Total Population
New York City Community Districts
1970, 1980, 1990 and 2000

COMMUNITY DISTRICTS		Total Population				Change 1990-2000	
		1970	1980	1990	2000	Number	Percent
BRONX COMMUNITY DISTRICTS							
1	Melrose, Mott Haven, Port Morris	138,557	78,441	77,214	82,159	4,945	6.4
2	Hunts Point, Longwood	99,493	34,399	39,443	46,824	7,381	18.7
3	Morrisania, Crotona Park East	150,636	53,635	57,162	68,574	11,412	20.0
4	Highbridge, Concourse Village	144,207	114,312	119,962	139,563	19,601	16.3
5	University Hts., Fordham, Mt. Hope	121,807	107,995	118,435	128,313	9,878	8.3
6	East Tremont, Belmont	114,137	65,016	68,061	75,688	7,627	11.2
7	Bedford Park, Norwood, Fordham	113,764	116,827	128,588	141,411	12,823	10.0
8	Riverdale, Kingsbridge, Marble Hill	103,543	98,275	97,030	101,332	4,302	4.4
9	Soundview, Parkchester	166,442	167,627	155,970	167,859	11,889	7.6
10	Throgs Nk., Co-op City, Pelham Bay	84,948	106,516	108,093	115,948	7,855	7.3
11	Pelham Pkwy, Morris Park, Laconia	105,980	99,080	97,842	110,706	12,864	13.1
12	Wakefield, Williamsbridge	135,010	128,226	129,620	149,077	19,457	15.0
BROOKLYN COMMUNITY DISTRICTS							
1	Williamsburg, Greenpoint	179,390	142,942	155,972	160,338	4,366	2.8
2	Brooklyn Heights, Fort Greene	110,221	92,732	94,534	98,620	4,086	4.3
3	Bedford Stuyvesant	203,380	133,379	138,696	143,867	5,171	3.7
4	Bushwick	137,902	92,497	102,572	104,358	1,786	1.7
5	East New York, Starrett City	170,791	154,931	161,350	173,198	11,848	7.3
6	Park Slope, Carroll Gardens	138,933	110,228	102,724	104,054	1,330	1.3
7	Sunset Park, Windsor Terrace	111,607	98,567	102,553	120,063	17,510	17.1
8	Crown Heights North	121,821	88,796	96,400	96,076	(324)	-0.3
9	Crown Heights South, Wingate	101,047	96,669	110,715	104,014	(6,701)	-6.1
10	Bay Ridge, Dyker Heights	129,822	118,187	110,612	122,542	11,930	10.8
11	Bensonhurst, Bath Beach	170,119	155,072	149,994	172,129	22,135	14.8
12	Borough Park, Ocean Parkway	166,301	155,899	160,018	185,046	25,028	15.6
13	Coney Island, Brighton Beach	97,750	100,030	102,596	106,120	3,524	3.4
14	Flatbush, Midwood	137,041	143,859	159,825	168,806	8,981	5.6
15	Sheepshead Bay, Gerritsen Beach	164,815	149,572	143,477	160,319	16,842	11.7
16	Brownsville, Ocean Hill	122,589	73,801	84,923	85,343	420	0.5
17	East Flatbush, Rugby, Farragut	149,496	154,596	161,261	165,753	4,492	2.8
18	Canarsie, Flatlands	188,643	169,092	162,428	194,653	32,225	19.8
MANHATTAN COMMUNITY DISTRICTS							
1	Battery Park City, Tribeca	7,706	15,918	25,366	34,420	9,054	35.7
2	Greenwich Village, Soho	84,337	87,069	94,105	93,119	(986)	-1.0
3	Lower East Side, Chinatown	181,845	154,848	161,617	164,407	2,790	1.7
4	Chelsea, Clinton	83,601	82,164	84,431	87,479	3,048	3.6
5	Midtown Business District	31,076	39,544	43,507	44,028	521	1.2
6	Stuyvesant Town, Turtle Bay	122,465	127,554	133,748	136,152	2,404	1.8
7	West Side, Upper West Side	212,422	206,669	210,993	207,699	(3,294)	-1.6
8	Upper East Side	200,851	204,305	210,880	217,063	6,183	2.9
9	Manhattanville, Hamilton Heights	113,606	103,038	106,978	111,724	4,746	4.4
10	Central Harlem	159,267	105,641	99,519	107,109	7,590	7.6
11	East Harlem	154,662	114,569	110,508	117,743	7,235	6.5
12	Washington Heights, Inwood	180,561	179,941	198,192	208,414	10,222	5.2
QUEENS COMMUNITY DISTRICTS							
1	Astoria, Long Island City	185,925	185,198	188,549	211,220	22,671	12.0
2	Sunnyside, Woodside	95,073	88,927	94,845	109,920	15,075	15.9
3	Jackson Heights, North Corona	123,635	122,090	128,924	169,083	40,159	31.1
4	Elmhurst, South Corona	108,233	118,430	137,023	167,005	29,982	21.9
5	Ridgewood, Glendale, Maspeth	161,022	150,142	149,126	165,911	16,785	11.3
6	Forest Hills, Rego Park	120,429	112,245	106,996	115,967	8,971	8.4
7	Flushing, Bay Terrace	207,589	204,785	220,508	242,952	22,444	10.2
8	Fresh Meadows, Briarwood	142,468	125,312	132,101	146,594	14,493	11.0
9	Woodhaven, Richmond Hill	110,367	109,505	112,151	141,608	29,457	26.3
10	Ozone Park, Howard Beach	113,857	105,651	107,768	127,274	19,506	18.1
11	Bayside, Douglaston, Little Neck	127,883	110,963	108,056	116,404	8,348	7.7
12	Jamaica, St. Albans, Hollis	206,639	189,383	201,293	223,602	22,309	11.1
13	Queens Village, Rosedale	184,647	173,178	177,535	196,284	18,749	10.6
14	The Rockaways, Broad Channel	98,228	100,592	100,596	106,686	6,090	6.1
STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY DISTRICTS							
1	Stapleton, Port Richmond	135,875	138,489	137,806	162,609	24,803	18.0
2	New Springville, South Beach	85,985	105,128	113,944	127,071	13,127	11.5
3	Tottenville, Woodrow, Great Kills	72,815	108,249	126,956	152,908	25,952	20.4

