



# Housing Emergency and Overcrowding: Latinos in New York City

Volume 1, No. 1

Centro Policy Brief

Spring 2003

## **Part I** **Structural Factors Bearing on Public Health**

The unexpected increase in population in New York City as reflected by the 2000 decennial census has been much celebrated in the media, policy and social circles alike as a boon for the city. But the robust growth, driven largely by the increase in migration from Latin America and high fertility rates among Latinos, while benefiting the city and the state of New York as a whole, has come at a disproportionate cost to the Latino population of the city. One of those costs has been the problems Latinos have had to face around housing.

In 2002, New York City had 3,209,000 housing units, of which 2,085,00 were in the rental market.<sup>1</sup> Of this rental market total only 2.94% were vacant and available for rent. This vacancy rate was even lower for rent-stabilized units (2.54%) and much lower still for low-rent units (1.54%).<sup>2</sup> This low vacancy rate is the reason New York City has declared a housing emergency continuously since 1966. (For a more detailed historical view by borough see Part II)

Vacancy rates have fallen due to a number of factors, chief among them the overall reduction in the housing stock. While the total number of housing units in New York City increased by 44,000 between 1996 and 1999—an increase reflected in the growth in the number of rent-stabilized apartments to 1,065,000 by 2002—the number of rent-controlled apartments had declined from 71,000 to 60,000 by 2002. The scarcity in housing units has been more prevalent at the lower end of the spectrum. The number of low-rent units, renting for less than \$400 of monthly gross rent, declined by 6.5%; and those renting between \$400 and \$599 decreased by 10.6% as of 1999. On the other hand, the number of units renting for more than \$1,750 or more in 1999 increased by 34%. Rents have risen concurrently.

The extremely low vacancy rate, particularly at the low-rent level, has contributed to financial hardship for many New

York City residents, many of them Latinos, as they have to expend greater shares of their income for housing. The median monthly gross rent increased to \$700 in 1999 from \$640 in 1996 (a 3.1% increase, when adjusted for inflation).<sup>3</sup> Moreover, whereas the median percent of household income spent on rent in the city was 27.4% in 1999, in ten neighborhoods the median percent of income spent on rent ranged from 30.7% to 36.5%.<sup>4</sup> Seven of these ten neighborhoods with the highest of rates of median percent income spent on rent were districts where Latinos were the majority of the population or were overrepresented.<sup>5</sup> In fact, whereas in New York City as a whole 24% of household spent more than 50% of their income on rent, five Latino neighborhoods were among the top ten in which 30% to 35% of the households in the neighborhood households spent more than 50% of their income in rent.<sup>6</sup>

The problem of affordability is most prevalent in the rental market, and it is telling who those who depend on the rental market are: 52% are non-immigrant whites; 59% are immigrant whites; 78% are non-immigrant blacks; 75% are immigrant blacks; 73% are non-immigrant Hispanics; and 85% are immigrant Hispanics.<sup>7</sup> The problem of affordability, however, is not limited to the rental market. Among homeowners, eight neighborhoods where Latinos are the majority or are well overrepresented are among the city's top ten in which an above average percentage (from 17.5% to 35.7%) of homeowners have housing costs greater than 60% of their income.<sup>8</sup>

These factors have led to an increase in people crowding and overcrowding into homes. The crowding rate (defined as more than one person per room) stands at 11.1% in 2002, an increase over previous years.<sup>9</sup> The severely crowded rate (defined as more than 1.5 persons per room) has also increased to 3.9% in spite of the increase in the construction of new

or rehabilitated housing units. By a different measure, the percentage of people that had less than one room per person in family housing in 1997 was: 2% for non-immigrant whites; 9% for immigrant whites; 13% for non-immigrant blacks; 20% for immigrant blacks; 17% for non-immigrant Hispanics; and 22% for immigrant Hispanics.<sup>10</sup> The disproportionate burden of crowding on Latinos can also be appreciated from neighborhood data. Whereas in the city as a whole 7.5% of households were severely crowded in 1999, there were ten neighborhoods where severely crowded households represented between 11.4% and 23.4% all of households.<sup>11</sup> Of these ten neighborhoods, Latinos were the majority population in six and overrepresented in another three.

