

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

40 NORTH PEARL STREET, ALBANY, NEW YORK 12243-0001

MARY JO BANE  
Commissioner



(518) 474-9475

LOCAL COMMISSIONERS MEMORANDUM

DSS-4037EL (Rev. 9/89)

Transmittal No: 92 LCM-110

Date: July 20, 1992

Division: Family & Children  
Services

TO: Local District Commissioners

SUBJECT: SFY 1992/93 Cap on State Share of Foster Care Expenditures

ATTACHMENTS: A. Chart of Local District Foster Care Cap Allocations is available on line

The purpose of this letter is to advise you of the Foster Care Reimbursement Cap amounts for all local social services districts as well as to provide additional information regarding the cap. As you are aware, the 1992/93 State Budget required enactment of a cap on the state share of all Foster Care reimbursements to local districts in SFY 92/93. An ADM on this topic will be forthcoming.

The attached chart lists the individual cap amounts for each social services district.

Additional information regarding the Foster Care Cap is being provided in a question and answer format.

1. Question: What expenditures are included in the Foster Care Cap?

Answer: All state share Foster Care reimbursement claims which are paid during SFY 92/93 are included under the cap. The major portion of these claims will be January '92 - December '92 maintenance and tuition, as well as IV-E and FNP-foster care administrative expenditures for October '91 - September '92. However, it also includes adjustments for any period for these same categories which are paid during SFY 92/93.

2. Questions: What expenditures are excluded?

Answer: Federal shares for all foster care costs as well as state share claims for Transitional Care, Committee on Special Education (CSE) placements, Adoption Assistance expenditures, and JD/PINS expenditures are not included in the Foster Care Cap allocations.

3. Question: Is the cap a cash or a liability "cap"?

Answer: The Foster Care Cap is a cash cap. The cap places a limit on the amount of state reimbursement available to Local Social Service Districts (LSSD's). Districts are eligible to continue to receive federal Title IV-E reimbursement regardless of whether they are under or over the cap.

4. Question: Will the state share of foster care costs claimed as EAF be subject to the cap?

Answer: No. The cap applies to the state share of foster care. Federal funds will continue to flow in accordance with routine reimbursement practices. The state share of EAF is governed by that program's rules.

5. Question: Does the cap allow for exceptions or waivers?

Answer: The budget language allows the Department, subject to Division of Budget approval, to grant exceptions to the cap based upon natural disasters or unforeseen circumstances. Waivers are not automatic, but subject to approval criteria. There is a very limited amount of funds available for this purpose.

6. Question: What factors might be considered in evaluating waiver requests?

Answers: The criteria for waivers are still being developed. Generally, we expect we will review:

- \* recent changes in case load data including the rationale for the increase
- \* use (and commitment) of preventive service initiatives to avert foster care placement or speed discharge
- \* availability of alternative program models designed to support permanency goals (i.e., Therapeutic Foster Care, Family Prevention (i.e., Homebuilder) projects, respite services, etc.)

- \* local efforts to use other resources in a coordinated manner to meet the needs of families and at-risk children
- \* FFP maximization efforts designed to assist local districts to stay under the cap
- \* participation in training and technical assistance sessions designed to reduce state and local costs
- \* cooperation with efforts to improve claiming and cost allocation practices
- \* emergency situations which directly impact upon placement practices
- \* availability of CPS post-indication services
- \* local district efforts to speed adoption outcomes.

7. Question: What actions can be taken to avoid exceeding the cap?

Answer: There exist a number of programmatic and administrative actions which can be implemented to assist a LSSD remain under their Foster Care Cap. These actions include:

#### FEDERAL MAXIMIZATION

- \* Maximize Title IV-E for new cases
- \* Maximize EAF funding as appropriate
- \* Maximize IV-E Administrative Reimbursement through proper SSRR/RMS Coding
- \* Review SSI/Zebley Eligibility for new Child Welfare (CW) cases
- \* Review existing Child Welfare cases under SSI/Zebley

#### PROGRAM SAVINGS/AVOIDANCE

- \* Conduct case reviews of long-term cases/out of county placements
- \* Review use of alternative placement options (i.e. Therapeutic FBH)
- \* Review Intake/placement decision-making process
- \* Examine and re-target as appropriate existing Preventive Service contracts/services

- \* Review children in Adoption status to determine critical milestones for achieving finalization
- \* Initiate more aggressive case review practices designed to promote discharge planning or more timely achievement of permanency goals
- \* Utilize Risk Assessment implementation to assess placement practices

#### ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

- \* Review claiming practices within Children Services with the goal of improving reimbursement under other Federal or State programs
- \* Conduct programmatic review of placement practices including DFY, group care, out of county care, etc.
- \* Assess need for the Homebuilders program and apply for Start-up funding if available
- \* Enlist the assistance and support of local Family Court Judges in speeding the adoption process
- \* Convene a local DSS task force designed to suggest and develop new methods to divert more costly placements, speed adoption processing, etc.

8. Question: What happens to any savings under the cap?

Answer: Savings under the cap are available for investment in initiatives which serve to promote foster care/adoption permanency outcomes or divert initial placements/replacements.

The state share savings can be used for 100 percent of the costs of a local initiative. The program initiatives must expand or supplement existing services. The statutory language establishing the cap as approved by the Legislature prohibits savings to be used for local fiscal relief.

The State Department of Social Services will issue guidelines for the use of cap savings in August 1992. Generally, local districts will be asked to submit a brief description of their initiative including an anticipated assessment of impact. The Department is looking to approve all preventive services, adoption and permanency initiatives which assist in achieving the legislative intent.

ATTACHMENT A

CHART OF LOCAL DISTRICT FOSTER CARE CAP ALLOCATIONS

<u>May 18, 1992</u>	Foster Care CAP <u>Allocation</u>
ALBANY	2,055,158
ALLEGANY	221,636
BROOME	2,395,130
CATTARAUGUS	696,336
CAYUGA	257,023
CHAUTAUQUA	892,939
CHEMUNG	632,571
CHENANGO	268,535
CLINTON	477,439
COLUMBIA	390,033
CORTLAND	507,154
DELAWARE	327,715
DUTCHESS	2,341,062
ERIE	5,810,631
ESSEX	140,600
FRANKLIN	142,767
FULTON	291,936
GENESEE	238,701
GREENE	311,733
HAMILTON	2,391
HERKIMER	208,985
JEFFERSON	407,129
LEWIS	196,568
LIVINGSTON	477,730
MADISON	413,880
MONROE	8,193,519
MONTGOMERY	193,705
NASSAU	5,371,950
NIAGARA	1,344,305
NEW YORK CITY	258,792,083
ONEIDA	2,090,703
ONONDAGA	4,502,063
ONTARIO	286,295
ORANGE	4,035,881
ORLEANS	168,525
OSWEGO	699,547
OTSEGO	540,226
PUTNAM	561,022
RENSSELAER	820,337
ROCKLAND	3,526,220
SARATOGA	385,587
SCHENECTADY	2,217,324
SCHOHARIE	255,756
SCHUYLER	75,787
SENECA	271,966
STEUBEN	383,624
ST. LAWRENCE	574,743
SUFFOLK	7,222,743
SULLIVAN	783,894
TIOGA	235,850
TOMPKINS	662,026
ULSTER	2,403,619
WARREN	237,649
WASHINGTON	353,920
WAYNE	102,180
WESTCHESTER	11,608,828
WYOMING	136,227
YATES	71,764
<u>Total:</u>	339,215,634

NEW YORK STATE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

40 NORTH PEARL STREET, ALBANY, NEW YORK 12243-0001

MARY JO BANE  
Commissioner



(518) 474-9475

LOCAL COMMISSIONERS MEMORANDUM

DSS-4037EL (Rev. 9/89)

Transmittal No: 92 LCM-111

Date: July 22, 1992

Division: Executive Services  
and Support

TO: Local District Commissioners

SUBJECT: Release of Additional Census Data

ATTACHMENTS: (1) Census Report No. 2 (on line), (2) State tables from STF 3 (not on line), (3) County tables from STF 3 (not on line), (4) Census Report No. 1 (not on line), (5) State tables from STF 1 (not on line), (6) County tables from STF 1 (not on line)

The Census Bureau has recently released more data for New York State from the 1990 census. This release contains some of the most relevant information for program planning at both the state and local levels, e.g., data on poverty, housing, the ability to speak English, immigration, and labor force experience.

