

EAST PATCHOGUE: A COMMUNITY POISED FOR REVITALIZATION

Prepared For

The Town of Brookhaven
John Jay LaValle, Supervisor
Timothy Mazzai, Town Council
August 2005

Prepared by

Martin R. Cantor, CPA, M.A, Director of Economic Development
Sustainable Long Island
Long Island Fund For Sustainable Development

55 Hilton Avenue
Garden City, New York 11530

Tel: (516) 873-0230
Fax: (631) 491-6744

East Patchogue: A Community Poised for Revitalization
August 2005

Table of Contents

I:	Introduction:	Page 3
II:	The Impact of the Global Economy and Changing Technology, Projections for the Long Island Labor Supply, and The Relationship Between Income and Education.	Page 8
III:	Suffolk County and East Patchogue: A Comparison of Economic and Social Indicators; Household Income, Academic Achievement, Single Parent Households, Labor Force Participation, Unemployment, and Home Ownership.	Page 16
VI:	Summary.	Page 61

I:INTRODUCTION:

Between 1980 and 2000, Long Island experienced the deindustrialization of its manufacturing base, caused in part by the contraction of the region's defense industry. This contraction, felt especially by Long Island's many machine shops, led to workforce reductions impacting much of the region's less skilled and less educated workers. At the same time, influenced largely by the globalization of economic activity between 1970 and 1990, the demand for more skilled and more educated workers was growing in Long Island's emerging high technology industries, and in the growing financial and banking sector.¹ This analysis discusses how East Patchogue, a growing culturally and ethnically diverse African-American, Hispanic and White community fared between 1990 and 2000 as compared to the surrounding Suffolk County.

What would be the impact of this period of industrial and economic restructuring on the East Patchogue workforce and related economy? What would be the cost to the community of the loss of jobs requiring a lower level of education, such as blue-collar manufacturing and clerical? Would East Patchogue's residents be able to achieve the education and skills necessary for employment in the emerging and higher paid technology jobs, such as specialized financial services, and computer and telecommunication technology and their related commercial applications? Would the global economy and changes in technology, now requiring more intellectual skills from the workforce, impact the correlation existing between education and family income as compared to past years? Would East Patchogue be similar to other diverse Suffolk County communities, which tend to have weaker or inadequate support structures for families? Would families living in homes have a property tax base adequate to fund today's financially strapped educational systems? And would East Patchogue be, as with other communities of color that often lag behind whites in educational attainment, employment, and income? The result for some contemporary

¹ See Table 2: *Long Island Average Annual Opening for Fastest and Slowest Growing Occupations 1997-2007.*

American communities is that the income gap has widened between the haves and have-nots. Would East Patchogue have the same experience and lag behind Suffolk County?

This analysis will explore the above questions by comparing East Patchogue, a primarily White multi-cultural community with African-American and Hispanic residents, with the surrounding primarily white, and economically more prosperous Suffolk County. The effects of globalization and technological change on Long Island and East Patchogue will be analyzed in part by using census data.

Conclusions will be drawn about the socio-economic structure of East Patchogue, which will be used to assist in a downtown business district revitalization strategy.

II: IMPACT of the GLOBAL ECONOMY and CHANGING TECHNOLOGY

WORKFORCE IMPACT: GLOBALIZATION and CHANGING TECHNOLOGY

The global economy is based on changes in technology and communications, whereby capital flows, commodity markets, information, raw materials, management and organization have become internationalized and fully interdependent.

Between 1970 and 1990, the evolution of our industrial system brought with it an economy emphasizing services and finances, and a renewed focus on major cities for specific production, services, marketing and innovation. Furthermore, the internationalization of mergers, acquisitions, and financial transactions made cities the ideal center for management and coordination, for the raising and consolidations of investment capital, and for the formation of an international property market. This demand for financial innovations and specialized financial services continued, even during the period when major developments in computer and telecommunications technology and their related commercial applications occurred. What evolved was a change in the composition and growth patterns of the economies of major cities, now weighted heavily toward finance and producer services resulting from the above-average growth of these

industrial sectors during the 1980's.² During this period of globalization, New York city increased its importance as a center of finance and as a center for global servicing and management. The New York City employment base lost 30 percent of its construction jobs, 22 percent of the manufacturing jobs and 20 percent of the transportation jobs. At the same time jobs in the wholesale/retail sector grew by 15 percent, by 21 percent in finance, insurance, and real estate, and respectively by 23, 42 and 62 percent in banking, and business and legal services sectors. Not only did these services sectors report an increase of jobs but their share of the New York City employment base also increased.³ The result was that jobs earlier workforces could fill now required a higher degree of learning.

This new structure of global economic activity has brought changes in the organization of work, resulting in a shift in the job supply, and causing a polarization of the income and occupational distribution of workers. The growth industries of the global economy show a greater incidence of jobs at the high and low paying ends of the wage scale than do the jobs in the older industries now in decline. Almost half the jobs in the producer services are lower-wage jobs, with the other half in the two highest earning classes. This is in contrast to a large share of manufacturing workers who were in the middle-wage earning jobs during the postwar era. This economic polarization was caused, in part, by the contraction of the manufacturing sector and the increase in the supply of low-wage jobs. This resulted in the decline of the labor market share of unionized shops and in the deterioration of wages, while sweatshops and industrial homework proliferated. Additionally, the supply of low-wage jobs in restaurants, hotels, cleaners, luxury housing, boutiques, etc., increased as required to service the new high-wage job holders created by globalization. Important not to be lost is that the growth of jobs in the global economy brings not only higher wage technological jobs but also many low-paying jobs.⁴ What prevents universal access to the

² Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p.87-88.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 126-134.

⁴ Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 9-10.

higher paying jobs generated by the global economy, is that in the United States only college graduates and those few with extra-specialized post-high school training have acquired the skills relevant to the demands of this highly technological marketplace. This differs from Japan and Germany, where most high school and college graduates leave school with the skills required for the global economy.⁵

Technological advances, now favoring intellectual over physical attributes of workers, have transferred skills once provided by workers to machines. Computers have replaced blue-collar manufacturing jobs, once epitomized by the assembly line, with their attendant technical and professional personnel. Further change is evident in what can be called the global assembly line, where production and assembly of goods originate from factories and depots throughout the world wherever labor costs and economies of scale make an international division of labor cost-effective. The globalization of production and assembly has created the need for increased centralization and complexity of management, control, and planning. The complexity of participating in world markets and foreign countries has resulted in diversification of product lines, mergers, and transnationalization of economic activities that require highly specialized skills in top-level management. This has fostered growth and development of higher levels of expertise among producer service firms such as accountants, attorneys, programmers, and financial, banking, public relations and management consultants, now being asked to improve upon their support services to where they now become crucial elements in corporate decision making. Thus, the multinational company, with its dispersed manufacturing facilities, contributes to the development of new types of planning in production and distribution required for its business.⁶ While geographically Long Island, and in particular Patchogue Station, may both be considered to be on the perimeter of the centers of global activity, the proximity to New York City,

⁵William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears, The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York:Alfred A Knopf, 1997), p.221.

⁶Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton:Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 10-11.

considered a leading global city, has impacted the Long Island region. The growth of Long Island's finance and banking sectors as well as the presence of many multi-national companies has brought the impact of the global economy to the region.

