all loan applications in New York City in 2007.

Loan applicants were assigned to a racial/ethnic group for purposes of our research based on the first reported race of the primary applicant. However, if the applicant reported his or her ethnicity as “Hispanic” the applicant was classified as Hispanic, regardless of the applicant’s reported race. When an applicant provided information to the lender via mail, internet or telephone and did not provide information on their race we assigned those loans to the “not reported” racial category. These loans were included in our national, City, and borough level analyses, but were not included in our calculation of the racial share of new home purchase borrowers.

HMDA requires lenders to report when the spread between the annual percentage rate (APR) of a loan and the rate of Treasury securities of comparable maturity is greater than three percentage points for first lien loans and five percentage points for junior lien loans. In this report, all loans with APRs above this threshold were referred to as high-cost loans.

**LIS PENDENS DATA (NOTICES OF FORECLOSURE)**

The Furman Center collects data on lis pendens filings from a private vendor, Public Data Corporation. A lis pendens may be filed for a host of reasons unrelated to a mortgage foreclosure. The Furman Center uses a variety of screening techniques to identify only those lis pendens related to a mortgage. Further, if the same property received any additional lis pendens within 365 days of the initial lis pendens, the additional lis pendens are not included in our rate to avoid double-counting the same foreclosure.

**POPULATION WEIGHTING FORMULA**

Several indicators included in this book (Asthma Hospitalizations, Felony Crime Rate and Students Performing at Grade Level in Math and Reading) are provided to us at geographic levels other than the community district level (such as police precincts or school districts). In order to make comparisons at the community district level, the Furman Center uses a population weighting formula.

For instance, when aggregating the felony crime rate from the 76 police precincts to the 59 community districts, we first calculate the rate for each of the 76 police

---


\(^4\) Information about specific requirement can be found at http://www.ffiec.gov/hmda/reporter.htm.
precincts. If a community district only contains one police precinct then that rate is directly used for the community district. If a community district contains more than one police precinct, we weight the rates for each precinct based on the number of housing units within the community district that are in each precinct.

For example, if community district 1 contains three precincts A, B, and C and of the 100 housing units in community district 1, 50 are in precinct A, 30 and in precinct B, and 20 are in precinct C the resulting formula would be:

\[
rate(CD1) = rate(A) \times .5 + rate(B) \times .3 + rate(C) \times .2
\]

Since police precincts and community districts are not co-terminus, it is possible that the same precinct would be included in the calculation of two or more community districts. However, it would be weighted accordingly each time.

**Calculating Distance to Amenities in GIS**

This book presents three new indicators (Units in a Historic District, Units within 1/2 Mile of a Subway Entrance and Units within 1/4 Mile of a Park) that show the percentage of housing units within a given distance to amenities.

**Walking Distance**

For calculating walking distance to a subway entrance, we obtained a database of entrances to MTA subway stations in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens from the New York City Department of Transportation (DOT). DOT geocoded most of these entrances. We supplemented their work by assigning geographies for ungeocoded entrances. For Staten Island, we interpolated subway entrances using a variety of GIS techniques, including current satellite imagery.

To determine walking distance, we used the New York City Department of City Planning’s LION shapefile to create a network buffer of streets with pedestrian right-of-ways that are within one half mile from a subway entrance. Using GIS, we then selected the lots that fall within this network buffer.

**“As the Crow Flies”**

Since our data on parks do not contain information on their entrances, we could not calculate actual walking distance. Instead, we used GIS to select the lots within a quarter mile around each park.

We also used the “as the crow flies” method to determine the number of housing units within a quarter mile of a point source of pollution. In the future, we intend to create a more complex buffer that takes into account differences in pollution dispersals.
Since its founding in 1995, the Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy has become the leading academic research center in New York City devoted to the public policy aspects of land use, real estate development and housing. The Center is dedicated to the following three missions:

- Providing objective academic and empirical research on the legal and public policy issues involving land use, real estate, housing and urban affairs in the United States, with a particular focus on New York City;

- Promoting frank and productive discussions among elected and appointed officials, leaders of the real estate industry, leaders of non-profit housing and community development organizations, scholars, faculty and students about critical issues in land use, real estate and urban policy;

- Presenting essential data and analysis about the state of New York City's housing and neighborhoods to all those involved in land use, real estate development, community economic development, housing, urban economics and urban policy. The Furman Center manages two websites that help disseminate information on New York City’s housing and neighborhoods to the public:

  - PlanNYC is a comprehensive urban planning website, with news summaries and links to development-related articles, official documents such as environmental impact statements, and a citywide calendar of upcoming planning events, including local community board meetings and public hearings. PlanNYC brings together information from advocacy organizations, government agencies, academic institutions, neighborhood groups, and media organizations, all in one location. Please visit www.plannyc.org.

  - The New York City Housing and Neighborhood Information System (NYCHANIS) is an interactive website that allows users to obtain data and information about New York City neighborhoods and create custom-made tables, charts, graphs, and maps. Please visit www.nychanis.com.

Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy
New York University
110 West 3rd St. Suite 209
New York, NY 10012
Telephone: 212-998-6713
Fax: 212-995-4341
Email: furmancenter@nyu.edu

http://furmancenter.org
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