This packet contains Census Report No.2, which presents an analysis of changes in New York State's poverty population between the 1980 and 1990 censuses. Appended to the report are 10 pages of tables with this new information: 5 for your county and 5 for New York State.

The Department will release a series of reports presenting census information. Report No.1, which is also attached for your convenience, contained state-level findings on basic demographic characteristics of the population and an overview of census terminology. The tables for your district from the first census release are appended to this report. You may want to retain these reports so that you will have a complete set of census information for your district. Future Census Reports will analyze data from the 1990 census on such topics as housing or labor force preparedness.

If you have any questions regarding these data, please call George Falco, Acting Director of the Office of Program Planning, Analysis and Development at (518) 473-7111 or Nancy Dunton at (518) 473-8548.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mark Lewis".

Mark Lewis  
Deputy Commissioner

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mary Jo Bane, Commissioner

Mark Lewis, Deputy Commissioner, Executive Services and Support

---

CENSUS REPORT NO. 2:

POVERTY IN NEW YORK STATE

1979 - 1989

Analysis of Data from the 1980 and 1990  
Censuses of Population and Housing:  
Summary Tape Files 3A.

---

Issued: July 1992

Office of Program Planning, Analysis and Development

## POVERTY IN NEW YORK STATE 1979-1989

Poverty data from the 1990 census were recently released for New York State on Summary Tape File 3 (STF3). This report presents some of the findings on poverty from that data set and compares them to comparable data from the 1980 census.

Poverty data from the 1990 census reflect 1989 economic conditions, not those in 1992. Nevertheless, these data provide an important benchmark for estimating trends in the geographic distribution and demographic characteristics of the poverty population. Moreover, they are the only data that will be available for small geographic areas (such as counties, cities, or neighborhoods) until data from the year 2000 census are released. Census data are the most reliable data source available for analyzing poverty among specific demographic groups (e.g. different age categories, racial and ethnic populations, or family compositions).

### HOW MUCH POVERTY?

In 1989, 2,277,296 (13.0%) New Yorkers lived in families that had incomes below the poverty line. According to the Department's administrative records, 9.7% of New York's population received some form of cash public assistance during 1989.

The 1990 census data show a modest reduction in the amount of poverty in New York State between 1979 and 1989 (poverty data always refer to income received during the previous year). In 1979, 2,298,922 New Yorkers (13.4%) were poor. This amounted to less than a 1% reduction in the number of people in poverty and a 3% reduction in the poverty rate. The decline in poverty reflected the effects of the economic boom during the second half of the 1980s.

Unfortunately, for the Department's planning needs, the data do not portray the effects of the recent, and continuing, recession. An analysis of another data set, the Current Population Survey, shows that between 1989 and 1990, the poverty rate in New York State increased by 1.7 percentage points -- more than four times the amount of the decline that occurred during the 1980s. In 1990, New York City's poverty rates were among the highest ever recorded there. Given the continuing rise in public assistance caseloads, it is reasonable to expect that when the 1991 data are released, they will show another increase in poverty for New York State.

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POOR

The decline in poverty between 1979 and 1989 occurred for many, but not all, demographic groups. Table 1 presents the change in the number of persons and families in poverty between 1979 and 1989. The number of poor may change because the size of the total population changed. To control, or account, for this, poverty rates are presented in Table 2. Poverty rates portray the different chances of being poor that are experienced by various population groups.



## Age

Most (53.2%) of the poor were working-age adults. While the number of working-age poor increased during the 1980s, the total population in this age range increased at an even faster pace. Thus, the percentage of working-age adults who were poor (i.e., their poverty rate) declined between 1979 and 1989.

The number of elderly who were poor increased by 12.7% between 1979 and 1989. This was the largest percentage increase among all of the age groups. In fact, the growth in the number of elderly poor exceeded the rate of increase in the total elderly population. As a result, **the poverty rate for the elderly increased during the 1980s.** This was the only age group to experience an increased risk of being in poverty.

The number of New York State children who were poor declined by more than 77,000 during the 1980s. **The child poverty rate fell,** as well. Nevertheless, children remained significantly more likely to be poor than people in other age groups. Children under the age of five continued to have higher poverty rates (20.6%) than children aged five through 17 (18.3%).

## Race/Ethnicity

**In 1989, approximately half of the poor population was white.** (Some of the whites were also Latino.<sup>1</sup>) Whites, however, had the lowest poverty rate (8.7%) and were the only racial group to experience a decline both in the number of poor and in the poverty rate during the 1980s.

Except for whites, the number of poor persons in each race/ethnicity category increased between 1979 and 1989. Some of these increases appear quite significant. This was due, at least in part, to the growth in the total population in each of these categories. In fact, total population figures show that the number of African Americans in New York State increased by 19% between 1980 and 1990; Native Americans, Eskimos, and Aleuts increased by 58%; and Asian and Pacific Islanders increased by 123%. The number of Latinos increased by 33%. These increases were not only due to births and immigration, but also to the propensity of persons to identify themselves on census questionnaires as belonging to a particular racial/ethnic category. On the other hand, the number of whites in the total population declined by 4% during the 1980s.

---

<sup>1</sup>The census form asks people to select a racial identification and to report whether or not they are of Hispanic origin (called Latino here). Thus, all individuals will have a racial and a Latino identifier. Poverty data currently available from the census do not allow the merging of these questions so that poverty rates can be reported for non-Latino whites, non-Latino African Americans, Latinos, and others. Thus, in Tables 1 and 2, poverty rates are presented for persons in four racial categories, and for persons who said they were of Latino origin.

The poverty rates for most racial/ethnic groups declined during the 1980s. The African American rate declined the most, by 3.3 percentage points. On the other hand, Asian and Pacific Islanders were the only group for which poverty rates increased during the 1980s (by 1.1 percentage points). However, this group still had the second lowest poverty rate (14.5%). The 1989 poverty rates for African Americans and Native Americans were approximately equal, with one out of four persons living in poverty. This was nearly three times the white poverty rate. Latinos had the highest poverty rate at 30.5%, three and one-half times the white rate.

#### Family Composition

In 1989, 10.0% of all New York State families (or 454,872 families) were living below the poverty line, down from 10.8% in 1979. **The number of families in poverty declined for all types of families between 1979 and 1989.**<sup>2</sup> The number of poor families with children declined by a larger percentage (7.0%) than the number of poor families without children (1.5%). The number of poor families maintained by a male declined by 12.7%, while the number of poor families maintained by a single female declined by just 0.6%.

In 1989, approximately 80% of all poor families contained children; 42% contained children under the age of five. Sixty percent of all poor families were maintained by single females, while 40% were maintained by males.

The risk of being in poverty, or poverty rates, also declined for all family types. However, **poverty rates declined about three times as fast for male householders (-35.5%) as for single female householders (-12.0%).**

In 1989, families with children were nearly four times more likely to be poor (15.8%) than families without children (4.2%). Families with children under the age of five were the most likely to be poor (19.2%). Families maintained by a single female were about six times more likely to be poor (30.1%) than families maintained by a male (5.1%). **The highest likelihood of poverty was found among families with young children maintained by a single female: 57.2% were poor.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Families can be categorized according to a number of dimensions. Tables 1 and 2 present information for families with and without children under the age of 18, and, for those with children, for families with children under the age of five. Poverty figures are also presented for families maintained by females without a spouse present and by males, regardless of whether there was a spouse present. Thus, according to this categorization, female householders with children are single mothers, while male householders with children may be either married or single.

## THE VERY POOR AND THE NEAR POOR

Some of the 2.3 million poor persons in New York State in 1989 were living in families with incomes far below the poverty threshold. While 13.0% of the state's population was below the poverty line, 6.3% (or 1.1 million persons) had incomes below 50% of the poverty line (see Table 2). This meant that their families had total annual incomes of less than \$4,718 for three-person families and of less than \$6,046 for four-person families.