At the same time that changes in technology were producing new jobs, they were also making others obsolete. The technologically revolutionized workplace was widening the gap between skilled and unskilled workers, primarily because education and training had grown to become more important than ever. An example of this disparity is that in 1987 the average unadjusted annual pay in New York City was \$28,735, as compared to \$43,964 in the finance, insurance and real estate sector.⁷

Because of low levels of education, unskilled workers tend to be out of work or poorly paid, with others facing the threat of job displacement. For example, jobs created to develop new computer operated machine tools also eliminated jobs for those trained only for manual assembly-line work. Similarly, advances in word processing increased the demand for those who not only can type but who also can operate specialized software, often eliminating routine typists and secretaries.⁸ This disappearance of work, caused by the structural changes of the global economy, subsequently impacting the distribution of jobs and the level of education required to obtain employment, resulted in the simultaneous occurrence of increasing joblessness and declining real wages for low-skilled workers. The decline of the mass production system, the decreasing availability of lower-skilled blue-collar jobs, and the growing importance of training and education in the higher-growth industries all have adversely affected the employment rates and earnings of low-skilled black workers.⁹ The skills still taught in the public schools in the United States were principally designed to provide low-income native and immigrant students with the basic literacy and numeracy skills required for routine work in mass production factories,

⁷ Ibid, p. 224.

⁸ William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears, The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), p. 152.

⁹ Ibid, p. 54.

service industries, or farms. The interaction between technological and international competition demanded by the global economy has eroded the basic institutions of the mass production system, which has now become reliant on productivity improvements where human capital costs have been replaced by technology and the few educated professional, technical, and managerial workers necessary for production.¹⁰

THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: LONG ISLAND OCCUPATIONAL FORECAST:

Impacting any labor force are the skill demands placed on it by its regional economy. The Long Island economy is not only consumer driven, but it is also influenced by its proximity to New York City, a center of global economic activity. Thus for Long Island, a large concentration of the current jobs available in the local economy, and those projected for the first half of this decade, are from service and technology sectors that require a higher degree of skill and education. Table 1 illustrates the overall projected job availability on Long Island, expressed as the total of new jobs created and the job openings necessary to fill existing positions left vacant due to retirements, deaths, relocation, etc. Table 2 illustrates that some of the fastest growing occupations in the Long Island region are related to technology, while some of the slowest are related to jobs requiring lesser skills. This supports the belief that higher paying jobs are not only currently available in the Long Island economy, but the demand for skilled and educated workers to fill these jobs will continue well into this decade.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 151.

Table 1: Long Island Occupational Outlook 1996 - 2006

<u>Employment Group</u>	<u>Annual Openings</u>	Average Net	
		<u>Job Growth</u>	<u>Replacement Jobs</u>
Managers/Administrators	2,160	750	1,410
Professional/Technology	9,970	4,250	5,720
Marketing/Sales	5,950	1,161	4,789
Administrative Support	5,040	500	4,540
Service Occupations	7,640	2,000	5,640
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	390	100	290
Precision Prod/Crafts/Repair	3,060	600	2,460
Operators/Fabricators	<u>3,050</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>2,650</u>
Total	<u>37,260</u>	<u>9,761</u>	<u>27,499</u>

Source: NYS Department of Labor as appearing in Long Island Business News Market Facts, 2000.

Table 2: Long Island Average Annual Openings for Fastest Growing Occupations 1997-2007

<u>Employment Group</u>	<u>Annual Growth Rate 1997-2007</u>	<u>Jobs Base Year 1997</u>	<u>Jobs Projected 2007</u>	<u>Median Hourly Wage</u>
Systems Analysts	9.1 %	3,020	5,770	\$22.19
Electronic Pagination Sys. Oper	8.0 %	200	360	\$14.16
Data Processing Equip. Repair	7.9 %	610	1,090	\$20.11
Occupational Therapy Assist.	7.3%	220	380	\$11.11
Adjustment Clerks	6.5%	4,620	7,610	\$10.97
Engineering, Mathematical				
Natural Science Managers	4.4%	2,300	3,320	\$34.34
Computer Support Specialists	4.3%	2,740	3,930	\$18.36
Telephone, Cable Install/Repair	3.8%	2,930	4,050	\$17.72
Data Base Administrators	3.8%	580	800	\$21.90

Table 2 (cont.): Long Island Average Annual Openings for the Slowest Growing Occupations: 1997-2007

Parking Lot Attendants	4.0%	700	980	n/a
Bill and Account Collectors	4.0%	4,580	6,400	\$11.47
Investigators, Clerical	4.0%	590	820	\$12.93
Insulation Workers	3.9%	180	250	n/a
Bicycle Repairers	3.8%	130	180	\$11.27
Manicurists	3.8%	680	940	\$ 5.78

Source: NYS Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook, Long Island Region

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND INCOME QUINTILES

The relationship between education, training, and income distribution is complex, in as education's effect on income distribution is dependent not only on the way education is planned, developed and financed, but is also contingent upon such socioeconomic factors as employment probabilities, educational composition of the labor force, wage structure, and economic base. However, education does create a more skilled labor force which results in a shift from lower paid unskilled employment, to higher paid skilled employment. This shift produces higher labor incomes, a reduction in skill differentials, and an increase in the share of wages in total output. The increase in the number of more educated and skilled people will increase the ratio of such people in the total labor force while decreasing the ratio of less educated people.¹¹

According to the World Bank, schooling, after controlling for the rate of economic growth, contributes significantly to a more equal income distribution in developing countries. As levels of schooling of the labor force increase, the income shares of both the bottom 40 percent and middle 40 percent of the population rise. Also important is that as the labor force gets more educated, income is redistributed from the top income quintile to the bottom 80 percent of the population.¹² Table 3 expresses the relationship between money income levels and educational attainment for families in the United States. Tables 1 and 2 suggest that there are higher paying jobs being created in the Long Island economy that require a higher degree of education, and by attaining that level of education a worker may be able to earn that higher paying job.

¹¹ Jandhyala B.G. Tilak, *Education and Its Relation to Economic Growth, Poverty, and Income Distribution* (Washington: The World Bank, May 1980), p. 29-32.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 77.

Table 3: Relationship Between 1999 Family Income Level and Educational Attainment Income Levels (\$1,000's)

Families	Total	\$10,000 to \$75,000						
		Under \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 to \$24,999	\$25,000 to \$34,999	\$35,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 and Over
Total	72,031	4,144	3,485	8,678	8,550	11,861	15,236	20,077
With Education	68,678	3,431	3,142	8,008	7,947	11,361	14,897	19,892
% of Total	95%	83%	90%	92%	93%	96%	98%	99%
Below 9th Grade	6%	16%	21%	14%	10%	5%	3%	1%
9th-12th No Grad	9%	23%	19%	17%	13%	9%	6%	2%
High Sch grad	32%	34%	34%	38%	39%	38%	34%	20%
Some College	19%	14%	13%	17%	18%	22%	21%	17%
Assoc. Degree	8%	5%	6%	6%	8%	8%	10%	9%
College Grad	17%	5%	5%	6%	9%	13%	18%	30%
Post Grad Deg	9%	3%	2%	2%	3%	5%	8%	21%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of The United States:2001: Table 671. Money Income of Families-Distribution by Family Characteristics and Income level: 1999

