

**ROOSEVELT: A COMMUNITY IN A REGION OF OVERALL PROSPERITY
OVERCOMING ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGES
1990 To 2000**

Prepared For

The Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency
Gary Rodolitz, Chairman

December 2002

Prepared by

Martin R. Cantor, CPA, M.A.

Planning, Economic and Economic Development Consultant
28 Woodmont Road
Melville, New York 11747

Tel: (631) 491-1388
Fax: (631) 491-6744

**Roosevelt: A Community In a Region of Overall Prosperity
Overcoming Economic Disadvantages
1990 to 2000**

Table of Contents

I:	Introduction	Page 3
II:	The Impact of Globalization and Changing Technology, Projections for the Long Island Labor Supply, and The Relationship Between Income and Education.	Page 4
III A:	How Roosevelt Fared Versus Nassau County: A Comparison of Household Income, Academic Achievement, Single Parent Households, Labor Force Participation, Unemployment, and Home Ownership.	Page 12
III B:	Roosevelt Business District Revitalization Strategy.	Page 32
IV:	Discussion Coordinating the Vision of the Town of Hempstead for the Roosevelt Community with the Economic Development Policies of Nassau County.	Page 46
V:	Availability and Use Assessment Analysis for Town of Hempstead Owned Land in the Roosevelt Community; Including Uses That Contribute To Economic Revitalization Efforts.	Page 50
VI:	Conclusion.	Page 56

I: INTRODUCTION

Between 1980 and 2000, Long Island experienced the deindustrialization of its manufacturing base, caused in part by the contraction of Long Island's defense industry. This contraction, felt especially by Long Island's many machine shops, led to workforce reductions impacting much of the regions less skilled and less educated workers. At the same time, demand for more skilled and more educated workers was growing in Long Island's emerging high technology industries, as well as in the growing financial and banking sector resulting largely from the globalization of economic activity between 1970 and 1990.¹ This analysis discusses how Roosevelt, a primarily African-American community, fared between 1990 and 2000 as compared to the surrounding Nassau County.

What would be the impact of this period of industrial and economic restructuring on the Roosevelt 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 Roosevelt'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, impact the correlation between education and family income as compared to past years? Because African-Americans live in poorer communities with underfunded educational systems, and tend to have inadequate family support structures, they have lagged behind whites in educational attainment, employment, and income. The result in some contemporary American communities is that the income gap has widened between the haves and have-nots. Would Roosevelt have the same experience and lag behind Nassau County?

This analysis will explore the above questions by comparing Roosevelt, a largely

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

African-American community, with the surrounding primarily white, and economically more prosperous Nassau County. The effects of globalization and technological change on Long Island and Roosevelt will be analyzed in part by using census data.

Following sections will discuss; the coordination of the vision of the Town of Hempstead and Hempstead Industrial Development Agency for the Roosevelt Community with the economic development policies of Nassau County; and how Town of Hempstead owned land in the Roosevelt community can be best used in the efforts of the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency to revitalize the Roosevelt business district. Conclusions will then be drawn about which economic development initiatives can best be employed in the Roosevelt community.

II: IMPACT of the GLOBAL ECONOMY and TECHNOLOGY CHANGES

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.

The evolution of our industrial system, between 1970 and 1990, brought with it an economy emphasizing services and finances and a renewed focus to 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 pay scale than do the jobs in the older industries now in decline. Almost half the jobs in the producer services are lower-wage jobs and half are in the two highest earnings class, 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 downgrading of the manufacturing sector and the increase in the supply of low-wage jobs, resulting in the decline of the share of unionized shops and in the deterioration of wages, all 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 jobholders created by globalization. Important not to be lost is that the growth of jobs in the global economy brings not only

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

³ *ibid.*, p. 126-134.

higher wage technological jobs but also many low-paying jobs.⁴ What prevents universal access to the 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,

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

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

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

and in particular Roosevelt, may both be considered to be on the perimeter of the centers of global activity, the proximity to New York City, 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, and 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 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

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.

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, 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: OCCUPATIONAL OUTLOOK FOR LONG ISLAND

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>	<u>Job Growth</u>	<u>Average Net 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 and 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 1998 Family Income Level and Educational Attainment
Income Levels (\$1,000's)

<u>Families</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>\$10,000</u>		<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$25,000</u>	<u>\$35,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$75,000</u>
		<u>Under</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>to</u>	<u>and</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>71,551</u>	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$14,999</u>	<u>\$24,999</u>	<u>\$34,999</u>	<u>\$49,999</u>	<u>\$74,999</u>	<u>Over</u>
		<u>4,593</u>	<u>3,799</u>	<u>8,811</u>	<u>9,052</u>	<u>11,995</u>	<u>15,427</u>	<u>17,874</u>
<u>With Education</u>	<u>68,309</u>	<u>3,846</u>	<u>3,427</u>	<u>8,088</u>	<u>8,562</u>	<u>11,539</u>	<u>15,111</u>	<u>17,736</u>
% of Total	95%	84%	90%	92%	95%	96%	98%	99%
Below 9th Grade	7%	17%	20%	14%	9%	5%	2%	1%
9th-12th No Grad	9%	23%	19%	17%	12%	10%	5%	2%
High Sch grad	32%	34%	35%	37%	41%	37%	34%	19%
Some College	18%	15%	15%	17%	19%	21%	21%	16%
Assoc. Degree	8%	4%	5%	6%	7%	9%	10%	9%
College Grad.	17%	5%	4%	7%	9%	13%	20%	31%
Post Grad Deg	9%	2%	2%	2%	3%	5%	8%	22%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of The United States:2000: Table 746. Money Income of Families-Distribution by Family Characteristics and Income level: 1998

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 no 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

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

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 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: NASSAU COUNTY AND ROOSEVELT: 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 African-American community of Roosevelt. Indeed, Roosevelt has remained segregated, while experiencing growth in the Asian and Pacific Islander populations. Several indices point to Roosevelt's stagnation, as compared to the economic development that has characterized Nassau County. There has been a decrease in married households, with single headed households increasing dramatically to where they represent nearly 1 in 2 families, more than two and a half the rate of Nassau County. While the educational enrollment in advanced grades are somewhat comparable to Nassau County, overall educational attainment levels are much lower in Roosevelt, and in part explain the larger decrease in Roosevelt employment levels as compared to Nassau County. The Roosevelt unemployment rates were higher, and labor participation rates were lower, than surrounding Nassau County, with the Roosevelt workforce more widely employed in jobs requiring fewer skills than the greater Nassau County. Moreover, fewer Roosevelt residents owned their own homes, while more were living in rental apartments, paying comparable high rents. The

¹⁴ *ibid*, p. 207.

following comparison of a broad range of social indicators and economic data shows how Roosevelt, a depressed economic community, did not fare as well as Nassau County.

POPULATION:

Table 4: Racial Composition

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
Total	<u>1,287,348</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>1,334,544</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>47,196</u>	<u>3.7%</u>
White	1,115,119	86.6%	1,058,285	79.3%	(56,834)	(5.1%)
Black	111,057	8.6%	134,673	10.1%	23,616	21.3%
Other(a)	61,172	4.8%	141,586	10.6%	80,414	131.5%
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Total	<u>15,030</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>15,854</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>824</u>	<u>5.5%</u>
White	1,185	7.9%	1,263	8.0%	78	6.6%
Black	13,331	88.7%	12,528	79.0%	(803)	(6.0%)
Other	514	3.4%	2,063	13.0%	1,549	301.4%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census, Table DP-1., 2000 U. S. Census, Table DP-1.

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

The total Nassau County population grew by 3.7 percent between 1990 and 2000, to a total of 1,334,544, whereas by 2000, the Roosevelt community reported growth of 5.5 percent to 15,854. While the population growth percentages were similar, the changes in their racial composition were not. In 1990, whites and blacks respectively represented 86.6 and 8.6 percent of Nassau County’s population. By 2000 the black component of Nassau County’s population had increased to 10.1 percent, while whites decreased to 79.3 percent; the non-white non-black population (termed other) rose from 4.8 percent to 10.6 percent. Blacks grew at a faster pace; increasing by 21.3 percent or 23,616 persons to 134,673, while Whites decreasing by 56,834 people, fell by 5.1 percent.

Between 1990 and 2000, while the total population of Roosevelt increased, the

concentration of blacks residents did not. In 1990, the Roosevelt population was 7.9 percent white and 88.7 percent black. By 2000, the Roosevelt population of 15,854 represented growth of 5.5 percent, with whites and other accounting for all the growth. The white population had increased by 6.6 percent, with those remaining representing only 8 percent of the Roosevelt population. Others, including Asian and Pacific Islanders, however, increasing by 301.4 percent to 2,063 persons, now represented 13 percent of the population. Blacks, while decreasing 6.0 percent to 12,528, were 79.0 percent of Roosevelt's population, making the concentrated black community of Roosevelt more segregated than the rest of Nassau County. In contrast, while Nassau County as a whole appeared slightly more integrated, Roosevelt and other Long Island communities where black majorities existed, such as North Amityville, Hempstead Village, and Bellport, actually became more segregated.

