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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.
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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 accurred 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.

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. ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ ) 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.

[^0]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 Ameridcans 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. 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.
${ }^{2}$ 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.

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. Sme of these families may be eligible for public assistance programs, due to income disregards.

In 1989, nearly 5 million persons, or onequarter 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 $(+9,949)$. Niagra county $(+3,516)$, Broome county $(3,459)$, Onondaga county $(+3,402)$, and Tompkins ccunty $(+3,369)$ 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/Manhatten 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\%), Cattaragus (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 Genesse (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 Niagra 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

## SELECTHD POVERTY POPULATIONS <br> New York State 1979 - 1989

|  | 1979 | 1989 | Change | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Persons | 2,298,922 | 2,277,296 | -21,626 | -0.9\% |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| <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 |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Families | 483,340 | 454,872 | $-28,468$ | -5.9\% |
| 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 |
| Male Householder | 209,924 | 183,191 | -26,733 | -12.7 |
| With Children | 139,386 | 120,122 | -19,264 | -13.8 |
| With Children <5 | n.a. | 65,008 |  |  |
| Female Householder | 273,416 | 271,681 | -1,735 | -0.6 |
| With Children | 247,793 | 240,040 | -7,753 | -3.1 |
| With Children <5 | n.a. | 124,058 |  |  |
| Source: 1980 and 1990 Censuses of Population, Summary Tape Files 3A. |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE 2

## SELECIED POVERTY RATES <br> New York state <br> 1979-1989

|  | 1979 | 1989 | Change | \% Change |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Persons | $13.4 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | -0.4 | $-3.0 \%$ |
| Age |  |  |  |  |
| $<5$ | 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 |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Families | 10.8 | 10.0 | -0.8 | $-7.4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Male Householder | 7.9 | 5.1 | -2.8 | -35.5 |
| With Children | 7.6 | 7.0 | -0.6 | -7.9 |
| With Children <5 | n.a. | 8.5 |  |  |
| Female Householder | 34.2 | 30.1 | -4.1 | -12.0 |
| With Children | 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 COUNIY

New York State
1979 - 1989

| County | 1979 | 1989 | Change | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |
| Cattaragus | 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 |
| Cattaragus | 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 | 9.6 | -3.2 | -28.6 |
| Warren | 12.7 | 9.6 | -2.9 | -23.2 |
| Washington | 12.5 | -2.9 | -5.7 |  |
| Wayne | 8.8 | 8.3 | -0.5 | -4.2 |
| Westchester | 7.1 | 6.8 | -0.3 | -9.6 |
| Wyoming | 9.4 | 8.5 | -0.9 | -6.9 |
| Yates | 14.4 | 13.4 | -1.0 |  |
| Source: 1989 and 1990 | Censuses of Population, Summary Tape Files | $3 A$. |  |  |
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\begin{array}{rr}
\text { BLACK ESK/ALEUI } \\
618273 & 14449
\end{array}
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$$
205964
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { HPPANIC } \\
\text { oRRIIII }
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ORIGIN } \\
& 531936
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 528840 \\
& \hline 6874,50
\end{aligned}
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\begin{aligned}
& 531966 \\
& 5888964 \\
& 5889
\end{aligned}
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\end{array}
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{ }^{409784}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4094977 \\
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53595
\end{array}
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& 409896 \\
& 48947 \\
& 4949
\end{aligned}
$$

1655971
1156723
711623
461367

| tsiatus |
| :---: |


|  | －00 | vono | oNun |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\infty-0$ | Omo | $v N \infty$ |
|  | $\infty-M$ | $N \infty$ | －N0 |
|  | $\cdots-\infty$ | 0170 | Noo |
| m | OMN | いいい | O－N |
| $\stackrel{\square}{18}$ | $N \sim$ | $\cdots \mathrm{m}$ | N | PROFESSIOHAL