Other research has shown that income is closely related to the level of education, as is the widening income gap. Robert Reich, in *The Works of Nations*, points out that a male with a high school diploma, but without college education, who is employed and earning \$27,733 in 1987, will find that fourteen years earlier in 1973, someone with the same education would have earned \$31,677, as expressed in 1987 dollars. Thus, with no more than a high school education, real earnings actually declined by 12 percent. That same male, if he had dropped out of high school and was working in 1987 would have earned \$16,094, as compared to the \$19,562 (expressed in 1987 dollars) he would have earned in 1973, a decline of 18 percent. For a graduate from a four-year college the earnings comparison would be different. The 1987 earnings of \$50,115 would be comparable to the \$49,531 (expressed in 1987 dollars) earned by a four-year college graduate in 1973. While a college degree does not guarantee that one will earn more, without it the chances are very slim that one will.¹³

The widening gap between rich and poor appears to be related to a growing divergence in how much money people receive for the work that they do, and that divergence appears to have something to do with education. As suggested by Table 3, if one graduated from

¹³ Robert B. Reich, *The Works of Nations* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), P. 205-206

college, earnings improved, if one did not, one tended to get poorer. Basic causes include, deindustrialization, technology replacing what manual labor once provided, and the global economy.¹⁴ Supporting this contention for Long Island are Tables 1 and 2, which report a current and future demand for jobs that require a higher degree of skill and education.

III A: SUFFOLK COUNTY AND EAST PATCHOGUE: A COMPARISON OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INDICATORS:

INTRODUCTION:

The 10 years between 1990 and 2000 brought socioeconomic changes to the New York City metropolitan area, including the primarily White yet growing culturally and ethnically diverse African-American and Hispanic community of East Patchogue. East Patchogue continues to have a large White population, while experiencing growth in the Black, Hispanic, and Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Several indices point to East Patchogue's comparative growth; as compared to the economic development that has characterized Suffolk County. In East Patchogue there has been a decrease in married households, with single headed households increasing to where they represent nearly 1 in 6 families, a growth rate that is 20 percent greater than Suffolk County, now having a 1 in 5 single headed household rate. The educational enrollment in advanced grades are somewhat comparable to Suffolk County, with overall educational attainment levels in East Patchogue keeping pace. This, in part, explains East Patchogue's similar employment levels as compared to Suffolk County. The East Patchogue unemployment and labor participation rates were comparable to surrounding Suffolk County, with East Patchogue's workforce widely employed in jobs requiring skills similar to those in greater Suffolk County. Fewer East Patchogue residents owned their own homes, with more living in rental apartments paying comparably high rents. The following comparison of a broad

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 207.

range of social indicators and economic data shows how East Patchogue, a community with economic potential, fared nearly as well as Suffolk County.

POPULATION:

Table 4: Racial Composition

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total	<u>1,321,864</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,419,369</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>97,505</u>	<u>7.4%</u>
White	1,190,315	90.0%	1,200,755	84.6%	10,440	.9%
Black	82,910	6.3%	98,553	6.9%	15,643	18.9%
Other(a)	48,639	3.7%	120,061	8.5%	71,422	146.8%
Hispanic(of any race)	87,852	6.6%	149,411	10.5%	61,559	70.1%
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Total	<u>20,195</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>20,865</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>670</u>	<u>3.3%</u>
White	19,155	94.8%	18,728	89.8%	(427)	(2.2%)
Black	416	2.0%	615	2.9%	199	47.8%
Other	624	3.2%	1522	7.3%	898	143.9%
Hispanic(of any race)	1,010	5.2%	1,947	9.3%	937	92.8%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, Table SF-3., 2000 U. S. Census, Table SF-3.

Note (a): Other includes Natural Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders.

The total Suffolk County population grew by 7.4 percent between 1990 and 2000, to a total of 1,419,369, whereas by 2000, the East Patchogue community reported smaller growth of 3.3 percent to 20,865. Reflecting the different population growth percentages were the changes in their racial composition. In 1990, whites and blacks respectively represented 90.0 and 6.3 percent of Suffolk County's population. By 2000, the black component of Suffolk County's population had increased slightly to 6.9 percent, while whites decreased to 84.6 percent. The non-white non-black population (termed other) rose from 3.7 percent to 8.5 percent. Blacks grew at a faster pace, increasing by 18.9 percent or

15,643 persons to 98,553, while Whites increasing by 10,440 people, grew marginally by .9 percent. The Hispanic population showed dramatic growth between 1990 and 2000. In 1990 Hispanics represented 6.6 percent of the Suffolk County population, growing by 70.1 percent by 2000, with the 149,411 Hispanics representing 10.5 percent of the 2000 Suffolk County population.

Between 1990 and 2000, while the total population of East Patchogue increased modestly, so did the concentration of blacks residents. In 1990, the East Patchogue population was 94.9 percent white and 2.0 percent black. By 2000, the East Patchogue population of 20,865 reflected growth of 3.3 percent, with decreases only among whites, with blacks, other residents, and Hispanic/Latinos accounting for all the growth. The white population had decreased by 2.2 percent, and now represented only 89.8 percent of the 2000 East Patchogue population. Others, including Asian and Pacific Islanders, increased by 143.9 percent to 1,522 persons, and now represented 7.3 percent of the population. Blacks, showing a dramatic increase of 47.8 percent to 615, were now 2.9 percent of East Patchogue's population. The Hispanic community of East Patchogue exhibited significant growth between 1990 and 2000. In 1990, the 1,010 Hispanics represented 4.8 percent of the population, growing by 92 percent, or 937 persons, to where the 1,947 Hispanics now represented 9.3 percent of the 2000 East Patchogue community. Both in numbers and percentage of the community, Hispanics have become the largest minority population in East Patchogue.

While Suffolk County, and East Patchogue as a whole appear slightly more integrated, other Long Island communities where black and Hispanic's live, such as North Amityville, Central Islip, Brentwood, Hempstead Village, and Bellport, actually became more segregated.

FAMILY STRUCTURE:

Table 5: Family Composition (with/without children under 18 years of age)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total Families	<u>340,593</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>360,422</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>19,829</u>	<u>5.8%</u>
Husband/Wife	282,081	82.8%	291,098	80.8%	9017	3.2%
Male head	14,399	4.2%	18,665	5.2%	4,266	29.6%
Female head	44,113	13.0%	50,659	14.0%	6,546	14.8%
Persons per Household	3.04		2.9		(.08)	(2.6)%
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Total Families	<u>5,237</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>5,338</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>1.9%</u>
Husband/Wife	4,496	85.9%	4,407	82.6%	(89)	(2.0%)
Male head	164	3.1%	265	5.0%	101	61.6%
Female head	577	11.0%	666	12.4%	89	15.4%
Persons per Household						

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table SF-3, 2000 Census Table SF-3.

Changes in family composition between 1990 and 2000 reflected similar structural weakening of the two-parent household in both East Patchogue and surrounding Suffolk County. However, East Patchogue demonstrated only a modest decrease of the two-parent household while at the same time showing a slight increase in the numbers of overall families. As shown in Table 5, single parent families increased 25.6 percent in East Patchogue, compared to the increase of 18.5 percent in Suffolk County. As a further example of two communities heading in somewhat different directions, is that between 1990 and 2000 two-parent families with children under 18 decreased by 2.0 percent in East Patchogue, while increasing by 3.2 percent for Suffolk County as a whole. By 2000, 19.2

percent of families with children in greater Suffolk County had single parent households, as compared to 17.2 percent one decade earlier, an 11.6 percent increase. In East Patchogue, 1990 single-family households, representing a smaller lower level with 14.1 percent of all families, grew 23.4 percent to 17.4 percent by 2000.