Factors Affecting Population Growth in New York City's 59 Community Districts: 1990-2000

Introduction

Between 1990 and 2000, the enumerated population of New York City went from 7,322,564 to 8,008,278, an increase of almost 686,000 persons. This large increase in enumerated population was the result of several major factors: substantial natural increase (more births than deaths); domestic migration losses that were largely offset by gains through immigration; and improvements in the methods used to conduct the census enumeration. This report takes a deeper and more localized look at population change by focusing on the city's 59 community districts. This neighborhood perspective provides a more thorough look at the forces that underlie the large increase in enumerated population between 1990 and 2000, especially since the city's population increase was not evenly distributed. Of the city's 59 community districts, 28 (11 in Queens, 7 in Bronx, 6 in Brooklyn, all 3 in Staten Island, and 1 in Manhattan,) had gains in excess of the city average (9.4 percent), while 31 CDs (12 in Brooklyn, 11 in Manhattan, 5 in the Bronx and 3 in Queens) gained less than the city average or lost population. Areas with the largest population gains included the central Bronx, southeastern and southwestern Brooklyn, the southern tip of Manhattan, and virtually all of Queens and Staten Island. Northern and central Brooklyn, the east Bronx, and the majority of Manhattan appeared to grow more slowly than the city as a whole.

The factors that determined the distribution of the city's population increase among CDs include: new housing construction, rehabilitation of existing structures, and other building alterations; domestic migration and the settlement patterns of new immigrants; the aging of certain population groups in neighborhoods and population turnover; patterns of natural increase; shifts in household size; and shifts in the capacity of the census to count housing units and people.