Public housing has served as a safety net for those facing dire housing conditions in the United States. But in this category of housing, Latinos are also experiencing a disproportionate burden. The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) reports in its 2003 One-Year Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) that the number of applicants to public housing stands at 105,000, while those who have applied for Section 8 vouchers are 149,000.<sup>12</sup> Latinos represent by far the largest proportion of those waiting lists, with 44.5% awaiting for an apartment in a public housing project and 41% awaiting for a voucher that would subsidize their rent in privately owned housing. With 181,000 units of rental housing, NYCHA's stock represents 8.6% of the total rental units throughout the City.

Overcrowding takes a human toll as it impacts people's psyche. Another negative consequence of overcrowding is the stress on the physical infrastructure of homes and apartments. As homes and apartments deteriorate physically as a result of overcrowding, the environmental triggers of asthma and other health hazards such as lead paint and asbestos proliferate. Increasingly, therefore, the housing crisis is disproportionately affecting the City's poor, which in New York correlate strongly with being black and/or Latino as well as immigrant. Neighborhood data corroborates this conclusion. Whereas for the City of New York as a whole the percent of housing units with 5 or more maintenance deficiencies was 3.1% in 1999, ten neighborhoods had percentages of households with those deficiencies that ranged from 6.5% to 12.8%. Of these ten neighborhoods with above average proportions of units with a high number of deficiencies, five were neighborhoods with a majority Latino population and one where Latinos were overrepresented.<sup>13</sup>

### **The Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998: Its Effects on the Production of New Housing**

When Congress passed and President Clinton signed into law the "Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998" (QHWRA) the federal government effectively terminated the construction of public housing. The law explicitly prohibits the use of public housing capital and operating funds for new construction that would result in the net increase in the number of public housing units owned, assisted, or operated by public housing authorities (PHAs).<sup>14</sup> The production of new federally-funded public housing can only take place as part of mixed-finance development projects.<sup>15</sup> Alternatively, The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) has sought to provide additional units through master-leasing, leasing housing units from private developers.

These provisions raise a number of issues that impact the well-being of current, and future, residents of public housing. First, by de-funding the construction of new public housing units, the federal government is contributing to worsen a housing crisis, particularly in New York City. The commitment to house the most vulnerable segments of the population has been rolled back and available alternatives (i.e. section 8 vouchers) have been rendered insufficient. As a group with a demonstrated disproportionate need for public housing, Latinos in New York City will continue to be disproportionately affected by substandard housing and overcrowding. Secondly, by engaging in a "decentralization" of public housing and relying on the private sector to provide housing services for lower-middle, low and very low-income residents the federal government is compromising the accountability it has sought to enhance with other provisions of QHWRA. Instituting management decentralization or privatization initiatives when a monitoring apparatus is lacking or tenant organizations are weak or non-existent sets the stage for mismanagement and abuse. This potential for diminished management accountability also bodes ill for Latino communities as it is those communities that have a disproportionate number of public housing units in their midst.<sup>16</sup> Problems from mismanaged housing developments may potentially spill over into the larger community.

On the other hand, QHWRA provides opportunities that are potentially beneficial to address the health concerns of renters. First, while federal funds are not available for the construction of added public housing units, QHWRA does allow the use of capital and operating funds for the remediation of

environmental hazards that may prevail in public housing developments, by excluding those amounts from the definition of development funds.

One factor that has been identified as a trigger of asthma attacks is the presence of pests, such as roaches and rodents, or mold. The droppings and dandruff from pests as well as spores from mold may cause allergic reactions that increase the chances of asthma attacks. A recent demonstration project conducted by Hunter College Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, with the participation of the NYC Department of Health and NYCHA, at Lehman Houses in East Harlem, was designed to abate these problems using a multi-pronged approach that included correcting infrastructure problems that contributed to the existence and proliferation of pests and mold in the development, and training residents in the most efficient methods to prevent and mitigate conditions in individual housing units that would result in the presence of these triggers.

The use of capital and operating funds for these remediation and mitigation efforts must be actively promoted. Where living conditions have become substandard, QHWRA allows for the use of federal funds for the one-for-one replacement of units.

Moreover, QHWRA authorizes HUD to make grants to PHAs or resident organizations to provide for supportive services and resident empowerment activities designed to assist residents in becoming economically self-sufficient on or near the public housing project.<sup>17</sup> Among the activities that can be funded by these grants are resident management activities, and resident councils or organizations would receive at minimum 25% of those funds. The Lehman Houses health demonstration project would fall into one such activity, as it used trained and organized public housing residents.