Another 3.6% of the state's population (636,381 persons) had incomes between 100% and 124% of the poverty threshold. These families are in substantial jeopardy of falling below the poverty line due to a small disruption in income or the addition of another family member. Some of these families may be eligible for public assistance programs, due to income disregards.

In 1989, nearly 5 million persons, or one-quarter of the state's population, were living in families with incomes below 185% of the poverty threshold. Many of these families were potentially eligible for a variety of publicly-funded programs, including AFDC, school lunch, and WIC.

According to the 1990 census, 602,196 households in New York State reported having received some form of cash public assistance in 1989. On average, these households had \$4,469 in public assistance income. This amount had declined since 1979, when households with public assistance income received an average of \$5,052 (in 1989 dollars).

## GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY

The poverty population is distributed quite unevenly throughout the state. Tables 4 and 5 present the numbers and percentages of people in poverty for each county in the state for 1979 and 1989. Changes in the numbers of poor persons reflect changes in population size or composition, while changes in poverty rates signify changes in the relative risk of being poor.

In 1989, 61% of the state's poor population lived in New York City. Another 5% lived on Long Island and more than 15% lived in the counties containing the central cities of upstate's metropolitan areas, such as Erie and Monroe counties. Thus, **altogether, more than 80% of the state's poor lived in very urban settings.** Nevertheless, there were significant pockets of poverty in the state's rural areas.

Counties experiencing the greatest increase in the number of poor persons during the 1980s included: the Bronx (+18,766), Monroe (+11,736), and Erie (+9,949). Niagara county (+3,516), Broome county (3,459), Onondaga county (+3,402), and Tompkins county (+3,369) also had sizeable increases in poverty populations.

Several counties experienced substantial declines in poverty populations between 1979 and 1989. These counties included: Suffolk (-20,698), Kings (-15,943), and Nassau (-15,057). New York/Manhattan also experienced a large decrease in its poor population (-7,957).

As was the case in 1979, **the state's highest 1989 poverty rate was in the Bronx (28.7%)**. Four other counties had poverty rates at or near the 20% level: Kings/Brooklyn (22.7%), St. Lawrence (20.8%), New York/Manhattan (20.5%), and Tompkins (18.9%). Four of the next five poorest counties were along the Southern Tier: Allegany (14.8%), Cattaraugus (14.0%), Chautauqua (13.8%), and Steuben (13.5%). The remaining county among the top ten poorest counties was Otsego (13.9%).

On the other hand, **five of the ten least poor counties were in New York City's suburban ring:** Putnam (3.6%), Nassau (3.7%), Suffolk (4.7%), Rockland (6.4%), and Westchester (6.8%). The tenth-ranking least poor county was Richmond/Staten Island (7.8%). Two more counties in the least poor ten were in the Hudson Valley: Dutchess (5.4%) and Saratoga (5.9%). The last two of the ten counties with the lowest poverty rates were Genesee (7.3%) and Ontario (7.4%).

Of the state's 62 counties, 40 experienced declines in poverty rates during the 1980s, while 22 had increases. Counties with the biggest declines generally had quite moderate poverty rates in 1979. The five counties with the biggest declines in poverty rates were: Hamilton, Madison, Saratoga, Warren, and Washington. Four of these counties are contiguous. There were also notable declines in poverty in Cortland, Dutchess, Green, Nassau, and Ulster counties.

The biggest increases in poverty rates during the decade occurred along the western edge of the state (Chautauqua, Erie, and Niagara counties). There were also large increases in Monroe, Tompkins, and Broome counties, and in Seneca and St. Lawrence counties. **None of the major increases in poverty rates occurred in the Hudson Valley or New York City metropolitan areas.**

## DISCUSSION

While the state as a whole experienced a modest decline in poverty between 1979 and 1989, specific subpopulations and geographic areas showed the greatest improvements in poverty rates. These groups included young children and their families, families maintained by male householders, and African American persons. Geographically, some of the greatest reductions in poverty rates occurred in the Glens Falls and southern Hudson Valley areas.

Despite the overall trend toward improvement in the poverty situation, some subpopulations showed increases in the odds of being poor. These groups included the elderly and Asian and Pacific Islanders. Areas of the state showing increases in poverty rates were concentrated along the western edge of the state and the Southern Tier.

More recent analyses of New York State's poverty populations can be conducted using successive Current Population Surveys. Such analyses are underway and will be available shortly. Moreover, the Department is investigating the feasibility of generating annual estimates of poverty populations for counties, since the next information for those areas will not be available until after the turn of the century.

**TABLE 1**  
**SELECTED POVERTY POPULATIONS**  
**New York State**  
**1979 - 1989**

	1979	1989	Change	% Change
<b>All Persons</b>	<b>2,298,922</b>	<b>2,277,296</b>	<b>-21,626</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>
<u>Age</u>				
<5	252,287	251,862	-425	-0.2
5-17	624,641	547,669	-76,972	-12.3
<18	876,928	799,531	-77,397	-8.8
18-64	1,186,164	1,211,902	25,738	2.2
65+	235,830	265,863	30,033	12.7
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>				
White	1,284,523	1,136,871	147,652	-11.5
African American	662,779	685,113	22,334	3.4
Native American	10,542	13,404	2,862	27.1
Asian/Pac. Isl.	43,412	97,718	54,306	125.1
Latino	540,909	638,530	97,621	18.0
<b>Families</b>	<b>483,340</b>	<b>454,872</b>	<b>-28,468</b>	<b>-5.9%</b>
Without Children	96,161	94,710	-1,451	-1.5
With Children	387,179	360,162	-27,017	-7.0
With Children <5	189,909	189,066	-843	-0.4
<u>Male Householder</u>				
With Children	209,924	183,191	-26,733	-12.7
With Children <5	139,386	120,122	-19,264	-13.8
	n.a.	65,008		
<u>Female Householder</u>				
With Children	273,416	271,681	-1,735	-0.6
With Children <5	247,793	240,040	-7,753	-3.1
	n.a.	124,058		

Source: 1980 and 1990 Censuses of Population, Summary Tape Files 3A.

**TABLE 2**  
**SELECTED POVERTY RATES**  
**New York State**  
**1979 - 1989**

	1979	1989	Change	% Change
<b>Persons</b>	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>-0.4</b>	<b>-3.0%</b>
<u>Age</u>				
<5	22.6	20.6	-1.9	-8.4
5-17	17.9	18.3	0.4	2.2
<18	19.0	18.6	-0.4	-2.1
18-64	11.3	11.0	-0.3	-2.7
65+	11.6	11.9	0.3	2.6
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>				
White	9.4	8.7	-0.7	-7.4
African American	28.3	25.0	-3.3	-11.7
Native American	24.6	23.5	-1.1	-4.5
Asian/Pac. Isl.	13.4	14.5	1.1	8.2
Latino	33.1	30.5	-2.6	-7.6
<b>Families</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>-0.8</b>	<b>-7.4%</b>
Without Children	4.6	4.2	-0.4	-8.7
With Children	16.4	15.8	-0.6	-3.7
With Children <5	21.4	19.2	-2.2	-10.3
<u>Male Householder</u>				
With Children	7.9	5.1	-2.8	-35.5
With Children <5	7.6	7.0	-0.6	-7.9
With Children <5	n.a.	8.5		
<u>Female Householder</u>				
With Children	34.2	30.1	-4.1	-12.0
With Children <5	47.8	43.4	-4.4	-9.2
With Children <5	n.a.	57.2		

Source: 1980 and 1990 Censuses of Population, Summary Tape Files 3A.

TABLE 3

RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL  
New York State - Persons  
1989

Ratio	Number	Percent	Cummulative Percent
<.50	1,109,501	6.3%	6.3%
.50 - .74	558,722	3.2	9.5
.75 - .99	609,073	3.5	13.0
1.00 - 1.24	636,381	3.6	16.6
1.25 - 1.49	599,131	3.4	20.9
1.50 - 1.75	685,424	3.9	23.9
1.75 - 1.84	260,155	1.5	25.4
1.85 - 1.99	411,856	2.4	27.8
2.00+	12,611,519	72.1	99.9
Total	17,481,762	100.0	100.0

Source: 1990 Census of Population, Summary Tape File 3A.