FAMILY STRUCTURE:

Table 5: Family Composition (with children under 18 years of age)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
Total Families	<u>344,502</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>347,026</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>2,524</u>	<u>.7%</u>
Husband/Wife	286,638	83.2%	282,126	81.3%	(4,512)	(1.6%)
Male head	13,914	4.0%	15,958	4.6%	2,044	14.7%
Female head	43,950	12.8%	48,942	14.1%	4,992	11.4%
Persons per family	2.94		3.34		.4	13.6%
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Total Families	<u>3,204</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>3,361</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>157</u>	<u>4.9%</u>
Husband/Wife	1,889	59.0%	1,795	53.4%	(94)	(5.0%)
Male head	251	7.8%	335	10.0%	84	33.5%
Female head	1,064	33.2%	1,231	36.6%	167	15.7%
Persons per family	3.90		3.98		.08	2.1%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-1, 2000 Census Table DP-1.

Changes in family composition between 1990 and 2000 reflected greater structural weakening of the two-parent household in both Roosevelt, and the surrounding Nassau County. As shown in Table 5, single parent families rose 49.2 percent in Roosevelt, nearly twice the 26.1 percent growth rate in Nassau County. However, as an example of two communities heading in somewhat the same direction, is that between 1990 and 2000 two parent families with children under 18 decreased by 5 percent in Roosevelt and by 1.6 percent for Nassau County as a whole. By 2000, 18.7 percent of families with children in the greater Nassau County had single parent households, compared to 16.8 percent one decade earlier. In Roosevelt, 1990 single-family households were already at a high level of 41 percent of all households, growing 46.6 percent by 2000.

In contrast to the 2000 family structure in Nassau County where 85.9 percent of families with children under 18 years of age had a male present, a male presence was reported in only 63.4 percent of Roosevelt families. Both represented a decrease from 1990, where 87.2 percent of Nassau County families had a male present as compared to 66.8 percent of Roosevelt families. The average 1990 Roosevelt family size of 3.9 persons was in excess of 30 percent more crowded than the 2.94 persons in the average Nassau County family. However, by 2000, family demographics had changed. Families in Roosevelt with a husband and wife had decreased by 5 percent, male headed families increased by 33.5 percent, and families headed by females increased by 15.7 percent. While families with children under 18 in Nassau County experienced only a .7 percent growth between 1990 and 2000, families in Roosevelt increased by a 4.9 percent to 3,361. While there was little growth in total Nassau County families, the average 2000 family became larger, increasing by 13.6 percent from 1990 to 3.34 persons per family. Despite families in Roosevelt growing by 4.9 percent, they became more crowded, growing by 2.1 percent to 3.98 persons

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

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
<u>Total Males</u>	<u>501,794</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>469,049</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(32,745)</u>	<u>(6.5%)</u>
Single Males	202,633	40.4%	173,390	37.0%	(29,243)	(14.4%)
Married Males	299,161	59.6%	295,659	63.0%	(3,502)	(1.2%)
<u>Total Females</u>	<u>553,856</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>589,567</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>35,711</u>	<u>6.4%</u>
Single Females	255,156	46.1%	257,499	43.7%	2,343	.9%
Married Females	298,700	53.9%	332,068	56.3%	33,368	11.2%
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
<u>Total Males</u>	<u>5,326</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>5,160</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>(166)</u>	<u>(3.1%)</u>
Single Males	3,219	60.4%	2,973	57.6%	(246)	(7.6%)
Married Males	2,107	39.6%	2,187	42.4%	80	3.8%
<u>Total Females</u>	<u>6,194</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>6,626</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>432</u>	<u>7.0%</u>
Single Females	4,237	68.4%	4,038	60.9%	(199)	(4.7%)
Married Females	1,957	31.6%	2,588	39.1%	631	32.2%

Source:1990 U.S.Census of Population-NYS Data Center, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-2.

Integral to family structure stability is the marital status of men and women. In 1990, 59.6 percent of the males living in Nassau County older than 14 years of age were married while 40.4 percent were single. Similarly, 46.1 percent of women were single with 53.9 percent married. By 2000, males had decreased by 6.5 percent, with single males dropping by 14.4 percent and married males falling at a slower 1.2 percent rate. Single males over 14 now represented 37 percent of males, with married males increasing to 63 percent. In similar fashion, by 2000, single females over 14 living in Nassau County had marginally increased by .9 percent, and now represented 43.7 percent of females. In contrast, married females growing by a much faster 11.2 percent rate,

increased to 56.3 percent of Nassau County females.

Between 1990 and 2000, single and married males and females over 14 years of age living in Roosevelt followed a pattern similar to Nassau County. While Nassau County males decreased by 6.5 percent and females grew by 6.4 percent, Roosevelt males fell by 3.1 percent and females increased by 7.0 percent. However, there were differences in the composition of that growth. Whereas Nassau County experienced declines in single males and slight growth in females over 14, single males and females in Roosevelt declined at a slower pace between 1990 and 2000. Nassau County single males decreased by 14.4, with females increasing .9 percent, while single Roosevelt males and females decreased by 7.6 and 4.7 percent respectively. In dramatic contrast, Nassau County married males fell by 1.2 percent as Roosevelt married males increased by 3.8 percent, whereas married Roosevelt females increased by 32.2 percent, exceeding the 11.2 percent growth of Nassau County married females. While there was evidence of the improvement and strengthening of the Roosevelt family structure, the incidence of marriage still lagged significantly behind that of Nassau County. In 1990, 60.4 percent of Roosevelt males were single, with 39.6 percent married, while 68.4 percent of females were single and 31.6 percent married. By 2000, reflecting the increase in Roosevelt married males and females, of the males, 57.6 percent were single and 42.4 percent were married, while 60.9 percent of females were single and 39.1 percent were married. By 2000 in Nassau County, 63 percent of males and 56.3 percent of females were married, increasing from 1990 levels of 59.6 and 53.9 percent respectively.

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 developed between 1990 and 2000, where differences in the pattern of school enrollment and in educational achievement

between Nassau County and the Roosevelt community emerged.

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

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
Preliminary	27,741	8.8%	30,116	8.4%	2,375	8.6%
Elementary-H.S.	187,696	59.0%	246,184	68.8%	58,488	31.2%
College	<u>102,438</u>	<u>32.2%</u>	<u>81,375</u>	<u>22.8%</u>	<u>(21,063)</u>	<u>(20.6%)</u>
Total	<u>317,875</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>357,675</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>39,800</u>	<u>12.5%</u>
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Preliminary	280	6.4%	365	7.1%	85	30.4%
Elementary-H.S	2,917	66.4%	3,734	73.2%	817	28.0%
College	<u>1,192</u>	<u>27.2%</u>	<u>1,005</u>	<u>19.7%</u>	<u>(187)</u>	<u>(15.7%)</u>
Total	<u>4,389</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>5,104</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>715</u>	<u>16.3%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-2, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-2.

In 1990, while Nassau County and Roosevelt exhibited similar patterns of school enrollment, there were discernible differences in the distribution of that enrollment. Of the 317,875 persons over 3 years of age enrolled in Nassau County schools, 8.8 percent were enrolled in preliminary schools, 59 percent were in elementary through high school, and 32.2 percent were attending college. By comparison, of the 4,389 Roosevelt school enrollees, 6.4 percent attended preliminary schools, 66.4 percent were enrolled in elementary through high school, and 27.2 percent were attending college. By 2000, the differing patterns narrowed between those enrolled in elementary through high school and those attending college. In Nassau County, of the 357,675 persons attending school, 8.4 percent were in preliminary schools, 68.8 percent were in elementary through high school, and 22.8 percent were attending college. Of the 5,104 students in Roosevelt, 7.1 percent were in preliminary schools, 73.2 percent were enrolled in elementary through

high school, and 19.7 percent were attending college. The enrollment distribution disparity became less clear by 2000, where 91.6 percent of Nassau County school attendees were in elementary through high school or more, as compared to 92.9 percent in Roosevelt. The result was a narrowing higher education enrollment gap, where the 22.8 percent of those in Nassau County attending college marginally exceeded the 19.7 percent in Roosevelt. The educational enrollment gap had narrowed, explained in part by the fact that those in Roosevelt attending college decreased by 15.7 percent between 1990 and 2000, a slower percentage decline than the 20.6 percent drop in Nassau County. The importance of college enrollment for both Nassau County and Roosevelt residents is that a correlation exists between higher levels of education and greater household income. That Roosevelt's growth in elementary through high school and college enrollment kept pace with Nassau County, while still lagging behind, would indicate that increased future household incomes could be anticipated in Roosevelt, 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>Nassau County:</u>						
8th Grade or less	52,599	6.0%	47,776	5.2%	(4,823)	(9.2%)
9-12 gr. no diploma	86,546	9.8%	72,962	8.0%	(13,584)	(15.7%)
High School Grad	266,264	30.2%	243,454	26.8%	(22,810)	(8.6%)
College 1-3 yrs.	211,557	24.0%	223,180	24.6%	11,623	5.5%
College Grad +	<u>264,071</u>	<u>30.0%</u>	<u>321,321</u>	<u>35.4%</u>	<u>57,250</u>	<u>21.7%</u>
Total	<u>881,037</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>908,693</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>27,656</u>	<u>3.1%</u>
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
8th Grade or less	736	8.2%	1,194	12.6%	458	62.2%
9-12 gr. no diploma	1,772	19.9%	1,593	16.8%	(179)	(10.1%)
High School Grad.	2,824	31.7%	2,914	30.8%	90	3.2%
College 1-3 yrs.	2,443	27.4%	2,413	25.5%	(30)	(1.2%)
College Grad +	<u>1,147</u>	<u>12.8%</u>	<u>1,357</u>	<u>14.3%</u>	<u>210</u>	<u>18.3%</u>
Total	<u>8,922</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>9,471</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>549</u>	<u>6.2%</u>

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-2, 2000 U.S. Census Table DP-2.