Similarly to the 2000 family structure in Suffolk County where 86.0 percent of families with children under 18 years of age had a male present, a male presence was reported in 87.6 percent of East Patchogue families. Both represented a marginal decrease from 1990, where 87.0 percent of Suffolk County families had a male present as compared to 89 percent of East Patchogue families. Additionally, the average 1990 East Patchogue household size of 2.78 persons was 8.6 percent less crowded than the 3.04 persons in the average Suffolk County household. This trend continued, and by 2000 East Patchogue households became less crowded with 2.71 persons. Families in East Patchogue with both a husband and wife present had decreased by 2 percent, male headed families increased by 61.6 percent, and families headed by females increased by 15.4 percent. In Suffolk County, families with children under 18 experienced a 5.8 percent growth between 1990 and 2000, while families in East Patchogue increased by a modest 1.9 percent to 5,338. While there was growth in total Suffolk County families, the average 2000 household became smaller, decreasing by 2.6 percent from 3.04 persons in 1990 to 2.96 persons. Similarly families in East Patchogue grew by 1.9 percent, and became less crowded, decreasing by 1.2 percent to 3.21 persons in 2000.

Table 6: Marital Status (those 14 years of age and older)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
<u>Total Males</u>	<u>508,381</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>516,143</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,762</u>	<u>1.5%</u>
Single Males	205,480	40.4%	193,684	37.5%	(11,796)	(5.7)%
Married Males	302,901	59.6%	322,459	62.5%	19,558	6.5 %
<u>Total Females</u>	<u>544,293</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>589,515</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>45,222</u>	<u>8.3%</u>
Single Females	242,571	44.6%	267,056	45.3%	24,485	10.1%
Married Females	301,722	55.4%	322,459	54.7%	20,737	6.9%
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
<u>Total Males</u>	<u>7,485</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,946</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>461</u>	<u>6.2%</u>
Single Males	2,583	34.5%	2,917	36.7%	334	12.9%
Married Males	4,902	65.5%	5,029	63.3%	127	2.6%
<u>Total Females</u>	<u>8,601</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>8,838</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>237</u>	<u>2.8%</u>
Single Females	3,643	42.4%	3,817	43.2%	174	4.8%
Married Females	4,958	57.6%	5,021	56.8%	63	1.3%

Source: 1990 U.S.Census of Population - NYS Data Center, 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3.

Integral to family structure stability is the marital status of men and women. In 1990, 59.6 percent of the males living in Suffolk County older than 14 years of age were married while 40.4 percent were single. Similarly, 44.6 percent of women were single with 55.4 percent married. By 2000, males had increased by 1.5 percent, with single males dropping by 5.7 percent and married males growing by 6.5 percent. Single males over 14 now represented 37.5 percent of males, with married males increasing to 62.5 percent. In contrast, by 2000, single females over 14 living in Suffolk County had grown by 10.1 percent, and now represented 45.3 percent of females. Similar to married males, married females grew at a slower 6.9 percent rate, yet decreased to 54.7 percent of Suffolk County females. Between 1990 and 2000, single and married males and females over 14 years of age living in East Patchogue followed a pattern somewhat similar to Suffolk County.

While Suffolk County males increased by 1.5 percent and females grew by 8.3 percent, East Patchogue males grew by 6.2 percent while females increased by 2.8 percent. However, there were differences in the composition of that growth. Whereas Suffolk County experienced declines in single males and growth in single females over 14, single males and females in East Patchogue both grew between 1990 and 2000. Suffolk County single males decreased by 5.7, with single females increasing 10.1 percent, while single East Patchogue males and females increased by 12.9 and 4.8 percent respectively. In contrast, Suffolk County married males grew by 6.5 percent, with East Patchogue married males increasing by less than half that rate at 2.6 percent. Married East Patchogue females increased slightly by 1.3 percent, almost five times less than the growth rate of Suffolk County married females. There was evidence of the improvement and strengthening of the East Patchogue family structure, with incidence of marriage showing higher percentages than that of Suffolk County. In 1990, 34.5 percent of East Patchogue males were single, with 65.5 percent married, while 42.4 percent of females were single and 57.6 percent married. By 2000, reflecting the differing rates of increase in East Patchogue married males and females, 36.7 percent of males were single and 63.3 percent were married, while 43.2 percent of females were single and 56.8 percent were married. By 2000 in Suffolk County, 62.5 percent of males and 54.7 percent of females were married, an increase for males from the 1990 level of 59.6 and a marginal decrease for females from 55.4 percent.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT:

If a correlation exists between academic achievement and higher family income, it may therefore be reasoned that those advancing to higher education have an opportunity to work in higher paying jobs. Such a correlation emerged between 1990 and 2000, where similarities in patterns of school enrollment and educational achievement between Suffolk County and the East Patchogue community became evident.

Table 7: School Enrollment (3 years of age and older)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Preliminary	28,516	8.2%	31,658	8.2%	3,142	11.0%
Elementary-H.S.	218,985	63.0%	273,741	70.6%	54,756	25.0%
College	<u>100,187</u>	<u>28.8%</u>	<u>82,092</u>	<u>21.2 %</u>	<u>(18,095)</u>	<u>(18.1%)</u>
Total	<u>347,688</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>387,491</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>39,803</u>	<u>11.4%</u>
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Preliminary	452	9.7%	275	5.3%	(177)	(39.2%)
Elementary-H.S	3,134	67.5%	3,723	72.4%	589	18.8%
College	<u>1,061</u>	<u>22.8%</u>	<u>1,145</u>	<u>22.3%</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>7.9%</u>
Total	<u>4,647</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>5,143</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>496</u>	<u>10.7%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3

In 1990, Suffolk County and East Patchogue exhibited similar patterns of school enrollment, however, there were differences in the distribution of that enrollment. Of the 347,688 persons over 3 years of age enrolled in Suffolk County schools, 8.2 percent were enrolled in preliminary schools, 63 percent were in elementary through high school, and 28.8 percent were attending college in 1990. By comparison, of the 4,647 East Patchogue school enrollees, 9.7 percent attended preliminary schools, 67.5 percent were enrolled in elementary through high school, and 22.8 percent were attending college. By 2000, the similar patterns continued between those enrolled in elementary through high school, excepting, in the case of Suffolk County, those attending college. In Suffolk County, of the 387,491 persons attending school, 8.2 percent were in preliminary schools, 70.6 percent were in elementary through high school, and 21.2 percent were attending college. Of the 5,143 students in East Patchogue, 5.3 percent were in preliminary schools, 72.4 percent were enrolled in elementary through high school, and 22.3 percent were attending college. Any distinguishable enrollment distribution disparity became clear by 2000, where 8.2 percent of Suffolk County school enrollees were in preliminary school, as compared to 5.3 percent in East Patchogue. This result portends that the community is aging, and that

higher education gaps may materialize in the future, thus stalling East Patchogue’s improvement since 1990. In 2000, the 21.2 percent of those in Suffolk County attending college was marginally less than the 22.3 percent in East Patchogue. This relationship contrasted with 1990, where the 22.8 percent of East Patchogue college enrollments was less than the 28.8 percent for Suffolk County. The educational enrollment gap existing in 1990 had narrowed, explained in part by the fact that those in East Patchogue attending college increased by 7.9 percent between 1990 and 2000, an increase 69.6 percent greater than the 18.1 percent drop in Suffolk County. The importance of college enrollment for both Suffolk County and East Patchogue residents is that a correlation exists between higher levels of education and greater family income. That East Patchogue’s growth in elementary through high school and college enrollment kept pace with Suffolk County, while showing increases, would indicate that increased future family incomes could be anticipated in East Patchogue, providing that students remain attached to their community