QHWRA potentially places more oversight and management power on the hands of organized public housing residents.<sup>18</sup> However, little is mentioned in HUD's regulations and in NYCHA's plans in regards to how resident councils (e.g. tenants' associations) will be organized, where they do not exist or are not functioning, or strengthened, where they are fledgling. Public housing tenants have the opportunity to become involved in the management and operation of their particular developments, included the potential for well-funded and operated organizations, but the information necessary for tenants to become more engaged is not being provided by either the local PHA or HUD. HUD can mandate that PHAs disclose how they are going to facilitate resident

involvement in the management of local housing projects. However, in NYCHA's case specifically, because it is a high performing PHA, it does not have to make such disclosures.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the housing conditions facing New York City residents, and Latinos in particular, and given the institutional constraints and opportunities afforded by federal, state and city legislation and regulations, the following recommendation affecting public housing are offered.

### Congressional Action:

1) Repeal of QHWRA's clauses that prohibit the funding of new public housing construction. The biggest obstacle to alleviating the housing problem is its limited supply, particularly at the lower end of the income spectrum. Repealing this restriction from the law would eliminate a legal hurdle for the federal financing of low-income housing, the area of greatest demand in New York City.

2) Provision of additional funding for medium- and high-density low-income and middle-income housing. Once the legal restriction on federal financing for new public housing is eliminated, a strong commitment on the part of the U.S. Government is necessary for the allocation of funds for affordable housing.

### Local Public Housing Authority Action:

3) Plan to facilitate resident involvement in housing project management. Tenant participation is not created by stipulation alone. While QHWRA allows for tenant participation in the management of the local housing project, this involvement must be encouraged and facilitated. Local public housing authorities must institute processes and programs (e.g., workshops, shadowing) that train public housing tenants at the local project level in residential management skills.

4) Use of Capital and Operating Funds to mitigate triggers of asthma. Reallocation of budgetary items, allowable under statutory and regulatory provisions, must be instituted and prioritized in order to confront this public health threat.

## Part II Housing and Population in New York City 1940-2000

New York City has never before had eight million residents living in its midst.<sup>19</sup> This number has been reached by a dynamic in which newcomers to the city have provided both

the critical mass that have revived dying neighborhoods and spurred vibrant localized economies as well as the pool of relatively low-wage labor that served as incentive for the expanding service sector economy on which the city mostly relies and on which the engine of the city's economy (the FIRE sector) has depended. In conjunction, the growth of the national economy pulled the city's fortune out of the doldrums of the 1980s and early 1990s and provided the spark that ignited the city's record economic growth of the late 1990s. As a result the city became a magnet for migrants and immigrants, which offset the continued departure of segments of its population (e.g. Puerto Ricans), on the one hand, and the stagnation in the growth of other segments (e.g. African-Americans), on the other. Thus, the 4% rate of population growth during the 1980s and the 9% growth during the 1990s more than made up for the 10% decline the city suffered during the 1970s.(See table 1)

As impressive as the eight million people figure is, this population growth has been driven by the particular growth in two of its boroughs: Queens and Staten Island. Since 1900 the population in Queens has grown fourteenfold; 72 % since 1940. Staten Island's has increased more than sixfold since the turn of the 20th Century; and more than doubled since 1940. The population increases in these two boroughs has been progressive, sometimes growing at a two-digit rate. Staten Island has had the strongest and most sustained population growth of all the boroughs, growing even during the 1970s as the other four boroughs were hemorrhaging. Queens had as impressive a growth rate as Staten Island, except during the 1970s, when the borough lost population along the three other large boroughs.