By 1990, an educational attainment gap had developed between Nassau County and Roosevelt. While 68.4 and 59.4 percent of the respective 1990 Nassau County and Roosevelt populations had completed some level of schooling, 84.2 percent of those over 25 years of age in Nassau County had graduated high school or gone on to higher education as compared to 71.9 percent in Roosevelt. By 2000, while Roosevelt maintained educational attainment levels, the education attainment gap had grown by 3.9 percent. Those over 25 years of age having attained some level of education had grown to 68.1 and 59.7 percent of the respective Nassau County and Roosevelt populations, with 86.8 percent of those in Nassau County having graduated high school and gone on to higher education as compared to 70.6 percent in Roosevelt. While the educational attainment gap had widen, those in Nassau County over 25 years of age attending school increased by 3.1 percent between 1990 and 2000, lagging behind the 6.2 percent growth in Roosevelt.

The importance of this education attainment gap is that it occurred after changes in the global economy restructured the job market from jobs requiring a lesser degree of education and skills to jobs requiring a higher level. While there was comparable growth in college and post college education attainment, the 23.8 percent of Roosevelt residents attaining higher education levels still lagged behind the 40.8 percent in greater Nassau County, drawing the correlation that a greater proportion of the Roosevelt population was employed in lower paying jobs, resulting in lower family income.

WORKFORCE EMPLOYMENT:

A correlation was found to exist between the higher levels of educational attainment levels achieved by Nassau County residents, their higher workforce employment rates, and their greater representation in higher paying jobs. While Roosevelt's percent of educational enrollment exceeded that of Nassau County, Roosevelt's lower educational achievement levels resulted in lower employment rates and higher representation in lower

paying jobs. In 1990, the 661,486 Nassau County persons over 16 years of age in the workforce represented 51.4 percent of the population, as compared to 51.3 percent of Roosevelt's population of 7,711 persons. By 2000, a clear difference in workforce representation had emerged. Whereas the composition of the respective workforces had some similarities, those employed in the Nassau County economy had fallen to 47.3 percent of the population, as compared to 42.7 percent of Roosevelt residents. Of note is that despite decreasing from 1990, the reliance on government employment by Roosevelt residents exceeded those in Nassau County. Reasons for this include the relative stability of employment as well as a job that provides pension and health benefits

Table 9: Workforce Employment - over 16 years of age

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
Private wage and salary	511,645	77.3%	485,369	76.9%	(26,276)	(5.1%)
Government	106,671	16.1%	108,083	17.1%	1,412	1.3%
Self-employed	<u>43,170</u>	<u>6.6%</u>	<u>37,736</u>	<u>6.0%</u>	<u>(5,434)</u>	<u>(12.6%)</u>
Total	<u>661,486</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>631,188</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(30,298)</u>	<u>(4.6%)</u>
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Private wage and salary	5,623	72.9%	5,245	77.4%	(378)	(6.7%)
Government	1,822	23.6%	1,326	19.6%	(496)	(27.2%)
Self-employed	<u>266</u>	<u>3.5%</u>	<u>202</u>	<u>3.0%</u>	<u>(64)</u>	<u>(24.1%)</u>
Total	<u>7,711</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>6,773</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(938)</u>	<u>(12.2)%</u>

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

JOB SKILLS:

Employment of Nassau County and Roosevelt workers were comparable in most industry sectors, excepting for jobs in the professional, managerial and administrative categories. These jobs tend to require a higher degree of education, something achieved

in greater percentages by the Nassau County workforce. Conversely, clerical, service and machine operators jobs, often requiring a lower degree of education, were the three largest categories employing Roosevelt residents.

Table 10: Employment by Industry Sector

<u>Industry Sector</u>	<u>1990</u>			
	<u>Nassau County</u>		<u>Roosevelt</u>	
Technician	20,753	3.1%	330	4.3%
Professional	115,951	17.5 %	870	11.3 %
Manager/Administrator	112,278	17.0 %	667	8.6%
Sales	93,861	14.2%	525	6.8%
Clerical	130,222	19.7%	1,843	23.9%
Crafts/Construct/Mechanic	57,824	8.8%	586	7.6%
Machine Operators	17,761	2.7%	452	5.9%
Transportation Operators	19,174	2.9%	447	5.8%
Laborers	16,141	2.4%	262	3.4%
Farm	5,202	.8%	101	1.3%
Service	68,286	10.3 %	1,524	19.8%
Private Household	<u>4,033</u>	<u>.6%</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>1.3%</u>
Total	<u>661,486</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,711</u>	<u>100%</u>

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

By 2000, the differing levels of educational attainment between Nassau County and Roosevelt residents had resulted in recognizable differences in labor force employment. The 2000 Nassau County labor force employment for those over 16 years old decreased by 4.6 percent to 631,188, and now represented 47.3 percent of the Nassau County population. Roosevelt's labor force was not so fortunate. The 6,773 persons in 2000 working represented 42.7 percent of Roosevelt's population, reflecting a disappointing 12.2 percent employment decrease from 1990. Additionally, those employed in private wage and salary jobs decreased by 6.7 percent, as compared to Nassau County's 5.1 percent drop. Government employment decreased by 27.2 percent; in contrast to the 1.3 percent growth in Nassau County. Entrepreneurs, the backbone of small business and

critical to economic growth of any community, differed significantly between Nassau County and Roosevelt. In Nassau County, those self-employed decreased by 12.6 percent between 1990 and 2000, and now represented 6.0 percent of the workforce. As an example of two workforce sectors heading in different directions, Roosevelt self-employed individuals, already in short supply, decreased by 24.1 percent and represented only 3 percent of the workforce. Furthermore, the percent ratio between Nassau County and Roosevelt self-employed had increased from 1.89 to 1 in 1990 to 2 to 1 in 2000. In addition, the composition of the respective workforces also changed during the 10 years ending with 2000, and appears in the following analysis.

Table 10 (cont.): Employment by Industry Sector

<u>Industry Sector</u>	<u>2000</u>			
	<u>Nassau County</u>		<u>Roosevelt</u>	
Professional	74,934	11.9%	668	9.8%
Finance/Insur/Real Estate	72,942	11.6%	489	7.2%
Sales	94,803	15.0%	986	14.6%
Clerical/Information	25,825	4.1%	975	14.4%
Crafts/Construct/Mechanics	32,466	5.1%	284	4.2%
Machine Operators	40,795	6.5 %	497	7.3%
Transportation Operators	38,099	6.0%	486	7.2%
Farm/Agric/Fish	635	.1 %	-0-	-0-%
Service	<u>250,689</u>	<u>39.7%</u>	<u>2,388</u>	<u>35.3%</u>
Total	<u>631,188</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>6,773</u>	<u>100 %</u>

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

Despite that the decrease between 1990 and 2000 of the Roosevelt workforce employment over 16 years of age was proportionately greater than Nassau County, the disparity in the distribution of jobs between the higher paying professional, managerial and administrative, crafts and construction sectors had narrowed. These jobs tend to

require a higher degree of education and skills, areas in which Roosevelt had kept pace with Nassau County. Nassau County decreased professional jobs by 35.4 percent, managerial and administrative (now included in Fire, Insurance and Real Estate) by 35.0 percent and crafts and construction jobs by 43.9 percent. By comparison, Roosevelt lost 23.2 percent of its professional jobs, decreased managerial and administrative employment by 26.7 percent and lost 51.5 percent of its crafts and construction employment. In occupations where a lower level of education would be acceptable, such as clerical and service, Nassau County grew by 39.3 percent, while Roosevelt, in the aggregate, reported no growth at all. However, in sales jobs, Nassau County increased by one percent while Roosevelt reported 87.8 percent growth.