Table 8: Educational Attainment - over 25 years of age

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
8th Grade or less	50,547	5.9%	41,038	4.3%	(9,509)	(18.8%)
9-12 gr. no diploma	101,571	11.9%	89,136	9.5%	(12,435)	(12.2%)
High School Grad	281,557	32.9%	294,953	31.3%	13,396	4.8%
College 1-3 yrs.	225,073	26.3%	258,410	27.4%	33,337	14.8%
College Grad +	<u>196,295</u>	<u>23.0%</u>	<u>258,864</u>	<u>27.5%</u>	<u>62,569</u>	<u>31.9%</u>
Total	<u>855,043</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>942,401</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>87,358</u>	<u>10.2%</u>
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
8th Grade or less	882	6.6%	575	4.0%	(307)	(34.8%)
9-12 gr. no diploma	1,880	14.0%	1,731	12.1%	(149)	(7.9%)
High School Grad.	5,097	37.9%	5,446	38.0%	349	6.8%
College 1-3 yrs.	3,412	25.3%	3,855	26.9%	443	13.0%
College Grad +	<u>2,180</u>	<u>16.2%</u>	<u>2,730</u>	<u>19.0%</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>25.2%</u>
Total	<u>13,451</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>14,337</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>886</u>	<u>6.6%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3.

By 1990, an educational attainment gap anomaly had developed between Suffolk County and East Patchogue. While 64.7 and 66.6 percent of the respective 1990 Suffolk County and East Patchogue populations had completed some level of schooling, 82.2 percent of those over 25 years of age in Suffolk County had graduated high school or gone on to higher education as compared to 79.4 percent in East Patchogue. By 2000, while East Patchogue maintained previous educational attainment levels, the education attainment gap had disappeared. Those over 25 years of age having attained some level of education were now 66.4 and 68.7 percent of the respective Suffolk County and East Patchogue populations. However, the higher education attainment gap remained, with 86.2 percent of those in Suffolk County having graduated high school and gone on to higher education as compared to 83.9 percent in East Patchogue. While the overall educational attainment gap was basically unchanged, those in Suffolk County over 25 years of age attaining some level of education increased by 10.2 percent between 1990 and 2000, nearly twice the 6.6 percent growth in East Patchogue. As with educational enrollment, those in East Patchogue attaining an 8th grade or less education decreased nearly twice as fast as Suffolk County.

The importance of this higher education attainment gap is that it occurred after changes in the global economy restructured Long Island's job market from jobs requiring a lesser degree of education and skills to jobs requiring a higher level. By 2000, growth in college and post college education attainment for Suffolk County had increased more than 1.2 times that of East Patchogue. Further indications of the higher education gap is that the 19 percent of East Patchogue residents in 2000 attaining higher education levels, 25.2 percent higher than the 16.2 in 1990, lagged behind the 27.5 percent in greater Suffolk County, which grew by 31.9 percent, from 23.0 percent in 1990. The issue is whether the narrow higher education attainment gap would correlate with a greater proportion of the East Patchogue population having the skills required for employment in higher paying jobs, resulting in greater family income. As with preliminary educational enrollment, those in

East Patchogue attaining an 8th grade or less education decreased nearly twice as fast as Suffolk County.

WORKFORCE EMPLOYMENT:

A correlation was found to exist between the higher levels of educational attainment achieved by Suffolk County and East Patchogue residents and their respective higher workforce employment rates, and representation in higher paying jobs. While East Patchogue's percent of post preliminary educational enrollment was relative to that of Suffolk County, East Patchogue's higher educational achievement levels resulted in similar employment rates and representation in higher paying jobs. In 1990, the 665,182 Suffolk County persons over 16 years of age in the workforce represented 50.3 percent of the population, as compared to 47.3 percent of East Patchogue's population of 20,195 persons. By 2000, the relationship between Suffolk County and East Patchogue workforce representations had reversed themselves. Those employed in the Suffolk County economy had fallen to 48.1 percent of the population, as compared to 50.9 percent of East Patchogue residents.

Furthermore while the 1990 distribution between private wage, government, and self-employed jobs was similar between Suffolk County and East Patchogue, by 2000 the relationships had changed. East Patchogue residents had 1.0 percent decrease in government employment, while Suffolk County increased by a similar amount; and the 11.2 percent growth in total East Patchogue employment exceeded the 2.7 percent for Suffolk County.

Table 9: Workforce Employment - over 16 years of age

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Private wage and salary	505,869	76.1%	522,597	76.5%	16,728	3.3%
Government	121,969	18.3%	122,849	18.0%	880	.7%
Self-employed	<u>37,344</u>	<u>5.6%</u>	<u>37,616</u>	<u>5.5%</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>.7%</u>
Total	<u>665,182</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>683,062</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>17,880</u>	<u>2.7%</u>
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Private wage and salary	7,067	73.9%	7,657	72.0%	590	8.3%
Government	1,969	20.6%	1,950	18.4%	(19)	(1.0%)
Self-employed	<u>524</u>	<u>5.5%</u>	<u>1,022</u>	<u>9.6%</u>	<u>498</u>	<u>95.0%</u>
Total	<u>9,560</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>10,629</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,069</u>	<u>11.2 %</u>

Source: 1990 U.S Census Table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3.

JOB SKILLS:

As presented in Table 10, employment of Suffolk County and East Patchogue workers in 1990 was comparable in most industry sectors, including jobs in the professional, managerial and administrative categories, which tend to require a higher degree of education. Similarly, clerical, service and machine operators jobs, often requiring a lower degree of education, were the other categories employing comparably larger percentages East Patchogue and Suffolk County residents.

Table 10: Employment by Industry Sector

1990

<u>Industry Sector</u>	<u>Suffolk County</u>		<u>East Patchogue</u>	
Technician	23,773	3.6%	402	4.2%
Professional	103,133	15.5%	1,482	15.5%
Manager/Administrator	89,432	13.4%	1,145	12.0%
Sales	85,593	12.9%	1,165	12.2%
Clerical	118,926	17.9%	1,841	19.3%
Crafts/Construct/Mechanic	79,624	12.0%	1,172	12.3%
Machine Operators	26,958	4.1%	386	4.0%
Transportation Operators	25,885	3.8%	538	5.6%
Laborers	20,698	3.1%	278	2.9%
Farm/Fishing	8,573	1.3%	88	.9%
Service	61,415	9.2%	851	8.9%
Private Household	1,964	.3%	6	.1%
Protective Service	<u>19,208</u>	<u>2.9%</u>	<u>206</u>	<u>2.1%</u>
Total	<u>665,182</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>9,560</u>	<u>100%</u>

Source: 1990 Census, Table SF-3, Labor Force Status and Employment Characteristics.