**TABLE 4**  
**PERSONS IN POVERTY**  
**BY COUNTY**  
**New York State**  
**1979 - 1989**

<b>County</b>	<b>1979</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>% Change</b>
New York State	2,298,922	2,277,296	-21,626	-0.9%
New York City	1,391,181	1,384,994	-6,187	-0.4
Albany	27,972	27,031	-941	-3.4
Allegany	7,030	6,726	-304	-4.3
Bronx	315,371	334,137	18,766	6.0
Broome	18,071	21,530	3,459	19.1
Cattaraugus	11,156	11,394	238	2.1
Cayuga	8,645	7,932	-713	-8.2
Chautauqua	15,911	18,818	2,907	18.3
Chemung	10,354	10,247	-107	-1.0
Chenango	5,984	5,942	-42	-0.7
Clinton	9,743	10,294	551	5.7
Columbia	6,108	5,835	-273	-4.5
Cortland	6,651	5,810	-841	-12.6
Delaware	6,303	5,768	-535	-8.5
Dutchess	16,801	12,997	-3,804	-22.6
Erie	105,664	115,613	9,949	9.4
Essex	4,760	4,263	-497	-10.4
Franklin	7,224	7,354	130	1.8
Fulton	6,397	6,889	492	7.7
Genesee	5,346	4,300	-1,046	-19.6
Green	4,656	4,081	-575	-12.3
Hamilton	650	450	-200	-30.8
Herkimer	8,512	8,453	-59	-0.7
Jefferson	11,924	12,252	328	2.8
Kings	530,106	514,163	-15,943	-3.0
Lewis	3,256	3,495	239	7.3
Livingston	5,310	4,826	-484	-9.1
Madison	7,532	5,872	-1,660	-22.0
Monroe	59,998	71,734	11,736	19.6
Montgomery	5,545	5,990	445	8.0
Nassau	62,249	47,192	-15,057	-24.2
New York	305,575	297,617	-7,958	-2.6
Niagra	19,760	23,276	3,516	17.8
Oneida	26,714	28,203	1,489	5.6
Onondaga	43,060	46,462	3,402	7.9
Ontario	6,768	6,784	16	0.2
Orange	24,867	27,471	2,604	10.5
Orleans	3,707	3,821	114	3.1
Oswego	13,335	13,614	279	2.1
Otsego	8,228	7,758	-470	-5.7
Putnam	3,169	3,045	-124	-3.9
Queens	212,558	210,057	-2,501	-1.2



County	1979	1989	Change	% Change
Rensselaer	16,326	13,779	-2,547	-15.6
Richmond	28,371	29,020	649	2.3
Rockland	15,671	16,532	861	5.5
St. Lawrence	17,945	17,414	-531	-3.0
Saratoga	12,058	10,509	-1,549	-12.8
Schenectady	12,733	12,134	-599	-4.7
Schoharie	3,626	3,415	-211	-5.8
Schuyler	1,833	2,026	193	10.5
Seneca	2,694	3,383	689	25.6
Steuben	11,867	13,087	1,220	10.3
Suffolk	82,087	61,389	-20,698	-25.2
Sullivan	9,447	8,805	-642	-6.8
Tioga	4,296	4,823	527	12.3
Tompkins	12,846	15,688	3,369	26.2
Ulster	17,053	13,450	-3,603	-21.1
Warren	6,820	5,307	-1,513	-22.2
Washington	6,574	5,333	-1,241	-18.9
Wayne	7,281	7,273	-8	-0.1
Westchester	59,896	58,164	-1,732	-2.9
Wyoming	3,534	3,300	-234	-6.6
Yates	2,994	2,969	-25	-0.8

Source: 1989 and 1990 Censuses of Population, Summary Tape Files 3A.

**TABLE 5**  
**POVERTY RATES - PERSONS**  
**BY COUNTY**  
**New York State**  
**1979 - 1989**

County	1979	1989	Change	% Change
New York State	13.4%	13.0%	-0.4	-3.0%
New York City	20.0	19.3	-0.7	-3.5
Albany	10.2	9.7	-0.5	-4.9
Allegany	15.0	14.8	-0.2	-1.3
Bronx	27.6	28.7	1.1	4.0
Broome	8.8	10.5	1.7	19.3
Cattaraugus	13.5	14.0	0.5	3.7
Cayuga	11.3	10.2	-1.1	-9.7
Chautauqua	11.2	13.8	2.6	23.2
Chemung	11.0	11.4	0.4	3.6
Chenango	12.3	11.7	-0.6	-4.9
Clinton	13.3	13.2	-0.1	-0.1
Columbia	10.5	9.6	-0.9	-8.6
Cortland	14.7	12.7	-2.0	-13.6
Delaware	14.1	12.8	-1.3	-9.2
Dutchess	7.3	5.4	-1.9	-26.0
Erie	10.6	12.2	1.6	15.1
Essex	13.4	12.3	-1.1	-8.2
Franklin	16.7	17.1	0.4	2.4
Fulton	11.8	13.0	1.2	10.4
Genesee	9.1	7.3	-1.8	-19.8
Green	11.7	9.7	-2.0	-17.1
Hamilton	13.0	8.7	-4.3	-33.1
Herkimer	12.9	13.1	0.2	1.6
Jefferson	13.7	11.8	-1.9	-13.9
Kings	24.0	22.7	-1.3	-5.4
Lewis	13.2	13.3	0.1	0.1
Livingston	10.1	8.5	-1.6	-15.8
Madison	12.4	9.2	-3.2	-25.8
Monroe	8.8	10.4	1.6	18.2
Montgomery	10.5	11.8	1.3	12.4
Nassau	4.8	3.7	-1.1	-22.9
New York	21.8	20.5	-1.3	-6.0
Niagra	8.8	10.7	1.9	21.6
Oneida	11.0	11.9	0.9	8.2
Onondaga	9.6	10.3	0.7	9.1
Ontario	7.9	7.4	-0.5	-6.3
Orange	10.0	9.3	-0.7	-7.0
Orleans	9.8	9.7	-0.1	-1.0
Oswego	12.3	11.7	-0.6	-4.9
Otsego	15.3	13.9	-1.4	-9.2
Putnam	4.1	3.6	-0.5	-12.2
Queens	11.4	10.9	-0.5	-4.4

County	1979	1989	Change	% Change
Rensselaer	11.2	9.3	-1.9	-17.0
Richmond	8.2	7.8	-0.4	-4.9
Rockland	6.2	6.4	0.2	3.2
St. Lawrence	17.2	20.8	3.6	20.9
Saratoga	8.0	5.9	-2.1	-26.3
Schenectady	8.7	8.3	-0.4	-4.6
Schoharie	13.3	11.5	-1.8	-13.5
Schuyler	10.6	11.2	0.6	5.7
Seneca	8.5	10.4	1.9	22.4
Steuben	12.2	13.5	1.3	10.7
Suffolk	6.6	4.7	-1.9	-25.8
Sullivan	15.1	13.4	-1.7	-11.3
Tioga	8.7	9.3	0.6	6.9
Tompkins	17.0	18.9	1.9	11.2
Ulster	11.2	8.6	-3.2	-28.6
Warren	12.7	9.6	-2.9	-23.2
Washington	12.5	9.6	-2.9	-23.6
Wayne	8.8	8.3	-0.5	-5.7
Westchester	7.1	6.8	-0.3	-4.2
Wyoming	9.4	8.5	-0.9	-9.6
Yates	14.4	13.4	-1.0	-6.9

Source: 1989 and 1990 Censuses of Population, Summary Tape Files 3A.