Furthermore, Roosevelt's labor force decreased at a greater percent than Nassau County's, with Roosevelt also reporting a higher 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>Nassau County:</u>						
Males employed	364,292	55.1%	339,295	53.8%	(24,997)	(6.9%)
Females employed	<u>297,194</u>	<u>44.9%</u>	<u>291,893</u>	<u>46.2%</u>	<u>(5,301)</u>	<u>(1.8%)</u>
Total	<u>661,486</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>631,188</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(30,298)</u>	<u>(4.6%)</u>
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Males employed	3,735	48.4%	3,271	48.3%	(464)	(12.4%)
Females employed	<u>3,976</u>	<u>51.6%</u>	<u>3,502</u>	<u>51.7%</u>	<u>(474)</u>	<u>(11.9%)</u>
Total	<u>7,711</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>6,773</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(938)</u>	<u>(12.2%)</u>

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

In 1990, of the 661,486 persons over 16 years of age employed in Nassau County, 55.1 percent were male and 44.9 percent females, a 1.23 to 1 ratio. For the 7,711 persons over 16 employed in Roosevelt, 48.4 percent were male and 51.6 percent female, a .94 to

1 ratio. By 2000, males in the Nassau County workforce had decreased by 6.9 percent, falling to 53.8 percent of the employment base. Females, while decreasing by 1.8 percent, improved their labor force participation by 1.3 percent. The male to female ratio in the workforce had narrowed to 1.16 to 1. In contrast, Roosevelt lagged behind Nassau County with a disappointing 12.4 percent decrease in employed males and an 11.9 percent decrease in employed females. The result was that males and females employed in Roosevelt respectively remained at 48 and 51 percent of the labor force. As female headed families increased regionally, fewer females proportionally participated in the labor force decrease in Nassau County, as did in Roosevelt. An important distinction is that females represented a larger share of the decrease in the Roosevelt workforce while Nassau County females did not. Additionally, while there was a greater proportional labor force decrease in Roosevelt in than in Nassau County, the male and female composition of the respective workforces, for the most part, remained unchanged.

As would also be expected, the relationship existing between the employment and unemployment status of males and females over 16 years of age was disproportionately favorable to Nassau County over Roosevelt.

Table 12: Unemployed Compared to Workforce (a)

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
Total Workforce	<u>690,066</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>655,363</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(34,703)</u>	<u>(5.0%)</u>
Male unemployed	<u>15,066</u>	<u>2.2%</u>	<u>12,807</u>	<u>2.0%</u>	<u>(2,259)</u>	<u>(15.0%)</u>
Female unemployed	<u>13,514</u>	<u>2.0%</u>	<u>11,368</u>	<u>1.7%</u>	<u>(2,146)</u>	<u>(15.9%)</u>
Total	<u>28,580</u>	<u>4.2%</u>	<u>24,175</u>	<u>3.7%</u>	<u>(4,405)</u>	<u>(15.4%)</u>
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Total Workforce	<u>8,406</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>7,237</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>(1169)</u>	<u>(13.9%)</u>
Male unemployed	<u>248</u>	<u>2.9%</u>	<u>273</u>	<u>3.8%</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>10.1%</u>
Female unemployed	<u>447</u>	<u>5.3%</u>	<u>191</u>	<u>2.6%</u>	<u>(256)</u>	<u>(57.3%)</u>
Total	<u>695</u>	<u>8.2%</u>	<u>464</u>	<u>6.4%</u>	<u>(231)</u>	<u>(33.2%)</u>

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

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

The 1990 Nassau County unemployed represented 4.2 percent of the workforce, with males approximately 2.2 percent of their workforce force and females 2 percent. Roosevelt's 8.2 percent unemployment rate was nearly double that of Nassau County's, with males and females respectively representing 2.9 and 5.3 percent of Roosevelt's workforce. By 2000, the Nassau County unemployed decreased to 3.7 percent of the workforce, a 15.4 percent decline, while Roosevelt's unemployment rate fell by almost a third to 6.4 percent. The unemployment status of Nassau 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 15 and 15.9 percent from 1990. In stark contrast, Roosevelt's male unemployed increased by 10.1 percent, while females decreased by 57.3 percent. Significant is that between 1990 and 2000 the Roosevelt unemployment fell slightly more than two times faster than Nassau County's rate. Also important was the fact that Roosevelt's workforce contracted nearly three times as fast as Nassau County's, and that the male unemployment rate by 2000 was nearly 2 times the Nassau County male unemployment rate.

A comparison between employed and unemployed reveals how Roosevelt had fared as compared to Nassau County. Between 1990 and 2000, the ratio of the 30,298 decrease in employment in the Nassau County economy for those 16 years of age and older, to the drop of 4,405 in unemployed was 6.88 to 1. While improving from 1990, Roosevelt's, net loss in employment of 938 resulted in a workforce where 4.06 persons were unemployed for every one not working. As a result, the ratio of employed to unemployed in Roosevelt, while improving between 1990 and 2000, still lagged behind Nassau County. In 1990, the Nassau County ratio was 23.2 persons employed to every person unemployed, with a 11.1 to 1 ratio in Roosevelt. By 2000, the Nassau County ratio improved to 26.1 to 1, while Roosevelt increased to 14.6 to 1. Roosevelt, while improving, remained a community of lower economic activity, surrounded by an economically vibrant Nassau County.

FAMILY INCOME:

The socioeconomic infrastructure of Roosevelt had weakened. Residents lagged behind Nassau County in academic attainment and job skills, resulting in a workforce that was forced to accept lower paying jobs. Furthermore, Roosevelt had nearly as many single parent households headed by females, as families headed by both husbands and wives. With workers lacking the required skills for higher paying jobs, and having fewer wage earners in their families, a drawn conclusion is that Roosevelt family income would be less than that of Nassau County families. The following tables reflect how family income in Roosevelt, while improving between 1990 and 2000, still lagged behind family income growth for Nassau County.

Table 13: Nominal Family Income

		<u>1990</u>			
<u>Nominal Family Income</u>	<u>Nassau County Families</u>		<u>Roosevelt</u>		
<u>Families</u>					
\$0 - \$5,000	4,247	1.2%	78	2.3%	
\$5,000-\$9,999	4,733	1.4%	136	4.0%	
\$10,000-\$14,999	7,557	2.2%	144	4.3%	
\$15,000-\$24,999	24,082	6.9%	375	11.1%	
\$25,000-\$49,999	89,077	25.7 %	1,165	34.5%	
\$50,000 and over	<u>217,094</u>	<u>62.6 %</u>	<u>1,479</u>	<u>43.8%</u>	
Total	<u>346,790</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>3,377</u>	<u>100 %</u>	

		<u>2000</u>			
<u>Nominal Family Income</u>	<u>Nassau County Families</u>				
<u>Roosevelt Families</u>					
\$0-\$9,999	7,572	2.2%	153	4.5%	
\$10,000-\$14,999	6,066	1.7 %	160	4.7%	
\$15,000-\$24,999	16,312	4.7 %	276	8.0%	
\$25,000-\$49,999	57,426	16.4 %	863	25.1%	
\$50,000 and over	<u>262,318</u>	<u>75.0 %</u>	<u>1,979</u>	<u>57.7 %</u>	
Total	<u>349,694</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>3,431</u>	<u>100 %</u>	

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

In 1990, the 10.6 percent of Roosevelt families represented at the lower income categories exceeded the 4.8 percent of Nassau County families earning \$15,000 or less. Fewer Roosevelt families also earned over \$25,000, with 88.3 percent of Nassau County families earning in excess of \$25,000, as compared to 78.3 percent for Roosevelt families. Furthermore, 43.8 percent of Roosevelt families earned over \$50,000, while 62.6 percent of Nassau County families did. By 2000, correlating with the improving educational attainment, economic conditions slightly improved to where only 3.9 percent of Nassau County families and 9.2 percent of Roosevelt families were earning less than \$15,000. Conditions also improved to where 91.4 percent of Nassau County families earned in excess of \$25,000, followed by 82.8 percent of Roosevelt families. In part because more residents attended or graduated college, Nassau County families earning over \$50,000 improved from 62.6 percent in 1990 to 75.0 percent in 2000. Furthermore, the gap between those earning over \$100,000 annually had also narrowed. In 1990, the 19.6 percent rate of Nassau County families earning over \$100,000 was triple the 6.3 percent of Roosevelt families. By 2000, Nassau County families earning over \$100,000, while nearly doubling to 37.4 percent, were now just over twice the 17.6 percent of Roosevelt families earning over \$100,000, a three-fold increase from 1990. Reflecting a lower percent of college attendees and graduates, Roosevelt families earning over \$50,000 per year, while improving from 43.8 percent in 1990 to 57.7 percent by 2000, still lagged behind Nassau County.

Mean per capita and family median income distribution variances also existed between Nassau County and Roosevelt, and are presented in the following table.

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

		<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>	
		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
		<u>Per Capita</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>Per Capita</u>	<u>Family</u>
<u>Nassau</u>	Nominal \$	\$23,352	\$60,619	\$32,151	\$81,246
<u>County:</u>	Real \$ (1)	\$16,873	\$43,800	\$17,588	\$44,445
<u>Roosevelt:</u>	Nominal \$	\$12,955	\$45,297	\$16,950	\$56,380
	Real \$	\$ 9,361	\$32,729	\$ 9,272	\$30,842

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

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

The 1990 Roosevelt mean per capita and median family incomes, expressed in both nominal and real dollars, were respectively 55 and 75 percent of their Nassau County equivalent. This gap became progressively worse by 2000. The Nassau County nominal mean per capita and median family incomes experienced a respective 38 and 34 percent growth between 1990 and 2000, while mean per capita and median incomes expressed in real dollars grew by 4.2 and 1.4 percent respectively. The growth of Roosevelt's mean per capita and median family incomes expressed in nominal dollars lagged behind at 31 and 25 percent, with mean per capita and median income expressed in real dollars not only lagging behind, but actually decreasing by 1 and 6 percent respectively. The Roosevelt mean per capita and median family incomes expressed in both nominal and real dollars had now having fallen to 53 and 69 percent of their Nassau County equivalents. Not only had Roosevelt failed to keep up with Nassau County, but it actually lost economic ground.