By 2000, the differing levels of educational attainment between Suffolk County and East Patchogue residents had resulted in little recognizable differences in labor force employment. The 2000 Suffolk County labor force employment for those over 16 years old increased by 2.7 percent to 683,062 and now represented 48.1 percent of the Suffolk County population. East Patchogue's labor force, however, fared better. The 10,629 persons working in 2000 represented 50.9 percent of East Patchogue's population, increasing by 11.2 percent from 1990. Additionally, as presented in Table 9, those employed in private wage and salary jobs increased by 8.3 percent, as compared to Suffolk County's 3.3 percent growth; with government employment decreasing by 1.0 percent, in contrast to the .7 percent growth in Suffolk County. Entrepreneurs, the backbone of small business and critical to economic growth of any community, differed significantly between Suffolk County and East Patchogue. In Suffolk County, those self-employed increased by

.7 percent between 1990 and 2000, and now represented 5.5 percent of the workforce. East Patchogue self-employed individuals increased by 95.0 percent and now represented 9.6 percent of the workforce. Furthermore, the percent ratio between the Suffolk County and East Patchogue self-employed had increased from 1.00 to 1.00 in 1990 to 1.00 to 1.75 in 2000. The composition of the respective workforces changed slightly during the 10 years ending with 2000, and appears in Table 10.

Table 10 (cont.): Employment by Industry Sector

<u>Industry Sector</u>	<u>2000</u>		<u>East Patchogue</u>	
	<u>Suffolk County</u>			
Professional	70,611	10.4%	668	6.3%
Finance/Insur/Real Estate	53,510	7.8%	642	6.0%
Sales	112,235	16.4%	1,756	16.5%
Clerical/Information	27,290	4.0%	857	8.1%
Mfg/Construct/Mechanics	116,395	17.1%	2,064	19.4%
Public Administration	38,124	5.6%	621	5.9%
Whse/Transport/Utilities	40,393	5.9%	603	5.7%
Farm/Agric/Fish	2,369	.3%	68	.6%
Service	<u>222,135</u>	<u>32.5%</u>	<u>3,350</u>	<u>31.5%</u>
Total	<u>683,062</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>10,629</u>	<u>100%</u>

Source: 2000 U.S. Census, Table SF-3

Despite that the percentage increase between 1990 and 2000 of the East Patchogue workforce employment over 16 years of age was proportionately greater than Suffolk County, there were similarities in the distribution of jobs between the higher paying professional, managerial and administrative, crafts and construction sectors. These jobs tend to require a higher degree of education and skills, areas in which East Patchogue had kept pace with Suffolk County. Suffolk County decreased professional jobs by 31.5 percent, managerial and administrative (now included in Finance, Insurance and Real Estate) by 40.1 percent, while increasing manufacturing, crafts, and construction jobs by

46.1 percent. By comparison, East Patchogue lost 54.9 percent of its professional jobs, decreased managerial and administrative employment by 43.9 percent and increased by 76.1 percent its manufacturing, crafts, and construction employment. In occupations where a lower level of education would be acceptable, such as clerical and service, Suffolk County grew by 38.3 percent, while East Patchogue, in the aggregate, reported 56.3 percent growth. In sales jobs, Suffolk County increased by 31.1 percent while East Patchogue reported 50.7 percent growth. Furthermore, East Patchogue's percent labor force increase was more than 4 times greater than Suffolk County's, with East Patchogue reporting the same degree of unemployment, when comparing those employed to those who are not.

Table 11: Employment Status - Male and Female - 16 years of age and older

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Males employed	369,116	55.5%	370,585	54.3%	1,469	.4%
Females employed	<u>296,066</u>	<u>44.5%</u>	<u>312,477</u>	<u>45.7%</u>	<u>16,411</u>	<u>5.5%</u>
Total	<u>665,182</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>683,062</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>17,880</u>	<u>2.7%</u>
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Males employed	5,301	55.4%	5,597	52.7%	296	5.6%
Females employed	<u>4,259</u>	<u>44.6%</u>	<u>5,032</u>	<u>47.3%</u>	<u>773</u>	<u>18.1%</u>
Total	<u>9,560</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>10,629</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,069</u>	<u>11.2%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census Tables SF-3.

In 1990, of the 665,182 persons over 16 years of age employed in Suffolk County, 55.5 percent were male and 44.5 percent females, a 1.25 to 1 ratio. For the 9,560 persons over 16 employed in East Patchogue, 55.4 percent were male and 44.6 percent female, a 1.24 to 1 ratio. By 2000, males in the Suffolk County workforce had increased by .4 percent, while falling to 54.3 percent of the employment base. Females, while increasing by 5.5 percent, also improved their labor force participation ratio, with the male to female ratio in the workforce narrowing to 1.19 to 1. Similarly, by 2000, East Patchogue reported a 5.6

percent increase in employed males and an 18.1 percent increase in employed females. With the labor force participation ratio narrowing between males and females, from 1.24 in 1990 to 1.11 in 2000, the result was that males and females employed in East Patchogue were respectively 52.7 and 47.3 percent of the labor force. As female-headed families increased regionally, slightly more females proportionally participated in the labor force increase in East Patchogue, than did in Suffolk County. However, as with Suffolk County, females represented a larger share of the increase in the East Patchogue workforce. Additionally, while there was a larger proportional labor force increase in East Patchogue than in Suffolk County, the male and female composition of the respective workforces shifted slightly more towards female workers.

As would be expected, the relationship existing between the employment and unemployment status of males and females over 16 years of age was slightly favorable to East Patchogue over Suffolk County.

Table 12: Unemployed Compared to Workforce (a)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total Workforce	<u>698,716</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>711,026</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>12,310</u>	<u>1.8%</u>
Male unemployed	<u>18,461</u>	<u>2.6%</u>	<u>14,668</u>	<u>2.0%</u>	<u>(3,793)</u>	<u>(20.5%)</u>
Female unemployed	<u>15,073</u>	<u>2.2%</u>	<u>13,296</u>	<u>1.9%</u>	<u>(1,777)</u>	<u>(11.8%)</u>
Total	<u>33,534</u>	<u>4.8%</u>	<u>27,964</u>	<u>3.9%</u>	<u>(5,570)</u>	<u>(16.6%)</u>
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Total Workforce	<u>10,056</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>11,032</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>976</u>	<u>9.7%</u>
Male unemployed	<u>287</u>	<u>2.8 %</u>	<u>217</u>	<u>2.0%</u>	<u>(70)</u>	<u>(24.4%)</u>
Female unemployed	<u>209</u>	<u>2.1%</u>	<u>186</u>	<u>1.7%</u>	<u>(23)</u>	<u>(11.0%)</u>
Total	<u>496</u>	<u>4.9%</u>	<u>403</u>	<u>3.7%</u>	<u>(93)</u>	<u>(18.8%)</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3.

Note (a): Workforce defined as employed plus unemployed.