HEALTH
EDUCAI IONAL
OTHER PROF PUBLIC ADIIIHISIRAIION
aREANAME: NEN YORK
$\qquad$

| \|P33/34/35 ANCESTRY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - |  | FIRST | T SECOI |
| \| | SINGLE | multifle | E MULIIPL |
| 1 A | ANCESTRY | AHCESIRY | A AHCESIRY |
| \| ARAB | 63785 | 79600 | 1623 |
| \|AUSTRIAl| | 51131 | 102693 | 35468 |
| \| BELGIAN | 5031 | 9102 | 254 |
| ICANADIAN | 18802 | 27678 | 8183 |
| ICZECH | 28677 | 48329 | 93020 |
| \| DAIIS SH | 11997 | 27709 | 9193 |
| I DUTCH | 72303 | 186762 | 21830 |
| [ EHGLISH | 420681 | 953639 | 9612484 |
| \|FIMHISH | 7560 | 13759 | 9 75 |
| IFREIICH | 132608 | 375387 | 2520 |
| \|FREIICH CAHADIAN | 71994 | 115706 | - 4204 |
| IGERMAN | 889893 | 2098719 | 980216 |
| IGPEEK | 110786 | 139379 | 92049 |
| \| HHMISIRIAH | 74846 | 115981 | 1709 |
| \| IP1: 1 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 981619 | 18157:5 | F 98972 |
| 111 ALIAN | 1747705 | 23i6i60 | - 46710 |
| ILITHUAHIAN | 27129 | 44089 | 9 2630 |
| \| NOPHEGIAN | 30223 | 56922 | 23323 |
| \| POLISH | 528015 | 841457 | 733962 |
| IPORIUGUESE | 26854 | 34455 | 596 |
| \|ROHANIAN | 29957 | 42516 | 62446 |
| \| RUSSIAN | 268646 | 455162 | 21414 |
| ISCOICH IRISH | 77000 | 118933 | $3 \quad 470$ |
| \|SCOIIISH | 67290 | 157345 | 51089 |
| I SLOVAK | 52410 | 75881 | 14216 |
| \| SUBJAHARAN AFRICAN | 57856 | 64451 | 149 |
| \| SHEDISH | 44970 | 99747 | 7655 |
| I SWIS | 11358 | 26905 | 51996 |
| \| UKRAINIAN | 61824 | 85206 | 6359 |
| \|U.S. OR AMERICAN | 468665 | 468754 |  |
| [HELSH | 19228 | 50662 | 2530 |
| IHEST IHDIAN |  |  |  |
| 1 (EXC HISPAHICS) | 435129 | 452338 | $8 \quad 242$ |
| IYUGOSLAVIAN | 23957 | 29150 | 074 |
| IRACE OR HISPANIC |  |  |  |
| \| ORIGIN GROUPS | 3322761 | 3552790 | 028016 |
| IOTHER GROUPS | 1096576 | 1203665 | 51491 |
| [ UNCLASSIFIED OR |  |  |  |
| HOT REPORTED | 1646081 | 1646081 | 1129853 |
| P27 SEX BY MARITAL STATUS |  |  |  |
| \| PRT SEX |  |  | FEMALE |
| NEVER MARRIED | 236 |  | 2172475 |
| MARRIED |  |  |  |
| SFOUSE PRESENT | 346 |  | 3433935 |
| SPOUSE ABSEHT |  |  |  |
| SEPARATED |  |  | 298544 |
| 0 THER |  |  | 177812 |
| WI DOLIED |  |  | 966254 |
| DI VORCED |  |  | 584703 |

$\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}\text { P45/46/47/48 FLACE OF HORK } \\ \text { (UIIVVRSE: HORKERS } 16+\text { ) }\end{gathered}\right.$
HORKED IN STAIE OF RESIDEHCE
HORKED IH COUNTY OF RESIDEHCE
HORKED OUISIDE COUNTY OF RESIDENCE
HORKED OUTSIDE S
LIVING IN AH MSA
HORKED IN MSA OF RESIDEHCE
CENIRAL CITY

|  | \|P50/51 TRAVEL TIME TO Minutes | HORK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-4 | 236110 |
| 5426325 | 5-9 | 749418 |
| 2594168 | 10-14 | 1045894 |
| 200120 | 15-19 | 1098794 |
|  | 20-24 | 1007332 |
|  | 25-29 | 383459 |
|  | 30-34 | 1070474 |
| 3982054 | 35-39 | 203778 |
| 2765229 | 40-44 | 306077 |
|  | 45-59 | 773375 |
| 3781251 | 60-89 | 858010 |
| 3338391 | I 90 OR MORE | 274670 |
| 61881 | HORKED AT HOME | 213222 |
|  | avg travel time | 29 |
| 29866 |  |  |
| 78178 | P53 PRIVAIE U"川\\| | ! UFANCY |
| 591441 | CAR, TRUCK, OH Vi,H |  |
|  | DROVE ALOHE | 4460757 |
|  | IH 2-PERSOH CARPOOL | 681236 |
| 3903748 | Ill 3-PERSOII CARFOOL | 105103 |
| 2691361 | \| IN 4-PERSOII CARPOOL | 36555 |
| 1625504 | IH 5-PERSOII CARFOOL | 11218 |
|  | IN 6-PERSOH CARPOOL | 4888 |
| 3501713 | I IH 7-OR-M10RE CARPOOL | 22188 |
| 4718900 | OIHER MEALIS | 2898668 |

HORKED OUISIDE MSA OF RESIDENCE
CEITTRAL CITY
RENAIIIDER OF A DIFFEFENT MSA
MOT KED OUTSIDE OF AIIY MSA
| NOT LIVIHG IN AH HSA
HORKED IN AN MSA
CEHIRAL CITY
REMAIHDER OF MSA
HORKED OUTSIDE OF ANY MSA
LIVING IN A PLACE
HORKED IN PLACE OF RESIDEHCE I HORKED OUTSIDE PLACE OF RESIDEHCE HOT LIVIHG IN A PLACE

IWORKED IH MCD OF RESIDEHCE
|HORKED OUTSIDE MCD OF RESIDENCE 471890010 IHER MEAHS
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## 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.