HOUSING:

As would be expected, with the additional costs of home ownership, including down

payment requirements, the lower mean per capita and median family incomes in Roosevelt impacted the incidence of home ownership.

Table 15: Occupied Housing Units

	<u>1990</u>		<u>2000</u>		<u>Increase (Decrease)</u>	
<u>Nassau County:</u>						
Total occupied units	<u>431,515</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>447,387</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>15,872</u>	<u>3.7%</u>
Owner occupied	347,143	80.4%	359,264	80.3%	12,121	3.5%
Renter occupied	84,37	19.6%	88,123	19.7%	3,751	4.4%
<u>Roosevelt:</u>						
Total occupied units	<u>3,849</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>4061</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>5.5%</u>
Owner occupied	2,907	75.5%	2,998	73.8%	91	3.1%
Renter occupied	942	24.5%	1,063	26.2%	121	12.8%

Source: 1990 U.S. Census Table DP-1, 2000 U.S. Census Tables DP-1.

In 1990, of the total occupied housing units in Nassau County, 80.4 percent were owner occupied and 19.6 percent renter occupied. Of Roosevelt's total occupied housing units, 75.5 percent were owner occupied with 24.5 percent renter occupied. By 2000, total Nassau County housing units had increased by 3.7 percent, with 76 percent of the increase owner occupied units, and 24 percent renter occupied. In Roosevelt, the total occupied housing units increased by 5.5 percent, with 43 percent of the increase owner occupied units, and 57 percent renter occupied. While Nassau County experienced a respective 3.5 and 4.4 percent balanced increase in owner and renter occupied housing units, what occurred in Roosevelt was a disparity in growth between owner and renter occupied housing units, which increased by 31 and 12.8 percent respectively. Nassau County's growth in owner occupied housing units had lagged slightly behind that of renter occupied units, while the opposite was occurring in Roosevelt where renter occupied housing units grew at a rate four times faster than owner occupied units.

In a trend that continued between 1990 and 2000, the 1990 median gross rent in Roosevelt of \$661, was slightly less than the Nassau County median gross rent of \$678. By 2000, the median gross rent of Roosevelt had increased 45 percent to \$960, as compared to the 42 percent increase in Nassau County's median gross rent to \$964 (1990 U.S. Census, table DP-1, 2000 U.S. Census table DP-4). Interestingly, despite lower incomes, renters in Roosevelt continued to pay almost as much rent as Nassau County as a whole.

SUMMARY:

Of all the socioeconomic indicators discussed above, family structure and academic attainment, workforce participation, jobs skills, household income, and home ownership, Roosevelt started from a less favorable position compared to Nassau County as a whole. During the 10-year period covered by this research, in comparison to the surrounding Nassau County, Roosevelt has:

(1) become a more concentrated and racially segregated black community, despite experiencing population growth at approximately the same rate as Nassau County;

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

(3) had a breakdown of traditional family structure, where there are more single males and females as married males and females;

(4) had slower growth in college enrollments, with greater student enrollment in elementary and high school;

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

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

(7) had a decrease, or negligible growth in higher paying professional, craft, construction, and machine operator jobs, and an increase in lower paying service, clerical,

and sales jobs;

(8) experienced a much sharper growth in both male and female unemployment;

(9) had growth in nominal median family and mean per capita income, yet a majority of families were still earning nominal income below \$56,380 as compared to approximately \$81,246 for Nassau County;

(10) had mean per capita and median real family income grow at a slower rate than Nassau County's, with decrease in Roosevelt's real mean per capita income.

(11) had a modest increase in owner occupied housing units and a sharper increase in renter occupied units; the opposite being true for Nassau County;

Overall, despite experiencing some growth between 1990 and 2000, Roosevelt had not kept pace with surrounding Nassau County.

The remaining sections of this study presents suggested Roosevelt business district and community revitalization strategies, how they relate to the economic development visions of the Town of Hempstead and Nassau County, and how the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency can assist with these initiatives. Included is an inventory of Town of Hempstead owned land parcels in the Roosevelt Business District, and how they can be invested in the revitalization effort.

III B: ROOSEVELT BUSINESS DISTRICT REVITALIZATION STRATEGIES:

A: IDENTIFIED WEAKNESSES:

Economic development is incremental, and depends heavily on people. Bricks and mortar can rebuild a business district, but it is the talent of people that make that development lasting. The presented socioeconomic profile of Roosevelt, while weaker than Nassau County, provides instances where opportunities for economic growth are achievable. With this in mind, the economic development plan for the Roosevelt business district must be designed to take advantage of the competitive advantages of the community. The strategy must also seek to strengthen the identified weaknesses in the

Roosevelt workforce. Those identified workforce weaknesses are:

- (1) **An entrepreneurial class** that decreased by 24.1 percent from 1990, to where Roosevelt entrepreneurs, as part of the Roosevelt workforce, are now 50% of the ratio that Nassau County's entrepreneurs are to the Nassau County workforce. This would indicate that there is growth potential in Roosevelt's entrepreneurial class, in as every community has untapped entrepreneurs, each representing a potential business. Experience indicates that many entrepreneurs begin by operating out of a home, garage, or a single building, dispersed, uncentered, disconnected and unrooted. Providing incentives that not only encourage development of Roosevelt's entrepreneurs, but also concentrate their economic activity in the Roosevelt business district, will provide an important economic spark that will contribute to revitalizing the downtown. By luring these entrepreneurs to Roosevelt's central business district, storefronts will become occupied. Town land can be built upon, customer traffic increases, and new economic activity is generated. As a critical mass of economic activity evolves, the downtown eventually becomes stronger than it's individual parts.
- (2) **A local workforce with potential to improve earnings.** Roosevelt's workforce is burdened with a family structure where more single males and females head households with children under 18 than married males and females. Furthermore, the single-family heads are a greater percentage of total Roosevelt families than their Nassau County counterparts. Roosevelt's weakened family structure is the result of a decade where families with both a male and female present decreased, resulting in more families headed by women than men. Why this matters is that single-family heads not only have income earning responsibilities, but also have child care concerns as well. Providing daycare support would allow single family heads to either seek higher paying jobs, or become employed, thereby

reducing Roosevelt's proportionately higher unemployment rate of males and females.

(3) **Housing** in Roosevelt, while in greater supply for homeowners than renters, still reflects the need for home ownership, given the sharper increase in renter occupied units than owner occupied. That improvement is achievable is evident, when compared to Nassau County where owner occupied units' represent a greater share of occupied housing units than rental units. Building housing units on Nassau Road can transform Roosevelt into a 24-hour community, a necessary element in any revitalization process. The attracting of young people to live on Nassau Road will bring more pedestrian traffic, and potential consumers, to the Roosevelt business district.

(4) **Median Family income** and mean per capita income in Roosevelt is below that of Nassau County, further compounding a decade long slide in Roosevelt's mean per capita income. One cause is the slow adaptation of Roosevelt's workforce to Long Island's changing job market, caused in part by the globalization of the world's economy and the impact of that change on the Long Island economy. Contributing to the lower median family income are the combination of more female family heads who traditionally earn lower salaries than their male counterparts, and the Roosevelt workforce's lower educational attainment levels, often making access to the higher paying jobs in the global marketplace more difficult. This situation can be improved with a coordinated policy that addresses aspects of job training and workforce support.

B: TARGETED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES:

One objective of this study was to identify the socio-economic issues confronting the Roosevelt Community, and within the context of the uncovered weaknesses, suggest

ways that the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency (IDA) can direct its incentives and economic development policies to support development of Town of Hempstead owned properties located in Roosevelt. Properly designed, the following initiatives can inject new economic activity into Roosevelt's business district by: increasing Roosevelt's workforce; returning town owned parcels to property tax rolls; attracting more pedestrians and consumers to Roosevelt's business district; and attracting young people to Roosevelt.

1: ROOSEVELT - A DESIGNATED ARTICLE 15 URBAN RENEWAL AREA

As other Long Island Towns such as Babylon and North Hempstead have done, the Town of Hempstead has enacted "Urban Renewal Plans" for the Roosevelt community. An Urban Renewal Plan provides the framework within which the Town of Hempstead and the Town of Hempstead IDA can focus economic development initiatives. What follows is a summary of the Town of Hempstead's four enacted Urban Renewal Plans for the Roosevelt Community, and how the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency can support those economic revitalization initiatives.

Enacted Article 15 Urban Renewal Plans For The Roosevelt Revitalization Program

Under the leadership of five Town of Hempstead supervisors, and supported by their respective town boards, four Urban Renewal Plans for the Roosevelt Community, in conformity with New York State General Municipal Law have been enacted. Each of these plans, enacted in 1987, 1992, 1993, and 1996, builds upon the initial plan by including areas in Roosevelt not included in previous legislation.