Housing

Population change is closely tied to shifts in the number of housing units. For the most part, the CDs with the largest gains in housing experienced the highest levels of population growth between 1990 and 2000. Increases in enumerated housing units occurred for several reasons. The first and most obvious is a net gain in housing units due to ***new construction***, which was substantial in some parts of New York City. In CD1 in Manhattan (Battery Park City/Tribeca) and CD3 in Staten Island (Tottenville/Woodrow/Great Kills), population gains appear to be almost entirely driven by net gains in newly constructed housing units. CD3 in the Bronx (Morrisania/ Crotona Park East) also experienced an increase in population as a result of new construction. While the city recorded more than 88,000 new units through final certificates of occupancy over the decade, these gains need to be set against units that were removed from the housing stock. For example, while new construction was sizable in Manhattan CD7 (West Side/Upper West Side) and CD8 (Upper East Side), the census showed a net loss of housing units in these areas. There are several reasons for this, including apartments being combined by

affluent residents. (Also, see discussion below on household size and changes in census methods.)

Increases in housing units also occurred as a result of ***rehabilitation of existing buildings*** as was the case in the 1990s in large swaths of the South Bronx and in Central Harlem. In these areas, many buildings that were entirely vacant and unfit for occupancy, were rehabilitated. Big gains in the population of CD2 (Hunts Point/Longwood), CD3 (Morrisania/Crotona Park East) and CD4 (Highbridge/Concourse Village) in the Bronx are directly tied to both new construction and the rehabilitation of existing structures.

Many neighborhoods in New York City are largely built-out and new housing is created not in large subdivisions, but as piecemeal additions to smaller buildings, as basement or garage apartment additions. Local government administrative building records and federal census address lists frequently understate the level of these ***smaller building alterations*** that result in added units. As such, special research was needed to insure that these units were counted in the 2000 Census. Large areas of the city, particularly those characterized by small homes that are more easily subdivided, gained population as a result of such alterations.

Migration/Immigration

When studying changes in neighborhoods, the most influential and volatile component of population change is usually migration, the movement of people into, out of, and within the city. Data from the 1990 Census and information available thus far for 2000 indicate that the inflow of immigrants, 1.2 million in the 1990s, was largely replacing the native-born and older immigrants who were leaving neighborhoods either through death or migration. This process has been an integral part of New York's distinctive demographic story, distinguishing it from other older cities of the northeast and midwest that have not attracted large numbers of immigrants.

One major implication of this migration and the turnover that it perpetuates, is change not only in the size of an area's population, but in the characteristics of residents. The big role that immigration plays in New York City's population and the large number of immigrants that the city receives from Asia, the Carribean and South America have resulted in substantial changes in the racial and ethnic composition of neighborhoods over time. For example, given its large and diverse immigration, most community districts in Queens display sharp increases in the percent of residents who are Hispanic and/or Asian. CD9 (Woodhaven/Richmond Hill), for example, has achieved an unprecedented mix of population by race and ethnicity. In 1990, whites in the Woodhaven/Richmond Hill area of Queens outnumbered Hispanics by over two to one, and Asians accounted for less than 10 percent of the CD's population. By 2000, Hispanics outnumbered whites and the Asian population has more than doubled due to large-scale immigration. Several other Queens CDs had large Hispanic and Asian populations that showed substantial increases over the decade. The best examples are in CD2 (Sunnyside/Woodside) and CD4 (Elmhurst/South Corona) in northern Queens, where both Asians and Hispanics are represented in large numbers.

Immigration, however, is just one part of the migration story. Domestic population movement also played a major role in the shifting characteristics of neighborhoods. Movements of people from other parts of the nation (domestic migration) and across the five boroughs of the city can be just as influential in determining neighborhood change. Unlike immigration, however, these flows are more difficult to measure directly. Instead, the influence of these movements is detected indirectly, through shifts in the characteristics of population groups that come to reside in the area. For example, the increased demand for apartments by professional in-migrants, predominantly native-born white nonhispanics, has put pressure on Manhattan's housing stock, where neighborhoods can no longer continue to supply enough housing to support those who arrive from other parts of the nation to establish careers each decade. As a result, increasing numbers of individuals share apartments with nonrelatives. Some leave Manhattan for other areas, principally in western Brooklyn. The end result is that three CDs in Brooklyn – CD1 (Williamsburg/Greenpoint), CD2 (Brooklyn Heights/Fort Greene), and CD6 (Park Slope/Carroll Gardens) experienced at least small gains in white nonhispanic population, and mostly population losses among black and Hispanic residents.[1]

Internal movements can also lead to other forms of racial and ethnic change. The search for better owner-occupied housing by relatively affluent black nonhispanic residents from north and central Brooklyn has brought them south, into CD18 (Canarsie/Flatlands), where the aging and outmigrating white nonhispanic population has made such housing available. At the same time, it appears that the families moving to Canarsie are larger, substantially increasing the average household size in the community and the overall population. The fact that Canarsie had little direct immigration in the 1990s further reinforces the key role of movement from other parts of the borough and, perhaps, other parts of the city. Similar but less pronounced shifts occurred in the 1990s in Bronx CD12 (Wakefield/Willamsbridge) and in Queens CD13 (Queens Village/Rosedale).