## Finding From the 100\% Data

- 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\%).
- While $52 \%$ of the state's population was female, the male population increased faster ( $3.4 \%$ ) than the female population ( $1.6 \%$ ).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 1970 s.
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.


## QUERUTEW OFTHE 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 Repors

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 1 A 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 ***

|  |  | 1980 | $\begin{gathered} - \text { COUNTY }^{1990} \\ \end{gathered}$ | \% CHANGE | NY STATE \% CHANGE | NY CITY \% CHANGE | $\begin{gathered} \text { - COMPARI } \\ \text { ROS } \\ \text { \% CHANGE } \end{gathered}$ | ON AREAS ROS URBAN \% CHANGE | RURAI. <br> \% CHANGE | VERY RURAI. \% 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: |  | $238.031$ | 216.075 | -9.2 | -9. 2 | -15.1 | -4.9 | $-2.8$ | -9.3 | -8.6 |
|  | $1 \text { TO } 2$ | 447.733 | 541.479 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 21.8 | 20.4 | 23.0 | 14.6 | 14.3 |
|  | 3 T0 5 | 662,025 | 743.139 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 13.1 | 11.7 | 16.4 | 19.0 |
|  | 6 T0 9 | 959,795 | 933.077 | -2.8 | -2.8 | . 6 | $-4.8$ | -7. 2 | . 6 | 32 |
|  | 10 T0 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 |
|  | 181021 | 1.253.675 | 1.118.755 | -10.8 | -10.8 | -7.0 | -12.9 | -14.9 | $-8.7$ | -11.7 |
|  | 22 T0 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 T0 59 | 2,885,516 | 2,725,777 | -5.5 | -5.5 | -4.5 | -6. 2 | -8.5 | -. 2 | 4.1 |
|  | $60 \quad 1064$ | 845.362 | 825.110 | -2.4 | -2. 4 | 7.1 | 1.0 | 2.7 | -3.3 | -3.5 |
|  | $65 \quad 1074$ | 1.293.032 | 1.348.279 | 4.3 | 4.3 | -6. 7 | 12.9 | 15.5 | 7.2 | 7.3 |
|  | $75 \quad 1084$ | 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-DF-State COUNTIES
NY CITY -- THE 5 COUNTIES/BOROUGHS OF NY CITY (BRONX, KINGS, NY CITY, DUEENS. \& RICHMOND)
ROS -- 57 REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES OUTSIDE OF NY CITY
ROS URBAN - REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A TOTAL 1990 POPULATION EOUAL TO OR GREATER THAN $2 O O, O O O$
RURAL - - REST-OF-STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A 1990 POPUIATION BELOW 200 , OOO
VERY RURAL - RURAL. ROS COUNTIES IN WHICH AT LEAST $70 \%$ OF THE 1980 POPULATION RESIDED IN RURAL CENSUS TRACIS

FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS: 1980 AND 1990
*** NEW YORK STATE ***

|  | $1980$ | $\begin{gathered} - \text { COUNTY } \\ 1990 \end{gathered}$ | \% CHANGE | NY STATE \% CHANGE | NY CITY <br> \% CHANGE | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPARI } \\ \text { ROS } \\ \% \text { CHANGE } \end{gathered}$ | ON AREAS ROS URBAN \% CHANGE | RURAL <br> \% CHANGE | VERY RURAL \% CHANGE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FAMILIES | 4.468.031 | 4.489 .312 | 5 | 5 | $-2.0$ | 2. 1 | . 8 | 5.2 | 6.5 |
| total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| household | 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 |  |  |  |  | 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 hhi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WITH CHILDREN | 473.089 | 561.613 | 18.7 |  |  |  | 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/BOROUGHS 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 $2 O O . O O O$
RURAL - REST-OF STATE COUNTIES WHICH HAVE A 1990 POPULATION BELOW 200 , OOO
VERY RURAL - RURAL ROS COUNTIES IN WHICH AT LEAST 7O\% OF THE 19BO FOPULATION RESIDED IN RURAL CENSUS TRACTS



[^0]:    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-Latnio whites, nonLatino 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.