The initial Phase I Urban Renewal Plan targeting Nassau Road, and the February 1986 Phase II Urban Renewal Plan addressing Nassau Road, Valdur Court and Gilbert Street Project Area, define the objectives upon which subsequent plans were based. These are; to eliminate substandard conditions within the Project Area; to provide decent, safe and

sanitary housing; to create housing opportunities, to rehabilitate existing commercial properties in accordance with standards of applicable codes; to keep existing businesses in the community; to attract new businesses to the community; to eliminate traffic congestion and create additional parking within the Project Area; to provide adequate access and parking facilities to serve the commercial area; to enhance the aesthetics of the Project Area; and to create jobs and strengthen the tax base.

The May 20, 1992 Urban Renewal Plan for the Washington Avenue Project, enacted on June 16, 1992 added; to eliminate incompatible mixed land use patterns; to eliminate commercial uses injurious to the well-being of school children in an adjacent public elementary school; and to eliminate or mitigate substandard roadway conditions.

The October 30, 1992 Urban Renewal Plan for the Saint Frances Street Project, adopted on May 25, 1993, targeted 3.86 acres of publicly owned open space in a residential area of Roosevelt for housing. This area had become an attraction for illegal drug sales and use, and was used by transients as an overnight sleeping area. This plan added; to eliminate or mitigate substandard infrastructure conditions within the public rights-of-way; and to enhance the Town's ability to coordinate all activities that will lead to the attainment of these objectives.

On March 26, 1996, the Town Board enacted the April 17, 1995 Debevois Avenue-West Centennial Avenue Project Urban Renewal Plan. This plan added; to create new opportunities for economic development; to overcome the weak correlation between existing ownership lines, zoning district lines, and tax lot lines through the acquisition and assembly of a number of privately owned parcels; to clear and prepare for resale for new economic development that will result in overall Project Area development that is cohesive, unified and compatible; to enhance the long-term viability of all "Not to be Acquired" properties through the overall upgrading of the Project Area; to provide opportunities for the growth and improvement of existing non-residential business and industrial properties, designated as "Not to be

Acquired”, by allowing for their possible expansion through the purchase of Project Area property designated for acquisition and redevelopment; and to enhance the Town’s ability to coordinate all activities that will lead to the attainment of these objectives.

The March 6, 1995 Urban Renewal Plan for the Roosevelt Housing Improvement Area Project encompassed the Unincorporated Area of Roosevelt, excepting for areas included in the aforementioned previously enacted Urban Renewal Plans. The objectives added to this Urban Renewal Plan are; to acquire, demolish and replace those structures which, due to the extent of disrepair, cannot be economically rehabilitated; to eliminate vacant parcels that have become eyesores to the neighborhoods due to litter, debris and junk; and to maintain and improve the single-family housing stock and insure continuation of safe, affordable and sanitary housing stock in the Roosevelt Community.

The Role of the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency

The broadness of the objectives of the enacted Urban Renewal Plans presents new opportunities for the use of Industrial Revenue Bonds. Bonds can, as expressed in the Agency’s adopted Uniform Tax Exemptions Policy and Guidelines, be issued to support those objectives, which can include housing and retail development projects.

Furthermore, whereas Article 15 Urban Renewal Plans do not necessarily expand the Industrial Development Agency’s powers, a project within an Urban Renewal Zone covered by an Urban Renewal Plan as adopted by the Town of Hempstead is eligible for Agency inducement. An important threshold for inducement is that the projects or facilities detailed in the Urban Renewal Plan must be of the scope, nature and type that the Agency is seeking to support. As such, the Urban Renewal Plan is one of important circumstances and factors that the Agency Board can look to in making a determination as to whether any project under consideration meets inducement criteria.¹⁵

¹⁵ Edie M. Longo

2: SMALL BUSINESS INCUBATOR

As the presented data indicates, entrepreneurs in Roosevelt, as a percent of the labor force, are one-half that of their Nassau County counterparts. Nurturing the development of Roosevelt entrepreneurs, as well as making available post high school certification for technology job training, will provide Roosevelt residents with the skills to access the higher paying jobs being created in the Nassau County economy. The success of both initiatives can bring more disposable income back to the Roosevelt community.

Technology and business incubation has proven to be a successful economic development strategy, which can be leveraged to facilitate academic, government and business collaborations at the community and regional levels.

An example of a successful business incubator is Esperanza Unida, Inc. a business incubator in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A presence for over 27 years, Esperanza Unida has continuously upgraded and expanded its services to help people linked by poverty and unemployment.¹⁶

Milwaukee is a city with a smaller population than Nassau County, yet similar to Nassau County it has felt the economic effects of industrial restructuring from globalization, and set backs to its significant industry. For Nassau County it was the shrinkage of the defense industry, for Milwaukee it was the contraction of beer-brewing and industrial machinery. Those most impacted were minority workers, with those unemployed having severely limited work-ready skills further hampered by a language barrier. With a grant from the Economic Development Administration, Esperanza Unida was able to acquire a building and prepare it for rehabilitation. A business that it had nurtured, an asbestos removal training business, removed the asbestos and trained 15 people in the process. Some of those 15 people now operate a business of their own. Furthermore, when Esperanza entered into a contract with a construction firm to renovate the building, one of the stipulations was that the crew hire people from the community to

¹⁶ Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

work with them. This particular part of the project focused on youth skills, with several young people from the area able to join the crew and train to reach union apprenticeship.¹⁷

Esperanza Unida's training business infrastructure enables the City of Milwaukee to deal with a problem similar to that existing in Roosevelt. That is, to connect employers with skilled workers from poverty communities. This targeted approach to developing training businesses and workers allows Esperanza Unida to focus on quality jobs which offer graduates living wages, benefits, and the potential for advancement.¹⁸ Something that the presented Roosevelt data infers is needed.

Esperanza Unida's business incubator has almost five floors occupied, offering a variety of services, including a local bank's bilingual home mortgage office, a copy shop (which is also part of the incubator's Graphic Arts Training program), a restaurant run by community residents, and office space. Other occupants are training programs and government agencies.¹⁹ An important dividend of the incubator's training program is that it has spawned successful businesses who are now part of the incubator's curriculum. Furthermore, while size of the facility is important, it is not as important as the tenants occupying the space. Incubator tenants should be synergistic with the higher paying jobs being created in the regional economy, in Long Island's case as presented in Table 2.

Another business incubator initiative is that of Rural Enterprises of Oklahoma, Inc. (REI), a private not for profit organization that provides financial services and technical assistance to businesses in Oklahoma communities, with the ultimate result of job creation. REI was designated as the State's first One-Stop-Capital Shop and a Certified Development Company by the U.S. Small Business Administration. REI is also a Community Development Financial Institution, which directs lending toward

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

economically distressed areas, often at lower interest rates. REI received a grant to construct a business incubator and Foreign Trade Zone facility. The 21,000 plus square foot multi-tenant facility includes space for both manufacturing assembly and start-up, and expanding small businesses. REI manages 11 of Oklahoma's 16 incubators with a 70 percent occupancy rate.²⁰

Why REI is relevant is that the city targeted for incubator tenancy businesses whose primary activities were compatible with the FTZ needs. Thus incubator tenants became an efficient source of assembly and manufacturing services. The role of matching tenant businesses to companies needing their services is similar to Esperanza Unida, which also played a role in identifying revenue sources for its businesses incubator tenants.

REI also focuses on entrepreneurial development, where on-site technical support services are available to tenants. Such assistance includes management, marketing, financing, exports, engineering and plant layout. Available to provide additional individual assistance is the State Department of Commerce, a broker/agent of the Oklahoma Alliance for Manufacturing Excellence, and a member of the Governor's International Economic Development Team, all of who are headquartered in the incubator. An initial incubator tenant was Telecommunications Systems, which specializes in telecommunications.²¹ Apparent to success is not only providing reasonable rents and business opportunities for tenants, but also providing access to technical assistance and entrepreneurial development mentoring, elements that can be replicated in Roosevelt.

3: WORKFORCE SUPPORT INITIATIVES

Economic development is incremental and predicated on people. As the presented Roosevelt Community data suggests, there is both a housing need, and an opportunity for

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

home ownership, since rental occupied units grew at a faster rate than owner occupied units, and that all those units had become more crowded. Also suggested is that the Roosevelt workforce may have disproportionately greater child care responsibilities, since there are almost as many single parent headed families as those jointly headed by males and females. A drawn conclusion is that the Roosevelt economy has potential for expansion by: identifying higher paying job opportunities for residents who have the requisite skills for employment; creating housing opportunities for young workers who wish to come back to their community; and providing access to daycare for members of Roosevelt's workforce who require it.

Housing can be an important tool in revitalizing a neighborhood. It provides a 24-hour presence from tenants who come and go with their daily routines, as well as maintaining stability of a local economy. Housing also creates a market for goods and services sold in the business district by attracting new consumers.

One such housing initiative would allow, on a special use permit basis insuring code standards adherence, residential units for occupancy that are above ground floor retail space. Opportunities exist for entrepreneurs to own a building where they can live above their ground floor commercial space. The Town of Riverhead recently approved such an initiative for artists who wish to live and work in the downtown-shopping district. That Town of Hempstead owned properties might be possible sites for such projects provides the Town with financial leverage for federal and state dollars to assist in the development.