AREANAME: NEW YORK

BG:

P1/2/3/6 PERSONS		P44 RESIDENCE IN 1985 -- MSA/PMSA LEVEL		P43 RESIDENCE IN 1985 -- STATE & COUNTY LEVEL			
TOTAL	17990455	LIVING IN AN MSA/PMSA IN 1990		SAME HOUSE IN 1985			10385913
UNWEIGHTED SAMPLE	2564485	SAME HOUSE IN 1985	9539550	DIFFERENT HOUSE IN U.S. IN 1985			
100% COUNT	17990455	DIFFERENT HOUSE IN U.S. IN 1985		SAME COUNTY			3557118
URBAN	15164245	THIS MSA/PMSA IN 1985		DIFFERENT COUNTY, SAME STATE			1458672
INSIDE URBANIZED AREAS	14116527	CENTRAL CITY	2324339	DIFFERENT STATE			
OUTSIDE URBANIZED AREAS	1047718	REMAINDER OF THIS MSA/PMSA	1564488	NORTHEAST			275407
RURAL	2826210	DIFFERENT MSA/PMSA IN 1985		MIDWEST			98505
RURAL FARM	82256	CENTRAL CITY	514000	SOUTH			235642
RURAL NONFARM	2743954	REMAINDER OF DIFFERENT MSA/PMSA	544393	WEST			118067
		NOT IN AN MSA/PMSA IN 1985	170576	ABROAD IN 1985			
P8 RACE		ABROAD IN 1985	594884	PUERTO RICO			41794
WHITE	13398003	NOT LIVING IN AN MSA/PMSA IN 1990		U.S. OUTFLYING AREA			9546
BLACK	2860590	SAME HOUSE IN 1985	846363	FOREIGN COUNTRY			562384
AMER IND, ESK OR ALEUT	59081	DIFFERENT HOUSE IN U.S. IN 1985		P36 YEAR OF ENTRY INTO U.S. (FOREIGN BORN)			
ASIAN OR PAC ISL	689262	IN AN MSA/PMSA IN 1985		1987 TO 1990	421568	1970 TO 1974	327143
OTHER RACES	983519	CENTRAL CITY	83499	1985 OR 1986	248170	1965 TO 1969	270919
		REMAINDER OF MSA/PMSA	144018	1982 TO 1984	279312	1960 TO 1964	175010
P10 HISPANIC ORIGIN	2151743	NOT IN AN MSA/PMSA IN 1985	398098	1980 OR 1981	240815	1950 TO 1959	234845
		ABROAD IN 1985	18840	1975 TO 1979	322572	BEFORE 1950	331507
P4 FAMILIES	4528888						
P5 HOUSEHOLDS	6634434	P28 LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH		P44 PLACE OF BIRTH		P54 SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND TYPE OF SCHOOL (UNIVERSE: PERSONS 3+)	
		SPEAK ONLY ENGLISH	12834328	NATIVE			
P22 FAMILY TYPE AND PRESENCE OF CHILDREN OVER 18 YEARS		SPEAK SPANISH		BORN IN STATE			
		SPEAK ENGLISH "VERY WELL"	947919	OF RESIDENCE	12147209	ENROLLED IN PREPRIMARY SCHOOL	
FAMILIES		SPEAK ENGLISH "WELL"	429009	BORN IN OTHER STATE IN THE US		PUBLIC SCHOOL	182647
MARRIED-COUPLE FAMILY WITH CHILDREN OVER 18	781236	SPEAK ENGLISH "NOT WELL" OR "NOT AT ALL"	471897	NORTHEAST	957156	PRIVATE SCHOOL	138531
NO CHILDREN OVER 18	2610615	SPEAK ASIAN OR PAC ISL LANG		MIDWEST	371590	ENROLLED IN ELEMENTARY OR HIGH SCHOOL	
		SPEAK ENGLISH "VERY WELL"	181856	SOUTH	874159	PUBLIC SCHOOL	2467954
OTHER FAMILY		SPEAK ENGLISH "WELL"	130264	WEST	166152	PRIVATE SCHOOL	427887
MALE HOUSE HOLDER, NO SPOUSE		SPEAK ENGLISH "NOT WELL" OR "NOT AT ALL"	147753	BORN OUTSIDE THE US			
WITH CHILDREN OVER 18	74574	SPEAK OTHER LANGUAGE		PUERTO RICO	437880	ENROLLED IN COLLEGE	
NO CHILDREN OVER 18	158973	SPEAK ENGLISH "VERY WELL"	1013419	OUTLYING AREA	47337	PUBLIC SCHOOL	887648
		SPEAK ENGLISH "WELL"	377934	BORN ABROAD OF AMER PARENT(S)	137111	PRIVATE SCHOOL	551551
FEMALE HOUSE HOLDER, NO SPOUSE		SPEAK ENGLISH "NOT WELL" OR "NOT AT ALL"	208669	FOREIGN BORN	2851861	NOT ENROLLED	12580012
WITH CHILDREN OVER 18	394839						
NO CHILDREN OVER 18	508651						
P57/58/59/60 EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN							
	PERSONS 18+			PERSONS 25+			
	TOTAL	TOTAL	WHITE	AMER IND, ESK-ALEUT	ASIAN & PAC ISL	OTHER	HISPANIC ORIGIN
ELEMENTARY (0 TO 8 YEARS)	1253564	1200827	778242	4790	71882	148589	313968
HIGH SCHOOL (1 TO 4 YEARS), NO DIPLOMA	2137921	1776777	1188067	7263	49300	134779	289309
HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA	4039081	3485686	2803690	9588	77195	117243	285552
SOME COLLEGE, NO DEGREE	2460875	1851182	1437368	6400	45101	63391	161596
ASSOCIATE DEGREE	898068	770268	620777	1956	25537	21943	53348
BACHELORS DEGREE	1758212	1561719	1302724	2841	98288	22147	68196
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE	1186433	1172110	1011010	1788	71774	11362	44686



AREANAME: NEW YORK

COUNTY:

MCD:

PLACE:

TRACT/BNA:

BG:

P70/71/72 LABOR FORCE STATUS BY SEX AND RACE/HISPANIC ORIGIN  
 (UNIVERSE: PERSONS 16 YEARS AND OLDER)

	TOTAL	WHITE	BLACK	AMER IND/ ESK/ALEUT	ASIAN/ PAC ISL	OTHER	HISPANIC ORIGIN
MALE							
LABOR FORCE	4852302	3784434	618273	14449	205964	229182	531936
IN ARMED FORCES	35428	27118	6002	176	673	1459	3096
CIVILIAN	4816874	3757316	612271	14273	205291	227723	528840
EMPLOYED	4470053	3541461	524011	12385	193479	198717	467437
UNEMPLOYED	346821	215855	88260	1888	11812	29006	61403
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	1814297	1331246	320804	6333	62495	93419	204086
FEMALE							
LABOR FORCE	4177244	3131447	700879	13460	160901	170557	409784
IN ARMED FORCES	4497	2692	1590	27	43	145	337
CIVILIAN	4172747	3128755	699289	13433	160858	170412	409447
EMPLOYED	3900665	2969139	623473	11975	151019	165059	355354
UNEMPLOYED	272082	159616	75816	1458	5739	25353	53593
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	3347201	2557487	473670	9828	109903	196313	411986

P78 OCCUPATION  
 (UNIVERSE: EMPLOYED PERSONS 16+)

MANAGERIAL & PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY OCCUPATIONS EXEC, ADMIN, & MANAGERIAL	1112178
PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY TECHNICAL, SALES, & ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	1396763
TECHNICIANS & REL SUPP	292837
SALES ADMIN SUPP, INC CLERICAL	937227
1543860	
SERVICE OCCUPATIONS PRIVATE HOUSEHOLD	43384
PROTECTIVE SERVICE	209035
SERVICE, EXC PROT. AND HOUSEHOLD	950196
FARMING, FORESTRY, & FISHING	93536
PREC PROD, CRAFT, & REPAIR	788806

P79 CLASS OF WORKER  
 (UNIVERSE: EMPLOYED PERSONS 16+)

WAGE AND SALARY	GOVERNMENT
PRIVATE FOR PROFIT	LOCAL
PRIVATE NOT FOR PROFIT	STATE
	FEDERAL
SELF-EMPLOYED	UNPAID FAMILY

P74 LABOR FORCE STATUS OF PARENTS  
 (UNIVERSE: OWN CHILDREN UNDER 18)