The 1990 Suffolk County unemployed represented 4.8 percent of the workforce, with unemployed males approximately 2.6 percent of their workforce force and females 2.2 percent. East Patchogue's 4.9 percent unemployment rate was nearly that of Suffolk County's, with unemployed males and females respectively representing 2.8 and 2.1 percent of East Patchogue's workforce. By 2000, the Suffolk County unemployed decreased to 3.9 percent of the workforce, a 16.6 percent decline, while East Patchogue's unemployment rate fell by a almost 18.8 percent to 3.7 percent. The unemployment status of Suffolk County males and females in 2000 each decreased to nearly 2 percent of their respective employment bases, with unemployed males and females decreasing respectively by 20.5 and 11.8 percent from 1990. In similar fashion, East Patchogue's male unemployed decreased by 24.4 percent, while females decreased by 11 percent. Significant is that between 1990 and 2000 East Patchogue's unemployment rate fell 13.3 percent more than Suffolk County's rate. Also important was that while the percentage growth of East Patchogue's workforce was slightly more than 5 times that of Suffolk County, the 2000 East Patchogue male and female unemployment rate continued to be nearly equal to Suffolk County's unemployment rate.

A comparison between employed and unemployed reveals how East Patchogue had fared as compared to Suffolk County. Between 1990 and 2000, the ratio of the 17,880 increases in employment in the Suffolk County economy for those 16 years of age and older, to the decrease of 5,570 in unemployed was 3.21 to 1. While improving from 1990, East Patchogue's, net gain in employment of 1,069 resulted in a workforce where 11.5 new persons were employed for every additional one not working. This resulted in the ratio of employed to unemployed in East Patchogue improving between 1990 and 2000 to where it mirrored Suffolk County. In 1990, the Suffolk County ratio of 19.8 persons employed to every one person unemployed exceeded the 19.3 to 1 ratio in East Patchogue. By 2000, the relationship had reversed to where the Suffolk County ratio, while improving to 24.4 to 1

was eclipsed by East Patchogue, which increased to 26.4 to 1. Surrounded by an economically vibrant Suffolk County, East Patchogue kept pace, becoming a community positioned for greater economic activity.

FAMILY INCOME:

While the socioeconomic infrastructure of East Patchogue had reflected minimal changes in the two-parent family structure, residents however kept pace with Suffolk County in academic attainment and job skills, resulting in a workforce that was capable of accessing higher paying jobs. Furthermore, East Patchogue single parent households in 2000 were 17.4 percent of all families with children under 18, while households headed by females slightly more than 2.5 times the households headed by men. The economic significance of this is that in 2000, women working full time had median income of \$32,935, 24 percent lower than their male counterparts who earned \$43,349.¹⁵ Despite this factor, and that 47.3 percent of East Patchogue’s workforce are women, East Patchogue workers had the requisite skills for higher paying jobs, had more families headed by men, and had more wage earners in their families, resulting in East Patchogue’s family income, while lagging behind, keeping pace with Suffolk County family income growth. Tables 13 and 14 compare Suffolk County and East Patchogue family income 1990 and 2000.

Table 13: Nominal Family Income

1990

<u>Nominal Family Income</u>	<u>Suffolk County Families</u>		<u>East Patchogue CDP Families</u>	
\$0 - \$5,000	4,730	1.4%	91	1.7%
\$5,000-\$9,999	6,407	1.9%	114	2.2%
\$10,000-\$14,999	10,536	3.1%	165	3.2%
\$15,000-\$24,999	27,903	8.1%	556	10.6%
\$25,000-\$49,999	105,383	30.6%	1,931	36.9%
\$50,000-\$99,999	147,114	42.8%	2,024	38.6%
Over \$100,000	<u>41,538</u>	<u>12.1%</u>	<u>356</u>	<u>6.8%</u>
Total	<u>343,611</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>5,237</u>	<u>100%</u>

¹⁵ 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-3, Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics

Table 13 (cont): Nominal Family Income

2000

<u>Nominal Family Income</u>	<u>Suffolk County Families</u>		<u>East Patchogue CDP Families</u>	
\$0-\$9,999	8,561	2.4%	93	1.7%
\$10,000-\$14,999	6,936	1.9%	136	2.5%
\$15,000-\$24,999	19,237	5.3%	307	5.8%
\$25,000-\$49,999	71,600	19.7%	1,170	21.9%
\$50,000-\$99,999	150,808	41.6%	2,439	45.7%
Over \$100,000	<u>105,715</u>	<u>29.1%</u>	<u>1,193</u>	<u>22.4%</u>
Total	<u>362,857</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>5,338</u>	<u>100%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-4, Income and Poverty Status in 1989; 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3, Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000.

In 1990, the 7.1 percent of East Patchogue families earning below \$15,000 exceeded the 6.4 percent of Suffolk County families earning \$15,000 or less, with 8.1% earning between 15,000 and 25,000 compared to East Patchogue's 10.6. Fewer East Patchogue families also earned over \$25,000, with 85.5 percent of Suffolk County families earning in excess of \$25,000, as compared to 82.3 percent for East Patchogue families. Furthermore, 45.4 percent of East Patchogue families earned over \$50,000, as compared with 54.9 percent of Suffolk County families. By 2000, correlating with improving educational attainment, economic conditions improved to where only 4.3 percent of Suffolk County families and 4.2 percent of East Patchogue families were earning below \$15,000, and 90.4 percent of Suffolk County families earned more than \$25,000, followed by 90 percent of East Patchogue families. In part because more residents attended or graduated college, Suffolk County families earning over \$50,000 improved from 54.9 percent in 1990 to 70.7 percent in 2000. Furthermore, the gap between families earning over \$100,000 annually had also narrowed. In 1990, the 12.1 percent rate of Suffolk County families earning over \$100,000 was nearly twice the 6.8 percent of East Patchogue families. By 2000, Suffolk County

families earning over \$100,000, while more than doubling to 29.1 percent, were now only 1.29 times more than East Patchogue, a decrease of 30 percent from 1990. In East Patchogue, 22.4 percent of the families now earned over \$100,000, a more than three fold increase from 1990. Reflecting similar percentages of college attendees and graduates with Suffolk County, East Patchogue families earning over \$50,000 per year had improved from 45.4 percent in 1990 to 68.1 percent by 2000, and narrowed the higher earning income gap by 6.9 percent.

Mean per capita and family median income variances also existed between Suffolk County and East Patchogue, and are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Mean Per Capita and Median Family (Nominal and Real) Income

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>	
	<u>Mean Per Capita</u>	<u>Median Family</u>	<u>Mean Per Capita</u>	<u>Median Family</u>
<u>Suffolk County:</u> Nominal \$	\$18,481	\$53,247	\$26,577	\$72,112
<u>Suffolk County:</u> (1) Real\$	\$13,392	\$38,585	\$14,603	\$39,622
<u>East Patchogue:</u> Nominal \$	\$16,092	\$46,751	\$23,619	\$64,323
<u>East Patchogue:</u> Real \$	11,661	33,878	12,977	35,342

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-4, 2000 U.S. Census Table SF-3.

Note (1): Adjusted for Inflation; Based on 1984 CPI as the base year, New York Area Index as of July 1990 and July 2000.