Daycare is one of the most stubborn impediments to escaping poverty. In addition to the working poor, two wage earner households also find accessing quality daycare as difficult as it is affordable. Many who use daycare prefer it near where they work, rather than near their home. This is in case an emergency need arises where they have to pick up their child. With many of Roosevelt's households headed by single parents, the need for daycare is apparent. One example of the contribution that daycare can make is illustrated

by the revitalization efforts of North Amityville, and the integral part played by the acquisition of a 12,000 square foot building on Albany Avenue and Great Neck Road. The Town of Babylon leveraged its Community Development Block Grant monies into a 20 year Section 108 loan to finance the project, which was included in an enacted Urban Renewal Plan located in the center of the targeted revitalization area. A daycare center, owned by a community resident occupies 10,500 square feet of the building, providing jobs for residents and care for the children of part of North Amityville's workforce.

4:THE ROOSEVELT COMMUNITY IN A NEW YORK STATE EMPIRE ZONE

In August 2002, the Town of Hempstead submitted an application to New York State for designation of eight areas within the Town, including the Unincorporated Area of Roosevelt, as an Empire Zone. Designation is competitive, with requirements outlined in Section 958 of the statute. Unfortunately, the Town's application for Empire Zone designation was not approved. However, with the Town and County still interested in Empire Zone designation, a discussion of Empire Zones is warranted.

For a community to be eligible for zone designation, it's 2000 census tract data must reflect; a poverty rate of a least 20 percent; an unemployment rate of at least 1.25 times the statewide average; a public assistance rate at 14 percent or greater; be a non-metropolitan area; and have no Empire Zone from the county in which the application is being made. Furthermore, the Empire Zone size cannot exceed two square miles, and at least 25 percent of the total land area must be able to be used for commercial or industrial activity.²²

Empire Zones, successors to Economic Development Zones, are authorized by Article 18B of the General Municipal Law. Designation is predicated upon the area under consideration being a distressed area of the state that meets certain unemployment and poverty criteria, or has been affected by significant job losses. Originally enacted in 1986,

²²Camoin Associates.

the law allowed for as many as 40 zones to be created, but was amended recently to allow for an additional six zones. The Empire Zone Program was established to; encourage business to locate, start-up and/or expand in targeted areas without jeopardizing other areas of the state; to revitalize economically distressed areas in large cities and small communities by stimulating private investment; provide jobs, especially for unemployed and publicly assisted individuals and zone residents; and to reduce poverty, unemployment, public assistance and blighted conditions in the zones.²³

The objectives for the Roosevelt Community contained in the Town of Hempstead Empire Zone application are to; attract new businesses; expand existing businesses; create new job opportunities; provide job training and education to a largely unskilled labor force; improve housing conditions; expand the existing community tax base; decrease public assistance recipients; cleanup Brownfield areas and eliminate blighted conditions along Nassau Road and Babylon Turnpike; and increase commercial and residential property values. The Town believes that the economic and financial incentives available through the Empire Zone program will complement its own economic revitalization program, targeting business expansion and job creation through the use of Community Development Block Grant funds and Industrial Revenue Bond financing.²⁴ These objectives are very similar to the objectives of the Town of Hempstead Revitalization Program and of the Urban Renewal Plans previously enacted by the respective Hempstead Town Boards. As such there is good synergy between programs, policies and desired outcomes.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Town of Hempstead Empire Zone Application

**5:THE HEMPSTEAD TOWN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY:
SUPPORTING THE URBAN RENEWAL ZONE, EMPIRE ZONE,
INCUBATOR, DAYCARE, AND HOUSING**

Real Property Tax Exemptions

Local incentives are where the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency (IDA) can be effective. While exemptions from property, and state and local sales taxes are usually only available through the issuance of Industrial Revenue Bonds, companies locating in an Empire Zone can obtain the same exemptions. The difference lies in real property tax abatements, which can be enhanced through issuance of Town of Hempstead Industrial Revenue Bonds. Under Section 485(e) of the New York State Real Property Tax Law, companies locating in the Empire Zone, and owning their own properties, may receive a ten year property tax exemption comprised of a 100 percent exemption for up to seven years, phasing out over the final three years. Under guidelines recently adopted by the Town of Hempstead IDA, the Agency may grant property tax abatements in an amount equivalent to double the amount allowed under Section 485 (b), or 100 percent tax abatement phased out over ten years. These guidelines further allow, on a case-by-case basis, the enhancement of the double 485(b) benefits, with these enhanced benefits exceeding ten years, as the IDA may deem appropriate. One such example is the Town of Brookhaven Industrial Development Agency, which has approved ten year enhanced 100 percent real property tax abatements for companies locating to its Empire Zone.

Similar to projects contained in Urban Renewal Plans, the Hempstead IDA may also issue bonds to finance companies locating to an Empire Zone, including retail, and may also provide a preference, both in terms of inducement and incentives available to those companies.²⁵

²⁵ Edie M. Longo.

Lower Interest Rate Financing

Through issuance of Industrial Revenue Bonds for projects located within or outside of either an Urban Renewal Area or Empire Zone, the Town of Hempstead IDA can be a factor in lowering the interest rates on financing the acquisition, construction, or equipping of manufacturing and civic facilities. This is critical, since lower interest rates often are a significant factor in determining the financial viability of a project. With two of the economic development proposals for Roosevelt's business district revitalization being a small business incubator and daycare facility, and with ventures such as these usually struggling to achieve profitability, interest rate reductions can make the difference between financial survival or not. Since both of these projects tend to receive not-for-profit status, they are eligible for Civic Facility financing and the lower interest rates that accompany the issuance of Civic Facility Bonds.

Whereas Industrial Development Agencies can issue both taxable and tax exempt industrial revenue bonds to finance projects, it is the tax exempt financing that lowers interest rates. Tax-exempt industrial revenue bonds are regulated by federal tax law, which makes interest income on these bonds exempt from federal and state income tax. Furthermore, federal tax law allows that tax exempt financing be used only for manufacturing, while the New York State Legislature expanded the use of tax exempt financing to Civic Facilities.

A civic facility is defined as any facility owned or operated by a not-for-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of New York State or authorized to conduct activities in New York State. Tax-exempt Civic Facility bonds allow a not-for-profit corporation to finance their projects at a lower cost than they would through conventional mortgage financing. A not-for-profit corporation with a strong credit history and financial statements can obtain an interest rate nearly 200 basis points less than a taxable bond. The interest rate reduction for a not-for-profit organization with weak financial statements will be less, however it can also obtain a lower interest rate if a letter

of credit from a top rated bank wraps around the outstanding bond issue balance, effectively guaranteeing the outstanding bonds. Thus, the bank guarantee serves to lower interest rates further.

The New York State Legislature recently adopted July 1, 2005 as the sunset date for the latest extension of Industrial Development Agency authorization to issue Civic Facility Bonds.

IV A: TOWN OF HEMPSTEAD VISION FOR THE ROOSEVELT COMMUNITY

Roosevelt is primarily a residential community comprised of approximately 85 percent single-family detached dwellings. Roosevelt is a well-defined community with housing surrounding Nassau Road, the community's business district. The business district is further divided into several sectors. The first commercial area, identified with commercial automobile, tires and furniture establishments, is defined as Nassau Road between the Southern State Parkway and Granada Avenue on the East, and Lee Street on the West. The area on Nassau Road, between Lee Street and West Roosevelt Avenue on the West, and between Granada Avenue and East Roosevelt Avenue on the East, is defined for mixed-use purposes such as retail and housing. The Roosevelt Central Business District, containing office, major retail and mixed housing is well defined, and designated as being within close proximity to the intersection of Nassau Road and Babylon Turnpike. General commercial and some light industrial uses are found along the remainder of Nassau Road and Babylon Turnpike. Open spaces and institutional uses are concentrated along Meadowbrook and Southern State Parkways, as well as around the center of Roosevelt and at scattered sites elsewhere. There is little undeveloped land left in Roosevelt.²⁶ There is, however, opportunity to invest town owned properties in targeted revitalization initiatives.

The Town of Hempstead's revitalization program for the Roosevelt Community has

²⁶Town of Hempstead Roosevelt Revitalization Program; Interview with Lorne Birch.

been under constant improvement since its beginnings in the late 1970's. That vision has been affirmed under the leadership of five Town of Hempstead Supervisors, and enacted by their respective town boards in the successive Urban Renewal Plans previously discussed. The primary financial catalyst for the community development program has been the Federally funded Community Development Block Grant Program, administered by the Town of Hempstead Department of Planning and Economic Development, as part of the Nassau County Consortium. The primary objectives of the Roosevelt revitalization program have been²⁷:

- A: The elimination of deteriorated conditions in the commercial center of Roosevelt and its residential areas;
- B: The strengthening of the downtown with improved shopping, parking, access, traffic flow and beautification;
- C: The retention and improvement of existing employment centers and growth of new businesses;
- D: Building of new affordable housing, and where eligible, the upgrading of existing housing stock through rehabilitation loans and grants.
- E: The improvement to existing public facilities, and construction of new public facilities.
- F: Improvement of paving, curbing and drainage on local streets.