LIVING WITH TWO PARENTS BOTH IN LABOR FORCE	1655971
ONE IN LABOR FORCE	1156728
LIVING WITH ONE PARENT IN LABOR FORCE	711623
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	461367

OPERATORS, FABRICATORS, AND LABORERS MACHINE OPER, ASSEMBLERS, & INSPECTORS	428873
TRANS & MATERIAL MOVING HANDLERS, EQUIP CLEANERS, HELPERS, & LABORERS	308361
265662	

[REDACTED]

P73 PRESENCE AND AGE OF CHILDREN AND  
 EMPLOYMENT STATUS  
 (UNIVERSE: FEMALES 16 YEARS AND OVER)

WITH OWN CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS UNDER 6 YEARS ONLY IN LABOR FORCE	
EMPLOYED OR IN ARMED FORCES	295880
UNEMPLOYED	31119
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	270360
6 TO 17 YEARS ONLY IN LABOR FORCE	
EMPLOYED OR IN ARMED FORCES	750264
UNEMPLOYED	45039
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	310866
UNDER 6 YEARS AND 6 TO 17 YEARS IN LABOR FORCE	
EMPLOYED OR IN ARMED FORCES	202146
UNEMPLOYED	19772
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	226085
NO OWN CHILDREN UNDER 18 YEARS IN LABOR FORCE	
EMPLOYED OR IN ARMED FORCES	2656872
UNEMPLOYED	176152
NOT IN LABOR FORCE	2539890

P77 INDUSTRY  
 (UNIVERSE: EMPLOYED PERSONS 16+)

AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY, & FISHERIES	97604
MINING	7946
CONSTRUCTION	431962
MANUFACTURING	
NONDURABLE GOODS	524080
DURABLE GOODS	703090
TRANSPORTATION	432904
COMMUNICATIONS & OTHER	
PUBLIC UTILITIES	227729
WHOLESALE TRADE	348846
RETAIL TRADE	1250746
FINANCE, INSURANCE, & REAL ESTATE	777401
SERVICES	
BUSINESS & REPAIR	434993
PERSONAL	249148
ENTERTAINMENT & RECREATION	128814
PROFESSIONAL & RELATED	
HEALTH	847035
EDUCATIONAL	799457
OTHER PROF & REL	684827
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	424136







NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mary Jo Bane, Commissioner

Mark Lewis, Deputy Commissioner, Executive Services and Support

---

CENSUS REPORT NO. 1:

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF NEW YORK STATE  
1980 - 1990  
and  
CENSUS OVERVIEW

Analysis of Data from the 1980 and 1990  
Censuses of Population and Housing:  
Summary Tape Files 1A.

---

Issued: February 1992  
Office of Program Planning, Analysis and Development

## SELECTED 1990 CENSUS DATA

Data from the 1990 decennial census will be vital to the administration and planning of social services programs in New York State. Indeed, the census is the only source of local-level data for several critical indicators of social well-being, such as the number of persons in poverty.

This packet of information contains some of the first data available from the 1990 census for your county. Four tables are enclosed, along with a summary of state-level findings. Additionally, the packet includes some background information on the census and a schedule for future releases of census data.

The attached tables were produced by the department and by the New York State Data Center in the Department of Economic Development. In addition to the data for your county, information for the state as a whole is included. The first two tables provide information on demographic characteristics and family composition for both 1980 and 1990. For your convenience, the amount of change over the decade has been calculated for your county, for the state, and for several other comparison areas. The third table contains more detailed 1990 data for your county. The same information is presented in the fourth table for the state as a whole.

### FINDINGS FROM THE 100% DATA

- o New York State's population grew slowly (2.5%) during the 1980s. New York City grew faster (3.5%) than the rest of the state (1.7%). Very rural areas, however, had the fastest rate of population growth (5.3%).
- o While 52% of the state's population was female, the male population increased faster (3.4%) than the female population (1.6%).
- o During the 1980s, the state's non-Hispanic white population declined (-5.7%), while the black (11.8%), Hispanic (33.3%), and other races (93.1%) populations grew substantially. Nevertheless, the state's population remains predominantly white (69%).
- o Although the number of households in New York State grew by 4.7%, the number of families remained essentially stable.
- o The growth in households was concentrated in nonfamily households (13.3%), those units containing a single individual or two or more individuals who were not related by blood, marriage, or adoption. The number of families grew at a faster rate in rural areas than in urban areas.
- o Half of all family households contained children. Most (70%) of the families with children were married couple families. One quarter were families maintained by single mothers and 5% were families maintained by single fathers. Nevertheless, the number of single father households nearly doubled over the course of the decade while the number of married couple families with children actually declined.

- o The number of families maintained by single mothers continued to grow during the 1980s, but the rate of increase slowed substantially from the rapid pace set during the 1970s. Between 1980 and 1990, these families increased by just 16.6%, compared with a growth rate of 71% during the 1970s.
- o The average family size in New York State was 3.22 persons. When all households, including nonfamily households, were considered, the average household size was 2.63 persons.
- o In 1990, the median, or "average," value of an owner-occupied housing unit in New York State was \$131,600. The median contract rent (excluding any additional cost for utilities and fuels) was \$428 per month.
- o According to the 1990 census, there were 7,226,891 housing units in New York State. Nearly half (48%) of these housing units were owner-occupied and 44% were renter occupied. Eight percent of all units were vacant.
- o Over half a million New Yorkers were living in group quarters in 1990. The two most common group quarters settings were college dormitories and nursing homes.
- o Over 43,000 persons were counted as being homeless. The census count of the homeless includes only those individuals found in shelters or visible on the street during the night of March 20, 1990.

## OVERVIEW OF THE CENSUS

Every 10 years the Census Bureau enumerates all of the people and housing units in the United States. The information gathered by the census provides a snapshot of the population, including its socioeconomic and housing characteristics. Census data are used in planning, distributing funds, and making programmatic decisions.

Census forms are mailed to most households in the U.S. for individuals to complete and mail back. Thus, the census is a do-it-yourself count. A core set of questions are asked of all households -- called the 100% data. Approximately 17% of all households receive an additional set of questions -- the sample data.

The Census Bureau goes to great lengths to assure the confidentiality of the reports that it receives. In no instance will information be released that could identify specific individuals.

## CENSUS GEOGRAPHY

Tabulations are prepared for a variety of geographic units. Much of the 100% data will be available for areas as small as blocks. Sample data are not reliable for blocks, so tabulations from those data are presented for block groups, census tracts, and larger geographic units. The geographic units for which data are potentially available include:

*United States*

*States, including Puerto Rico*

*Counties*

*Minor Civil Divisions (MCDs).* Legal subdivisions of counties, called towns or townships in many states.

*Incorporated places (cities, villages, etc.)*

*American Indian reservations*

*Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs).* One or more counties which include a large population nucleus and nearby communities that have a high degree of interaction.

*Urbanized Areas (UAs).* A central city and surrounding urban fringe that together have a population of 50,000 or more with a population density exceeding 1,000 people/square mile.

*Urban/Rural.* Urban includes all persons living in urbanized areas and places of more than 2,500, while rural includes all others.

*Census Tracts.* Small locally defined statistical areas in metropolitan areas, generally with a population of 4,000.

*Block Numbering Areas (BNAs).* Groups of blocks in areas without census tracts.

*Block groups.* Groupings of blocks within census tracts and BNAs.

*Blocks*

## DATA CONTENT

The data items that were collected are presented in Table 1. The questions were similar to those asked in 1980, both because they continue to provide important information about the population and because it is desirable to be able to assess change over the decade.