The 1990 East Patchogue mean per capita and median family income, as expressed in both nominal and real dollars, were respectively 87 and 88 percent of their Suffolk County equivalent. By 2000, however, this gap had widened slightly. The Suffolk County nominal mean per capita and median family incomes experienced a respective 44 and 35 percent growth between 1990 and 2000, while mean per capita and median family income expressed in real dollars grew by 9.0 and 2.7 percent respectively. The growth of East

Patchogue's mean per capita and median family income expressed in nominal dollars exceeded Suffolk County's with 46.7 and 37.6 percent respectively. Mean East Patchogue per capita and median family income expressed in real dollars also exceeded Suffolk County, with increases of 11.3 and 4.3 percent respectively. The East Patchogue mean per capita and median family income expressed in both nominal and real dollars had now increased to 89 and 89 percent of their Suffolk County equivalents. Not only had East Patchogue kept pace with Suffolk County, but it also gained economic ground.

HOUSING:

As would be expected, with the additional costs of home ownership, including downpayment requirements, the relatively higher mean per capita and median family incomes in East Patchogue favorably impacted the incidence of home ownership.

Table 15: Occupied Housing Units

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Suffolk County:</u>						
Total occupied units	<u>424,719</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>469,299</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>44,580</u>	<u>10.5%</u>
Owner occupied	340,253	80.1%	374,360	79.8%	34,107	10.0%
Renter occupied	84,466	19.9%	94,939	20.2%	10,473	12.4%
Persons/Owner Occup.	3.16		3.07		(.09)	(2.8)%
Persons/Renter Occup.	2.57		2.55		(.02)	(.8)%
	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>East Patchogue CDP:</u>						
Total occupied units	<u>7,073</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,502</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>429</u>	<u>6.1%</u>
Owner occupied	4,592	64.9%	5,004	66.7%	412	8.9%
Renter occupied	2,481	35.1%	2,498	33.3%	17	0.7%
Persons/Owner Occup.	3.11		3.00		(.11)	(3.5)%
Persons/Renter Occup.	2.17		2.14		(.03)	(1.4)%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census Tables SF-3.

In 1990, of the total occupied housing units in Suffolk County, 80.1 percent were owner occupied and 19.9 percent renter occupied. Of East Patchogue's total occupied housing units, 64.9 percent were owner occupied with 35.1 percent renter occupied. By 2000, total Suffolk County housing units had increased by 10.5 percent, with 77 percent of the increase owner occupied units, and 23 percent renter occupied. In East Patchogue, the total occupied housing units increased by 6.1 percent, with 96 percent of the increase being owner occupied units, with a 4 percent increase in renter occupied units. While Suffolk County experienced a more balanced 10.0 and 12.4 percent respective increase in owner and renter occupied housing units, East Patchogue reported owner occupied unit growth of 9.0 percent, and a renter occupied housing unit increase of 0.7 percent. Suffolk County's growth rate in owner occupied housing units had lagged slightly behind that of renter occupied units, while the opposite was occurring in East Patchogue, where the owner occupied housing unit growth rate increased nearly 12.9 times faster than the rate for renter occupied units.

Not only had housing unit growth in East Patchogue lagged behind Suffolk County, that housing had become less crowded. In Suffolk County, which reported 7.4 percent growth in population between 1990 and 2000, persons per owner occupied and renter occupied units decreased, primarily due to the 10.5 percent increase in total housing units. By comparison, East Patchogue's population increased by 3.3 percent, while total occupied units increased by 6.1 percent, resulting in less crowded housing. Persons per owner occupied units decreased by 3.5 percent, while persons per rental housing unit marginally decreased by 1.4 percent, from 2.17 persons in 1990 to 2.14 persons in 2000.

In a trend that continued between 1990 and 2000, the 1990 median gross rent in East Patchogue of \$779 was 11.9 percent more than the Suffolk County median gross rent of \$696. By 2000, the median gross rent of East Patchogue had increased 16.4 percent to \$907, as compared to the 36 percent increase in Suffolk County's median gross rent to

\$945 (1990 U.S. Census, table SF-3, 2000 U.S. Census table DP-4). Despite lower family incomes, renters in East Patchogue not only continued to pay almost as much rent as Suffolk County as a whole, but that gross rent was now 4.1 percent lower than the median gross rent of Suffolk County, significantly narrowing the gap from 1990.

SUMMARY:

Of all the socioeconomic indicators discussed above, family structure and academic attainment, workforce participation, jobs distribution, household income, and home ownership, East Patchogue started in 1990 from a comparable position as compared to Suffolk County as a whole. During the 10 year period covered by this research, in comparison to the surrounding Suffolk County, East Patchogue:

(1) despite having a population growth rate slightly below that of Suffolk County, East Patchogue's White community decreased, with Blacks, Hispanics and others growing at rate greater than the Suffolk County Black, Hispanic and Asian growth rate;

(2) experienced a decrease in families with a male and female present, and had more families headed by women than men; however, households headed by men experienced dramatic growth.

(3) had a weakening of traditional family structure, where single males and females grew at a faster rate than married males and females;

(4) had greater positive growth in college enrollments than Suffolk County, with equivalent student enrollment growth in elementary and high school; but contrasting findings (decrease) are found with regards to preliminary school enrollment.

(5) had slower growth rate in post-secondary education attainment;

(6) had a significant increase in self-employed entrepreneurs, an increase in private sector employment, and a marginal decrease government employment;

(7) had comparable distribution in higher paying professional, craft, construction, and machine operator jobs, and similar increases in lower paying service, clerical, and sales jobs;

(8) experienced high growth in workforce employment, with similar steep decreases in both male and female unemployment; however, females showed the most significant growth in terms of employment

(9) had growth in nominal median family and nominal mean per capita income, with nearly half of the families earning nominal median income above \$64,323 as compared to Suffolk County where less than half of the families earned below the nominal median income of \$72,112;

(10) had real mean per capita and real median real family income growing at a slightly greater rate than Suffolk County's, with a marginal increase in East Patchogue's real mean per capita income.

(11) had a significant increase in owner occupied housing units and a marginal increase in renter occupied units; while Suffolk County reported significant growth for both;

(12) experienced a greater decrease in persons per renter and owner occupied units than Suffolk County.

Overall, having experienced growth in the socio-economic indicators between 1990 and 2000 discussed in this report, East Patchogue kept pace with, and in some cases exceeded, surrounding Suffolk County.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

New York State Data Center, Department of Economic Development. *1990 Census of Population and Housing - Summary Tape File 3 - Selected Characteristics*. April, 1992.

New York State Department of Labor. *Occupational Outlook, Long Island Region. Long Island Labor Market Information*. Online. Internet, 11 June 2001.
Available, <http://www.wdsny.org/longisle/top.htm>.

Reich, Robert B. *The Works of Nations*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Tilak, Jandhyala G.G. *Education and Its Relation to Economic Growth, Poverty, and Income Distribution*. Washington: The World Bank, May 1990.

United States. Bureau of the Census. *1990 Census, Population of Housing Summary Tape File 1 and 3 (STF 1 and 3)*. Online. Internet, 15 June 2003.

Available, <http://Factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes>.

Table DP-1: General Population and Housing Characteristics: 1990.

Table DP-2: Social Characteristics: 1990.

Table DP-3: Labor Force Status and Employment Characteristics: 1990

Table DP-4: Income and Poverty Status in 1989: 1990.

United States. Bureau of the Census. *Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF-1)*. Online. Internet, 15 June 2003. Available, <http://Factfinder.census.gov/bf>.

Table DP-1: Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000.

Table DP-2: Profile of Selected Social Characteristics: 2000.

Table DP-3: Profile of Selected Economic Characteristics: 2000.

Wilson, William Julius. *When Work Disappears, The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.