The population story for the Bronx, Brooklyn and Manhattan, however, is not uniform. Each one has yet to reach previous population peaks. Manhattan at 1,537,195 people, for instance, is still climbing from its 1980 nadir (1,428,285 people), to which it had sunk from its zenith in 1910 (2,331,542 people). Manhattan has seen its population decline in 1920 and 1930, increase in 1940 and 1950, decline again in 1960, 1970 and 1980, with another growth trend marked in 1990 and 2000. (See table 1)

The Bronx has had similar upswings and downturns, but they have been characterized by taking place in shorter spurts, jolting the borough in the process. The Bronx had as impressive a growth during the first three decade of the century as Queens and Staten Island. Its population grew sixfold between 1900 and 1930. It continued growing through 1950, but people left the borough during that decade. During the 1960s, however, the borough gained some of the population it had lost, reaching its population peak of

1,471,701 in 1970. The 1970s, on the other hand, were bleak for the Bronx. It lost 21% of its population, spurred on by the vagaries of the economy but exacerbated by the "planned shrinkage" policies of the city and state governments. Since that time, the population has increased once again, particularly during the 1990s, with a robust 11% gain. But its population is still below its 1940 levels.(See table 1)

The trend in Brooklyn has been more uniform over time. After a steady growth during the first decades of the century, topping at 2,738,175 in 1950, the borough saw its population decline from the 1950s through the 1970s. The growth trend returned during the 1980s and continued through 2000.(See table 1)

The housing stock in the city of New York has also increased, as with the growth in population, from 2,210,000 in 1940 to 3,200,000 in 2000.(See table 2) With the exception of the Bronx, which reached its housing peak in 1970, the 2000 census showed that every other borough had the most housing units it had ever had. Despite a 44% increase in housing stock since 1940, the city of New York continues to face a housing emergency. This fact can be appreciated by observing the relative variation of housing units to the extant population.

For the city as a whole, the number of persons living in a housing unit has declined by a third since 1940. In other words, if in 1940 3.36 people lived in a given dwelling unit, by 2000 that number had declined to 2.5 persons.(See table 3) This datum would seem counterintuitive to an explanation of overcrowding and housing emergency.<sup>20</sup> But a closer look at the data shows that the number of people living in a dwelling, while decreasing significantly from 1940 through 1970, has increased 2% in each of the last two decades. Moreover, the distribution of population per housing unit has not been uniform throughout the city.

The city average was 2.5 persons per dwelling in 2000, but it ranged from as low as 1.93 in Manhattan to 2.73 in Queens.(See table 3) Manhattan has consistently had the lowest number of people per housing unit of any borough in the city. In contrast, both Staten Island and the Bronx have been the boroughs with the highest concentration rates. The increase in the number of people per dwelling unit over the past two decades has not taken place uniformly either. For instance, in the Bronx the rate increased in the 1980s, but then declined in the 1990s, albeit at the slowest of rates. In Staten Island, the rate, which had been decreasing since the 1940s, slowed its decrease during the 1990s. In Manhattan, however, the change was small but reflecting an increase. In Brooklyn and Queens, on the other hand, the increase since 1980 has been more pronounced. During the 1980s the trend

in the increasing rate of people per household unit was driven by the Bronx and Brooklyn. In 1990s, it was largely Queens that propelled the growth.

These data show the concentration of people in all available housing units as the number of available dwellings is more limited. For instance, while the total number of housing units counted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census in 2000 was 3,200,912, only 94% of those (3,021,588) were actually occupied. (See table 5) The relatively fewer number of available housing units, given by the number of vacant units to total units, creates an added pressure on the housing stock as the population increases. This can be observed in the increase in the ratio of people per housing unit, about 6 % higher in 2000, 1990 and 1980, when using occupied housing units as denominator. For the city as a whole, the concentration of people per occupied unit of housing was 2.65 in 2000. (See table 6) An increase in this ratio over the two previous decades is noted also in every borough with the exception of Staten Island.

## Endnotes

1 Data drawn from Moon Wha Lee. (2003) Selected Findings of the 2002 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. NYC: City of New York, Department of Housing Preservation and Development. February 7.

2 Low-rent units are those renting for less than \$500.00 a month in 1999.

3 Data drawn from 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. U.S. Bureau of the Census. June 29, 2000. [www.census.gov/hhes/www/nychvs.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/nychvs.html)

4 University Heights/ Fordham, Soundview/ Parkchester, Highbridge/ South Concourse, Mott Haven/ Hunts Point, Morrisania/ Belmont in the Bronx and Sunset Park and East New York/ Starrett City in Brooklyn. Data drawn from Wallin, Denise, Michael Schill & Glynis Daniels, (2002). State of New York City's Housing and Neighborhoods, 2002. New York: New York University, Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy. P. 82.