---

**Table 1**  
**CENSUS CONTENT**

---

### 100-PERCENT COMPONENT

#### **Population**

Household Relationship  
Sex  
Race  
Age  
Marital status  
Hispanic origin

#### **Housing**

Number of Units in Structure  
Number of rooms in unit  
Tenure--owned or rented  
Value of home or monthly rent  
Congregate housing  
Vacancy characteristics

### SAMPLE COMPONENT

#### **Population**

*Social Characteristics:*  
Education -- enrollment and attainment  
Place of birth, citizenship  
Ancestry, Year of entry to U.S.  
Language spoken at home  
Migration (residence in 1985)  
Disability, work and transportation  
  
Fertility  
Veteran status

#### **Housing**

Year moved into residence  
Number of bedrooms  
Plumbing and kitchen facilities  
Telephone in unit  
Vehicles available  
Heating fuel  
Source of water, method of  
    sewage disposal  
Year structure built  
Condominium status  
Farm residence  
Shelter costs, including utilities

#### *Economic Characteristics:*

Labor force  
Occupation, industry, and class of worker  
Place of work and journey to work  
Work experience in 1989  
Income in 1989  
Poverty status in 1989  
Year last worked

## 1990 CENSUS RELEASE SCHEDULE

Census data are released on a variety of media: printed reports, computer tapes, microfiche, on-line data systems, laser (compact) discs, and flexible diskettes for microcomputers. In general, 100% data are released before sample data and computer tapes are released several months before printed reports. Computer tapes are also released three to four weeks before laser discs (CD-ROMs) are released.

Most data products contain predefined sets of tables for fixed geographic areas. Only the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) tape differs from this format.

### Tape Products

The first data released from the 1990 census were 100% population counts by age and race and Hispanic origin and housing counts, used in Congressional reapportionment and in local legislative redistricting. This tape file (P.L. 94-171) was released in February 1991.

The next data to be released were the 100% items (age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, marital status, household relationships, value of home or monthly rent paid, and number of rooms in unit). This tape, Summary Tape File 1 (STF 1) will be released in four files, differing in terms of geographic coverage. To date, STF 1A, containing information for states and subsetting geographic units down to the block group level, and STF 1B, including data for blocks, have been released for New York State.

STF 2 contains 100% information on the same topics covered by STF 1, but the tabulations contain greater detail. In particular, all tabulations are shown for the total population and for specific racial and Hispanic origin portions of the population. STF 2 has also been released.

STF 3 will provide the first release of the sample, or long-form questionnaire, information (education, ancestry, language, disability, occupation, income and poverty, year moved into residence, number of bedrooms, etc.). STF 3 will also be released in a series of files covering different geographies. STF 3A will contain data for States and subsetting geographies down to the block group level. It is scheduled for release this March.

STF 4 will contain sample population and housing data in more detail than in STF 3, with tables for racial, Hispanic origin, and possibly selected ancestry population groups. STF 4A, scheduled for release in late 1992, will provide data for census tracts (or block numbering areas) in Metropolitan Statistical Areas and for counties and places in the remainder of the state. STF 4B, also due for release in late 1992, will provide data for the State, urban and rural areas, counties, and Minor Civil Divisions of 2,500 or more inhabitants.

The PUMS file, to be released in 1993, contains a sample of individuals with all of their demographic, economic, social, and housing characteristics. Individual records on the PUMS are identified by number; all names and addresses have been deleted. This tape is used primarily by researchers to answer detailed questions. The smallest unit of geography on the PUMS is the county group, or smaller area, containing at least 100,000 individuals.

### Printed Reports

Three series of printed reports will be issued from the 1990 census. These series will be titled 1990 Census of Population and Housing, 1990 Census of Population, and 1990 Census of Housing. Drawn from the data on the census tapes, each of these series will have reports containing 100% data and reports containing sample data. Altogether, these three series will include 30 individual reports. In addition, 40 subject reports on specific population and housing topics will be prepared.

To date, one printed report has been released for New York State: Summary Population and Housing Characteristics. This report contains some of the 100% data found on STF 1A for the state, counties, minor civil divisions, and places. It can be obtained through the Government Printing Office.

### Access

The department will provide relevant information from the 1990 census to you, as it becomes available.

## CHANGE IN COUNTY POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS: 1980 AND 1990

\*\*\* NEW YORK STATE \*\*\*

	COUNTY			COMPARISON AREAS					
	1980	1990	% CHANGE	NY STATE % CHANGE	NY CITY % CHANGE	ROS % CHANGE	ROS URBAN % CHANGE	RURAL % CHANGE	VERY RURAL % CHANGE
TOTAL PERSONS	17,558,072	17,990,455	2.5	2.5	3.5	1.7	.6	4.4	5.3
SEX: MALES	8,338,747	8,625,673	3.4	3.4	5.0	2.4	1.1	5.5	6.3
FEMALES	9,219,325	9,364,782	1.6	1.6	2.3	1.1	.1	3.3	4.3
RACE: WHITE	13,211,516	12,460,189	-5.7	-5.7	-14.6	-2.2	-4.3	2.3	3.7
BLACK	2,298,672	2,569,126	11.8	11.8	9.0	19.5	16.7	49.2	38.0
HISPANIC	1,660,901	2,214,026	33.3	33.3	26.8	69.2	67.2	82.9	89.9
OTHER	386,983	747,114	93.1	93.1	97.7	82.7	90.3	54.4	32.1
AGE: UNDER 1	238,031	216,075	-9.2	-9.2	-15.1	-4.9	-2.8	-9.3	-8.6
1 TO 2	447,733	541,479	20.9	20.9	21.8	20.4	23.0	14.6	14.3
3 TO 5	662,025	743,139	12.3	12.3	10.9	13.1	11.7	16.4	19.0
6 TO 9	959,795	933,077	-2.8	-2.8	.6	-4.8	-7.2	.6	3.2
10 TO 13	1,106,837	919,928	-16.9	-16.9	-8.7	-21.5	-24.5	-14.2	-10.4
14 TO 17	1,274,424	905,851	-28.9	-28.9	-21.8	-32.9	-34.8	-28.4	-27.5
18 TO 21	1,253,675	1,118,755	-10.8	-10.8	-7.0	-12.9	-14.9	-8.7	-11.7
22 TO 29	2,316,869	1,290,819	-44.3	-44.3	-45.9	-43.1	-43.5	-41.9	-41.0
30 TO 44	3,412,284	4,298,256	26.0	26.0	26.4	25.6	23.2	31.9	31.8
45 TO 59	2,885,516	2,725,777	-5.5	-5.5	-4.5	-6.2	-8.5	-.2	4.1
60 TO 64	845,362	825,110	-2.4	-2.4	7.1	1.0	2.7	-3.3	-3.5
65 TO 74	1,293,032	1,348,279	4.3	4.3	-6.7	12.9	15.5	7.2	7.3
75 TO 84	672,046	767,270	14.2	14.2	5.6	21.1	21.8	19.7	21.0
85 & OLDER	190,443	248,173	30.3	30.3	36.0	26.6	28.9	21.8	16.6

THE COMPARISON COLUMN HEADINGS ARE DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

NY STATE -- NY CITY AND THE 57 REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES  
 NY CITY -- THE 5 COUNTIES/BOROUGHES OF NY CITY (BRONX, KINGS, NY CITY, QUEENS, & RICHMOND)  
 ROS -- 57 REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES OUTSIDE OF NY CITY  
 ROS URBAN -- REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A TOTAL 1990 POPULATION EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 200,000  
 RURAL -- REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A 1990 POPULATION BELOW 200,000  
 VERY RURAL -- RURAL ROS COUNTIES IN WHICH AT LEAST 70% OF THE 1980 POPULATION RESIDED IN RURAL CENSUS TRACTS



FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS: 1980 AND 1990

\*\*\* NEW YORK STATE \*\*\*

	COUNTY			COMPARISON AREAS					
	1980	1990	% CHANGE	NY STATE % CHANGE	NY CITY % CHANGE	ROS % CHANGE	ROS URBAN % CHANGE	RURAL % CHANGE	VERY RURAL % CHANGE
TOTAL FAMILIES	4,468,031	4,489,312	.5	.5	-2.0	2.1	.8	5.2	6.5
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	6,345,951	6,639,322	4.6	4.6	1.0	7.5	6.4	10.2	10.9
HOUSEHOLD TYPE:									
MARRIED-COUPLE HH									
WITH CHILDREN	1,731,768	1,563,272	-9.7	-9.7	-8.6	-10.3	-12.0	-6.2	-5.4
NO CHILDREN	1,764,848	1,752,573	-.7	-.7	-12.2	6.4	5.5	8.8	10.0
MALE-HEADED HH									
WITH CHILDREN	56,405	108,382	92.1	92.1	109.5	78.7	72.7	88.8	93.0
NO CHILDREN	115,225	145,819	26.6	26.6	26.8	26.3	30.4	15.9	15.6
FEMALE-HEADED HH									
WITH CHILDREN	473,089	561,613	18.7	18.7	14.7	24.5	19.5	38.0	43.1
NO CHILDREN	115,225	357,653	9.5	9.5	5.3	14.5	17.2	6.4	8.8
NON-FAMILY HH	1,877,920	2,150,010	14.5	14.5	6.2	24.4	24.4	24.6	24.3

THE COMPARISON COLUMN HEADINGS ARE DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:

- NY STATE -- NY CITY AND THE 57 REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES
- NY CITY -- THE 5 COUNTIES/BOROUGHES OF NY CITY (BRONX, KINGS, NY CITY, QUEENS, & RICHMOND)
- ROS -- 57 REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES OUTSIDE OF NY CITY
- ROS URBAN -- REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A TOTAL 1990 POPULATION EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN 200,000
- RURAL -- REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A 1990 POPULATION BELOW 200,000
- VERY RURAL -- RURAL ROS COUNTIES IN WHICH AT LEAST 70% OF THE 1980 POPULATION RESIDED IN RURAL CENSUS TRACTS

1990 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING -- SUMMARY TAPE FILE 1 -- SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS  
 PREPARED BY THE NEW YORK STATE DATA CENTER, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT -- FOR MORE INFORMATION CALL (518) 474 6005  
 AREA NAME: NEW YORK COUNTY: MCD: PLACE: TRACT/BHA: BG/BLOCK:

P1/4 PERSONS BY URBAN/RURAL RESIDENCE		P5/11/12 PERSONS BY AGE AND SEX			H23/A/B/C VALUE OF SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED UNITS		H1/3/5 TENURE AND VACANCY STATUS		
		TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE					
TOTAL	17990455	UNDER 1	216075	110680	105395	LESS THAN \$15,000	15321	OWNER OCCUPIED	346443
URBANIZED AREA	0	1 AND 2	541479	277774	263705	\$15,000 TO 19,999	12636	RENTER OCCUPIED	317488
OTHER URBAN	0	3 AND 4	498210	254294	243916	\$20,000 TO 24,999	19862		
RURAL	0	5	244929	125160	119769	\$25,000 TO 29,999	25462	VACANT:	
NOT SPECIFIED	17990455	6	234934	120387	114547	\$30,000 TO 34,999	34891	FOR RENT	16373
		7 TO 9	698143	357539	340604	\$35,000 TO 39,999	38851	FOR SALE ONLY	6818
P2 FAMILIES	4489312	10 TO 14	1140177	582620	557557	\$40,000 TO 44,999	48628	RENTED OR SOLD,	
P3 HOUSEHOLDS	6639322	15 TO 17	685602	351103	334499	\$45,000 TO 49,999	48166	NOT OCCUPIED	4496
		18 AND 19	544525	275658	268867	\$50,000 TO 59,999	113789	OCCASIONAL USE	21262
P7 RACE		20	294541	149510	145031	\$60,000 TO 74,999	222783	FOR MIGRANT WORKERS	81
WHITE	13385255	21	279689	140761	138928	\$75,000 TO 99,999	337805	OTHER VACANT	9726
BLACK	2859055	22 TO 24	834669	415458	419211	\$100,000 TO 124,999	219708		
AMER. INDIAN	60855	25 TO 29	1564617	774559	790058	\$125,000 TO 149,999	211921	TOTAL	722689
ESKIMO	754	30 TO 34	1573571	775543	798028	\$150,000 TO 174,999	232183		
ALEUT	1042	35 TO 39	1426461	698556	727905	\$175,000 TO 199,999	206809	H41 UNITS IN STRUCTURE	
CHINESE	284144	40 TO 44	1298224	625529	672695	\$200,000 TO 249,999	247833	1, DETACHED	2929333
FILIPINO	62259	45 TO 49	1042317	496475	545842	\$250,000 TO 299,999	133164	1, ATTACHED	301794
JAPANESE	35281	50 TO 54	871603	413813	457790	\$300,000 TO 399,999	111905	2	812325
ASIAN INDIAN	140985	55 TO 59	811857	382319	429538	\$400,000 TO 499,999	43911	3 OR 4	507748
KOREAN	95648	60 AND 61	335402	155359	180043	\$500,000 OR MORE	61978	5 TO 9	374858
VIETNAMESE	15555	62 TO 64	489708	224151	265557	LOWER QUARTILE	\$76,200	10 TO 19	329884
CAMBODIAN	3646	65 TO 69	755342	331502	423840	MEDIAN	\$131,600	20 TO 49	603981
HMONG	165	70 TO 74	592937	244199	348738	UPPER QUARTILE	\$200,400	50 OR MORE	1064209
LAOTIAN	3253	75 TO 79	461880	174121	287750			MOBILE HOME	
THAI	6230	80 TO 84	305390	101650	203740			OR TRAILER	194934
OTHER ASIAN	42137	85+	248173	66953	181220	H32/A/B/C CONTRACT RENT --		OTHER	107825
HAWAIIAN	1496					SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED			
SAMOAN	586	TOTAL	17990455	8625673	9364782	HOUSING UNITS			
TONGAN	30								
OTHER POLYNESIAN	62	P16 HOUSEHOLD TYPE							
GUAMANIAN	1803					LESS THAN \$100	54979	P28 GROUP QUARTERS POPULATION	
OTHER MICRONESIAN	72	NO RELATED CHILDREN				\$100 TO 149	144682	INSTITUTIONAL:	
MELANESIAN	65	FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS				\$150 TO 199	142255	CORRECTIONAL	
OTHER PACIFIC ISL	343	MARRIED COUPLE	1752573		1563272	\$200 TO 249	187212	INSTITUTIONS	9002
OTHER RACE	989734	MALE HOUSEHOLDER, NO WIFE PRESENT	145819		108382	\$250 TO 299	224236	NURSING HOMES	12617
P9 HISPANIC ORIGIN		FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER, NO HUSBAND PRESENT	357653		561613	\$300 TO 349	289205	PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS	2005
MEXICAN	93244					\$350 TO 399	314763	JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS	6981
PUERTO RICAN	1086601	NON FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS				\$400 TO 449	306551	OTHER INSTITUTIONS	23906
CUBAN	74345	MALE HOUSEHOLDER	906943			\$450 TO 499	252455	OTHER GROUP QUARTERS:	
OTHER HISPANIC	959836	FEMALE HOUSEHOLDER	1243067			\$500 TO 549	239232	COLLEGE DORMITORIES	16592
						\$550 TO 599	150575	MILITARY QUARTERS	1287
P8/10 HISPANIC ORIGIN BY RACE						\$600 TO 649	162129	EMERGENCY SHELTERS FOR HOMELESS	3247
NONHISPANIC						\$650 TO 699	111452	VISIBLE IN STREET LOCATIONS	1073
WHITE	12460189	HISPANIC	925066			\$700 TO 749	101268	OTHER NONINSTITUTIONAL	5613
BLACK	2569126		289929			\$750 TO 999	223110	TOTAL	54526
NATIVE AMERICAN	50540	P17A PERSONS PER FAMILY	3.22			\$1,000 OR MORE	155807		
ASIAN/PAC ISL	666843					NO CASH RENT	85496		
OTHER RACE	29731								
		H17A/18A PERSONS PER UNIT							
						LOWER QUARTILE	\$302		
						MEDIAN	\$428		
						UPPER QUARTILE	\$596		
		ALL OCCUPIED UNITS	2.63						
		OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS	2.86						
		RENTER OCCUPIED UNITS	2.38						
TOTAL	15776429	2214026							