Finally, there are some domestic flows that largely consist of immigrants who first settle in other parts of the nation, but then come to live in New York City. Such is the case with Mexican migrants, who have entered New York City's neighborhoods, not directly from Mexico, but as migrants from other entry points in the U.S. Their numbers have increased dramatically in the 1990s, replacing Puerto Ricans and maintaining the population in Manhattan CD11 (East Harlem), and spurring population growth in Brooklyn CD7 (Sunset Park/Windsor Terrace), Queens CD3 (Jackson Heights/North Corona), Queens CD4 (Elmhurst/South Corona), and parts of Bronx CD7 (Bedford Park/Norwood/Fordham).

Aging and Population Turnover

Another reason why areas grow or decline in population is as a result of a positive or negative balance of births over deaths. There are many neighborhoods in New York City that are heavily first and second generation European. Typically, these communities have relatively large populations aged 65 years and older. Examples include portions of: CD8 in the Bronx (Riverdale/Kinsgridge/Marble Hill), CD11 in the Bronx (Pelham Parkway/Morris Park), CD11 in Brooklyn (Bensonhurst/Bath Beach) and CD10 in

Brooklyn (Bay Ridge/Dyker Heights). A similar pattern can be found in the northern part of CD7 in Queens (Flushing/Bay Terrace). Some census tracts in these neighborhoods grew slowly or lost residents between 1990 and 2000 because of little or no natural increase and because they lacked significant immigrant inflows.

Areas where older Europeans are being replaced by a large number of Hispanic immigrants tend to have substantial levels of growth. Part of the reason for this is related to the effects of fertility among recent immigrants. The high level of births among Hispanic immigrants and Mexican migrants, a function of high fertility rates and a youthful age distribution, has dramatically increased population growth in some of the city's neighborhoods in the 1990s. The highest levels of growth can be seen in CD3 in Queens (Jackson Heights/North Corona), which received tens of thousands of Hispanic immigrants in the 1990s. Similarly, selected portions of CD7 in Brooklyn (Sunset Park/Windsor Terrace) have been growing over the past 20 years as a result of the fertility of new Hispanic immigrants and, more recently, due to increases in Mexican flows.

However, other areas with high levels of natural increase have not experienced high levels of growth. For example, Brooklyn CD4 (Bushwick) and Manhattan CD12 (Washington Heights/Inwood) had among the highest levels of natural increase in the city, yet their population gains were smaller than the citywide average, 2 percent in CD4 and 5 percent in CD12. In the case of CD4, it is likely that patterns of internal migration to other parts of Brooklyn have largely countered growth due to natural increase. A similar picture can be drawn of Manhattan CD12, where the largely built-out, fully-occupied nature of the housing stock and outmigration to the west Bronx have attenuated the impact of natural increase on total population growth.

An aging population makes neighborhoods prime candidates for turnover, with new groups coming onto the scene and replacing older residents. There are many reasons why people move, including changes in employment, housing, and life-cycle changes, such as marriage, birth of a child, and retirement. However, the propensity to migrate is highest among persons in their twenties and thirties and generally declines with age (although there is a small increase in the propensity to move in the retirement ages). Many "aging" communities in New York City are characterized by a steady turnover that, over time, results in race and ethnic transitions. The Belmont community in Bronx community district 6 is a prime example of this kind of change, with the longstanding Italian population slowly giving way to new residents of other European and Hispanic origins. Other communities where this pattern is occurring include Bronx CD11 (Pelham Parkway/Morris Park), Brooklyn CD11 (Bensonhurst/Bath Beach) and Queens CD5 (Ridgewood/Glendale/Maspeth). Sometimes, however, turnover occurs more quickly, because the impact of an aging population is augmented by large domestic migration losses, as was the case in Brooklyn CD18 (Canarsie/Flatlands).