5 Latinos are overrepresented in a neighborhood when they make up between 27% (their proportion in New York City) and 50% of its population in 2000. Of 55 geographical areas in which New York City can be subdivided, Latinos represented the majority population in 11 (6 in the Bronx, 2 in Brooklyn, 2 in Manhattan and 1 in Queens). In addition, Latinos are overrepresented in other 11 areas of the city (2 in the Bronx, 2 in Brooklyn, 2 in Manhattan and 5 in Queens). See Wallin et al 2002, p. 250.

6 See Wallin et al (2002), p.84.

7 Garfinkel, Irwin & Marcia K. Meyers (1999) New York City Social Indicators 1997: A Tale of Many Cities. New York,

NY: Columbia University, School of Social Work, Social Indicators Survey Center, February. P. 24.

8 See Wallin et al (2002) p.86.

9 Lee (2003).

10 Garfinkel & Meyers (1999), p. 27.

11 See Wallin et al (2002), p. 212.

12 These figures represent current needs as an application for public housing remains active for only three years.

13 See Wallin et al (2002), p. 204.

14 Section 519, Title V of Public Law 105-276.

15 Ibid. Section 539.

16 Public housing accounts for 5.6% of all housing units in New York City. Of the ten community districts in the city with the highest percentage of public housing units in its housing stock four are majority Latino (Mott Haven/Melrose with 39%, East Harlem with 34%, Morrisania/Crotona with 32%, and Parkchester/Soundview with 12%) and in an additional two Latinos are overrepresented (East New York/Starrett City with 13%, and Lower East Side/Chinatown with 20%). Wallin et al (2002), p. 90.

17 Section 538, Title V of P.L. 105-276.

18 Ibid. Section 534

19 The figures provided throughout the text have been drawn from the decennial censuses conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census between 1940 and 2000.

20 These data are aggregate numbers and therefore it is hard to determine a number of factors that would impact on the quality of housing. The available data, for instance, does not provide information on the number of rooms per housing unit. It is therefore not possible to determine overcrowding. The data do not make distinction about the type of unit, whether it is a rental or an owner-occupied unit.

## References

Garfinkel, Irwin & Marcia K. Meyers (1999) New York City Social Indicators 1997: A Tale of Many Cities. New York, NY: Columbia University, School of Social Work, Social Indicators Survey Center, February.

Moon Wha Lee. (2003) Selected Findings of the 2002 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. NYC: City of New York, Department of Housing Preservation and Development. February 7.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (2000). 1999 New York City Housing and Vacancy Survey. June 29. [www.census.gov/hhes/www/nychvs.html](http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/nychvs.html)

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2002). PHA Plan—Final: Annual Plan for Fiscal Year 2003. (New York City Housing Authority Agency Plan 2003.) Office of Public and Indian Housing. October 18.

Wallin, Denise, Michael Schill & Glynis Daniels, (2002). State of New York City's Housing and Neighborhoods, 2002. New York: New York University, Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy.

**Table 1**

**New York City Population (1900-2000)**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1900	200507		1166582		1850093		152999		67021		3437202	
1910	430980	1.15	1634351	0.40	2331542	0.26	284041	0.86	85969	0.28	4766883	0.39
1920	732016	0.70	2018356	0.23	2284103	-0.02	469042	0.65	116531	0.36	5620048	0.18
1930	1265258	0.73	2560401	0.27	1867312	-0.18	1079129	1.30	158346	0.36	6930446	0.23
1940	1394711	0.10	2698285	0.05	1889924	0.01	1297634	0.20	174441	0.10	7454995	0.08
1950	1451277	0.04	2738175	0.01	1960101	0.04	1550849	0.20	191555	0.10	7891957	0.06
1960	1424815	-0.02	2627319	-0.04	1698281	-0.13	1809578	0.17	221991	0.16	7781984	-0.01
1970	1471701	0.03	2602012	-0.01	1539233	-0.09	1986473	0.10	295443	0.33	7894862	0.01
1980	1168972	-0.21	2230936	-0.14	1428285	-0.07	1891325	-0.05	352121	0.19	7071639	-0.10
1990	1203789	0.03	2300664	0.03	1487536	0.04	1951598	0.03	378977	0.08	7322564	0.04
2000	1332650	0.11	2465326	0.07	1537195	0.03	2229379	0.14	443728	0.17	8008278	0.09

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

**Table 2**

**New York City Housing Units (1940-2000)**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	395245		762526		617373		394389		48839		2218372	
1950	432259	0.09	814134	0.07	635944	0.03	495308	0.26	55820	0.14	2433465	0.10
1960	473159	0.09	875757	0.08	727424	0.14	617077	0.25	65156	0.17	2758573	0.13
1970	508789	0.08	902622	0.03	714593	-0.02	708419	0.15	89961	0.38	2924384	0.06
1980	451118	-0.11	881367	-0.02	754796	0.06	740129	0.04	119000	0.32	2946410	0.01
1990	440955	-0.02	873671	-0.01	785127	0.04	752690	0.02	139726	0.17	2992169	0.02
2000	490659	0.11	930866	0.07	798144	0.02	817250	0.09	163993	0.17	3200912	0.07

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

**Table 3**

**Ratio of Population to Housing (1940-2000)**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	3.529		3.539		3.061		3.290		3.572		3.361	
1950	3.357	-0.049	3.363	-0.050	3.082	0.007	3.131	-0.048	3.432	-0.039	3.243	-0.035
1960	3.011	-0.103	3.000	-0.108	2.335	-0.243	2.932	-0.063	3.407	-0.007	2.821	-0.130
1970	2.893	-0.039	2.883	-0.039	2.154	-0.077	2.804	-0.044	3.284	-0.036	2.700	-0.043
1980	2.591	-0.104	2.531	-0.122	1.892	-0.122	2.555	-0.089	2.959	-0.099	2.400	-0.111
1990	2.730	0.054	2.633	0.040	1.895	0.001	2.593	0.015	2.712	-0.083	2.447	0.020
2000	2.716	-0.005	2.648	0.006	1.926	0.017	2.728	0.052	2.706	-0.002	2.502	0.022

**Table 4**

**Housing Units per Capita**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	0.283		0.283		0.327		0.304		0.280		0.298	
1950	0.298	0.051	0.297	0.052	0.324	-0.007	0.319	0.051	0.291	0.041	0.308	0.036
1960	0.332	0.115	0.333	0.121	0.428	0.320	0.341	0.068	0.294	0.007	0.354	0.150
1970	0.346	0.041	0.347	0.041	0.464	0.084	0.357	0.046	0.304	0.037	0.370	0.045
1980	0.386	0.116	0.395	0.139	0.528	0.138	0.391	0.097	0.338	0.110	0.417	0.125
1990	0.366	-0.051	0.380	-0.039	0.528	-0.001	0.386	-0.014	0.369	0.091	0.409	-0.019
2000	0.368	0.005	0.378	-0.006	0.519	-0.016	0.367	-0.050	0.370	0.002	0.400	-0.022

**Table 5**

**New York City Occupied Housing Units (1940-2000)**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	377843		716933		548378		361689		43076		2047919	
1950	425021	0.12	795665	0.11	624498	0.14	461228	0.28	51507	0.20	2357919	0.15
1960	463401	0.09	850866	0.07	695763	0.11	583141	0.26	61731	0.20	2654902	0.13
1970	497222	0.07	876119	0.03	687283	-0.01	690056	0.18	86192	0.40	2836872	0.07
1980	429257	-0.14	828257	-0.05	704502	0.03	711940	0.03	114574	0.33	2788530	-0.02
1990	424112	-0.01	828199	0.00	716422	0.02	720149	0.01	130519	0.14	2819401	0.01
2000	463212	0.09	880727	0.06	738644	0.03	782664	0.09	156341	0.20	3021588	0.07

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

**Table 6**

**Ratio of Population to Occupied Housing**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	3.691		3.764		3.446		3.588		4.050		3.640	
1950	3.415	-0.075	3.441	-0.086	3.139	-0.089	3.362	-0.063	3.719	-0.082	3.347	-0.081
1960	3.075	-0.100	3.088	-0.103	2.441	-0.222	3.103	-0.077	3.596	-0.033	2.931	-0.124
1970	2.960	-0.037	2.970	-0.038	2.240	-0.082	2.879	-0.072	3.428	-0.047	2.783	-0.051
1980	2.723	-0.080	2.694	-0.093	2.027	-0.095	2.657	-0.077	3.073	-0.103	2.536	-0.089
1990	2.838	0.042	2.778	0.031	2.076	0.024	2.710	0.020	2.904	-0.055	2.597	0.024
2000	2.877	0.014	2.799	0.008	2.081	0.002	2.848	0.051	2.838	-0.023	2.650	0.020