Household Size

An important factor in population growth relates to changes in how densely housing is occupied, or shifts

in average household size. CD3 in Queens (Jackson Heights/North Corona) had an average household size of about 3.17 persons, compared to 1.85 in Manhattan CD1 (Battery Park City/Tribeca). Despite the fact that both CDs had major increases in the absolute number of reported units which were in the same range (4,900 in CD1 and 5,800 in CD3), the effect on absolute number of residents added to the population was much larger in Queens CD3 than in Manhattan CD1. Moreover, Queens CD3 had a major increase in household size over the decade, while Manhattan CD1 actually declined slightly. This disparity serves to illustrate why CDs 2 through 8 in Manhattan, all with low average household size, showed little change or small losses, in comparison to CDs in the other boroughs, and the four CDs to the north, which either have significant immigrant influxes (CD9 - Manhattanville/Hamilton Heights, CD11 - East Harlem and CD12 - Washington Heights/Inwood), or significant increases in housing (CD10 - Central Harlem).

Shifts in the Capacity of the Census to Count Housing Units and People

While the demographic underpinnings of population change are substantial in many of the city's community districts, these forces are not sufficient to explain reported population change. Part of the change in enumerated population was not really actual population change (i.e., people added over the decade), but a function of capturing people in 2000 who were missed in 1990. Shifts in census coverage refer to changes from decade to decade in the capacity of the census to enumerate populations. The Address List Improvement Act of 1994 allowed local government representatives to review and correct the address lists that were used to mail questionnaires and follow-up on non-responding households in the 2000 Census, which was unprecedented. In New York City, local participation in correcting the 2000 Census address list improved coverage over 1990.[2] Several hundred-thousand more households received questionnaires in 2000 compared to 1990 because of the combined efforts of the Census Bureau and local government. Many of these units that are now being counted already existed in 1990; thus, the addition of these units to the census count is the result of better census-taking.

There are also other issues that affect coverage and may have influenced the census results for some CDs. Some of the reported changes in housing seem inconsistent with local knowledge regarding expected changes. For example, the frequent observation about market pressure on Manhattan's housing stock seems inconsistent with what are high levels of vacant units in some Manhattan CDs. Here, the key seems to be in the large number of units that were reported as vacant for "seasonal or occasional use" in 2000. While some apartments are held by corporations and others for "occasional" use, it is likely that many occupants reported another dwelling as their primary residence. Over one-half of the units listed as vacant in CD5 (Midtown Business District), CD6 (Stuyvesant Town/Turtle Bay) and CD8 (Upper East Side) were "for seasonal and occasional use." (To put this in perspective, in the Rockaways – Queens CD14 – long known for its beach houses, the share of all vacants held for "seasonal and occasional use" was 35 percent.) Further, the reported number of vacant units that were for "seasonal or occasional use" increased sharply in most CDs. This results in exaggerated counts of units that were unoccupied and has likely contributed to an underenumeration of the population in

Manhattan, because at least some Manhattan residents were counted at addresses outside of the city on April 1, 2000.

Evaluating the effects of a shift in coverage on population change is a difficult task, which involves comparisons with local administrative data to make judgments about the level of actual change observed in an area versus what would be expected. At present, the Department is evaluating the impact of coverage change on shifts in the enumerated population for the city, boroughs and all 59 community districts. Among the methods being used to estimate the impact of coverage is to use the city's housing unit estimates from 1990, which differed in many cases from 1990 Census housing counts, to get a more accurate basis for estimating actual change over the decade. In addition, a demographic method is being employed to separately estimate the components of change – natural increase and net migration – after removing coverage effects. This method demographically "survives" the 1990 population to 2000 and uses migration data from the 1980s and 1990s to estimate the size of the coverage shift. This analysis will be published in a forthcoming report.

1. Also, the presence of a substantial orthodox Jewish population in selected portions of these areas has served to maintain the white nonhispanic population.

2. In addition to address list review efforts, New York City established the Mayors Office for Census 2000, which was responsible for a major outreach effort aimed at encouraging New Yorkers to mail back questionnaires and cooperate with follow-up enumerators.