**Table 7**

**Occupied Housing Units per Capita**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	0.271		0.266		0.290		0.279		0.247		0.275	
1950	0.293	0.081	0.291	0.094	0.319	0.098	0.297	0.067	0.269	0.089	0.299	0.088
1960	0.325	0.111	0.324	0.114	0.410	0.286	0.322	0.084	0.278	0.034	0.341	0.142
1970	0.338	0.039	0.337	0.040	0.447	0.090	0.347	0.078	0.292	0.049	0.359	0.053
1980	0.367	0.087	0.371	0.103	0.493	0.105	0.376	0.084	0.325	0.115	0.394	0.097
1990	0.352	-0.041	0.360	-0.030	0.482	-0.024	0.369	-0.020	0.344	0.058	0.385	-0.024
2000	0.348	-0.013	0.357	-0.008	0.481	-0.002	0.351	-0.049	0.352	0.023	0.377	-0.020

**Table 8**

**New York City Vacant Housing Units (1940-2000)**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	17402		45593		68995		32700		5763		170453	
1950	7238	-0.58	18469	-0.59	11446	-0.83	34080	0.04	4313	-0.25	75546	-0.56
1960	9758	0.35	24891	0.35	31661	1.77	33936	0.00	3425	-0.21	103671	0.37
1970	11428	0.17	26067	0.05	27095	-0.14	13015	-0.62	3044	-0.11	80649	-0.22
1980	21861	0.91	53110	1.04	50294	0.86	28189	1.17	4426	0.45	157880	0.96
1990	16843	-0.23	45472	-0.14	68705	0.37	32541	0.15	9207	1.08	172768	0.09
2000	27447	0.63	50139	0.10	59500	-0.13	34586	0.06	7652	-0.17	179324	0.04

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

**Table 9**

**Ratio of Population to Vacant Housing**

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	80.147		59.182		27.392		39.683		30.269		43.736	
1950	200.508	1.502	148.258	1.505	171.248	5.252	45.506	0.147	44.413	0.467	104.466	1.389
1960	146.015	-0.272	105.553	-0.288	53.640	-0.687	53.323	0.172	64.815	0.459	75.064	-0.281
1970	128.780	-0.118	99.820	-0.054	56.809	0.059	152.630	1.862	97.057	0.497	97.892	0.304
1980	53.473	-0.585	42.006	-0.579	28.399	-0.500	67.094	-0.560	79.557	-0.180	44.791	-0.542
1990	71.471	0.337	50.595	0.204	21.651	-0.238	59.974	-0.106	41.162	-0.483	42.384	-0.054
2000	48.554	-0.321	49.170	-0.028	25.835	0.193	64.459	0.075	57.988	0.409	44.658	0.054

*Table 10*

Vacant Housing Units per Capita

Year	Bronx	% Change	Brooklyn	% Change	Manhattan	% Change	Queens	% Change	Staten Island	% Change	New York City	% Change
1940	0.012		0.017		0.037		0.025		0.033		0.023	
1950	0.005	-0.600	0.007	-0.601	0.006	-0.840	0.022	-0.128	0.023	-0.318	0.010	-0.581
1960	0.007	0.373	0.009	0.405	0.019	2.193	0.019	-0.147	0.015	-0.315	0.013	0.392
1970	0.008	0.134	0.010	0.057	0.018	-0.056	0.007	-0.651	0.010	-0.332	0.010	-0.233
1980	0.019	1.408	0.024	1.376	0.035	1.000	0.015	1.275	0.013	0.220	0.022	1.186
1990	0.014	-0.252	0.020	-0.170	0.046	0.312	0.017	0.119	0.024	0.933	0.024	0.057
2000	0.021	0.472	0.020	0.029	0.039	-0.162	0.016	-0.070	0.017	-0.290	0.022	-0.051

*Carlos Vargas-Ramos, Ph.D., a political scientist, is Centro's researcher on public policy and the author of this report. Inquiries may be addressed to Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños—Hunter College, 695 Park Avenue, E1429, New York, NY 10021 Centro@hunter.cuny.edu*