The Hempstead Town Board has expressed this vision, and the strategic plan for its implementation, in previously enacted Urban Renewal Plans and in the Town's recently submitted application to New York State for designation as an Empire Zone.

IV B: NASSAU COUNTY VISION FOR THE ROOSEVELT COMMUNITY

With limited resources available to direct toward revitalizing the Roosevelt Business District, and with the zoning, construction permit approval process, and housing authority powers residing with the Town of Hempstead, it is important to the revitalization's

²⁷ Ibid.

success that the vision and objectives of the Town of Hempstead and Nassau County are shared ones. Towards that goal, discussions were held with Nassau County Economic Development Officials; Deputy County Executive for Economic Development Peter Sylver; Executive Director of the Nassau County Industrial Development Agency Joseph Gioino, who also serves Peter Sylver as Manager of Nassau County Economic Development programs; and Cecilia Capers, Assistant to the Director of Community Development and liaison to the Roosevelt Community for the revitalization effort.

Among those present, there was agreement that Nassau County wants to cooperate in any manner that it can to assist the Town in revitalizing Roosevelt, but its resources are limited due to the County's fiscal condition. There are however resources that could be made available, depending on implementation of contemplated policy initiatives.

Nassau County, in its denied application for **Empire Zone** status, defined its zone by incorporating four separate communities, one of which was Roosevelt. The manner in which the Town of Hempstead IDA could assist a Nassau County awarded Empire Zone is the same as previously discussed for an Empire Zone awarded to the Town of Hempstead.

Additionally, for projects of significance, was the availability of **Federal Community Development Block Grant** funds for either direct grants or leveraging a portion of the annual funds into Section 108 loans, which are low interest loans repayable over a period as long as twenty years. Allocation of these funds is through the Nassau County consortium, and is competitively awarded by the Nassau County Department of Housing and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Nassau County is also considering a **linked deposit program**, which links a banks becoming a repository for the County's cash deposit accounts to that bank's lending policies in underserved neighborhoods such a Roosevelt. All too often these communities have found it more difficult to access commercial lending. Banks seeking **Community Reinvestment Act (CRA)** credits, would find lending in the Roosevelt Community a

perfect opportunity in which to participate, effectively creating a consortium of banks that would finance commercial and residential development in the Roosevelt Community. With some commercial banks now purchasing civic facility bonds, this new capital could be become a new source of Hempstead Town Industrial Development Agency activity.

Transfer of development rights was another area of interest to Nassau County. With congestion in the HUB area, HUB development rights transferred to areas outside of the HUB area would receive greater density, thus providing a financial incentive to a developer to build outside the HUB area. In the case of Roosevelt, where the FAR was averaged at 33 percent in tables 17 and 18, transfer of development rights could push the FAR above 40 percent.

The town owned parcels in Roosevelt's business district provides an opportunity for the Town of Hempstead to attract economic development investment to Roosevelt by enacting innovative zoning incentives and fast tracking building permits. Incentive zoning is most effective in communities with a competitive market such that developers are willing to negotiate to build in a particular location. However it has also been instituted in less competitive environments, often combined with other public incentives.²⁸

In recent years incentive zoning has been utilized in downtowns seeking to improve the retail flow. Many downtowns have a discontinuous retail flow with ground floor space devoted to office, blank walls and other uses, which fragment the pedestrian flow and hurt the physical ambiance. The Town of Hempstead owns eight such groupings of properties on Nassau Road, the commercial thoroughfare of Roosevelt. Local officials in other locales have used incentive zoning to encourage the development of ground floor space for retail and other uses which encourage pedestrians to shop and stay in the downtown.²⁹ The Hempstead Industrial Development Agency could provide financing

²⁸ National Council for Urban Economic Development.

²⁹ Ibid

and incentives towards this effort through the issuance of industrial revenue bonds.

Nassau County officials want to assist as best as they can in the revitalization effort, but realize that they play a supporting role, with the lead agency being the Town of Hempstead. With the Town of Hempstead and Nassau County having shared visions for the Roosevelt community, and with Nassau County economic development officials wishing to participate and cooperate toward that revitalization, how the Town owned properties are ultimately used will not only contribute toward the revitalization of Roosevelt, but will also influence what the business district will look like. The following discussion puts in perspective possible uses for that land.

V: THE ROOSEVELT COMMUNITY: A LAND USE ASSESSMENT

The Town of Hempstead owned properties in the Roosevelt community are located in the central business district, and for the most part, are on Nassau Road. The Town recognizes that these properties offer an opportunity to invest in the economic development strategies identified in it's enacted Urban Renewal Plans and in it's Empire Zone application. What follows is an analysis of land use in the Roosevelt Community, what the Town of Hempstead owns, and how those owned properties can be grouped to maximize their potential in the Roosevelt Business District Revitalization Strategies, and the Targeted Economic Development Initiatives presented in Section III B above.

The existing land use summary for the Roosevelt Community is as follows:

Table 16: Existing Land Use Summary - 2001³⁰

<u>Category</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Residential	585	52.4
Commercial	25	2.2
Industrial	8	.7
Transportation/Utilities	10	.9
Institutional	70	6.3
Recreational	40	3.6
Roadways	350	31.3
Vacant	20	1.8
Water	<u>9</u>	<u>.8</u>
Total Acres	<u>1,117</u>	<u>100.00</u>

Use Assessment of Town of Hempstead Owned Properties

Currently the Town of Hempstead, in Phases VIII, IX, X, and XI of its ongoing Roosevelt community development program, has identified for acquisition 22 land parcels in Roosevelt, including a Cul de Sac and one entire street. These properties are intended for home construction and residential use in the Town’s residential housing program.

On the Nassau Road Central Business District, as defined above, the Town of Hempstead owns 21 land parcels inventoried for commercial development. A description of each parcel is presented below,³¹ followed by a discussion of how some of the properties, when grouped together, may be used to address components of the Roosevelt Business District Revitalization Strategy as detailed in III-B above. These components include targeted economic development and workforce support initiatives such as housing, daycare and a business incubator.

³⁰ Town of Hempstead Roosevelt Revitalization Program.

³¹ Lorne Birch Personal Interview.

Table 17: Town of Hempstead Owned Properties In The Roosevelt Community(a)
September 2002 (Zoned Commercial or Light Industrial)

<u>Sec</u>	<u>Blk</u>	<u>Lot</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Lot Size Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>FAR Sq.Ft.(b)</u>	<u>Bldg Size Sq.Ft.(c)</u>	<u>Pkng Spots(d)</u>
55	402	352	67 Nassau Rd	6,074	2,004	4,009	10
55	415	1,2	19-23 Debevoise	15,000	4,950	9,900	25
55	416	35	245 Nassau Rd	4,082	1,348	2,694	7
55	418	11-16,21	301 Nassau Rd	31,538	10,407	20,815	52
55	418	132/141	305 Nassau Rd	“	“	“	“
55	K	84	Nassau Rd	58,300	19,239	38,478	96
55	K	262	Nassau Rd	2,259	745	1,491	4
55	435	1018/ 1019	364 Nassau Rd	70,564	23,286	46,572	116
55	435	1020/ 1023	396 Nassau Rd	“	“	“	“
55	427	201	403 Nassau Rd	3,737	1,233	2,466	6
55	427	203	399 Nassau Rd	3,333	1,100	2,200	5
55	427	205	395 Nassau Rd	4,900	1,617	3,234	8
55	427	207	391 Nassau Rd	2,300	759	1,518	4
55	427	437	392 Nassau Rd	5,200	1,716	3,432	9
55	427	438	411 Nassau Rd	3,400	1,122	2,244	6
55	431	73	509 Nassau Rd	13,584	4,483	8,966	22
55	438	593	420 Nassau Rd	17,320	5,716	11,431	29
55	483	333	530 Nassau Rd	<u>7,920</u>	<u>2,614</u>	<u>5,227</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>28 Parcels</u>				<u>249,511</u>	<u>82,339</u>	<u>164,677</u>	<u>412</u>

Notes:(a) Information Provided by Town of Hempstead Department of Planning and Economic Development. All properties zoned commercial as of September 2002. Several may be light industrial.

(b) FAR, Floor Area Ratio calculated as 33 percent of entire lot size square footage, as estimated by the Town of Hempstead Department of Planning and Economic Development.

(c) Building size calculated as twice the FAR, allowing for a second story on any structure built. Current zoning allows for 60 feet height of structures built for properties on several acres. Since no town owned property has that acreage, expected height of 35 feet or 2 1/2 floors can be anticipated. Thus building size calculated at twice FAR square footage.

(d) Parking spots calculated at 1 spot for each 200 square feet of retail space provided, considered ground floor only. Parking requirements to be adjusted, depending on second story tenancy.

The properties, almost all with frontage on Nassau Road, have been assembled in a manner where many of the parcels are contiguous with each other. The following schedule presents land configurations where some acquired land parcels are grouped

together to create larger building sites.

Table 18: Grouped Town of Hempstead Owned Properties in the Roosevelt Community: September 2002 (Zoned Commercial or Light Industrial)

<u>Nassau Road Location</u>	<u>Blk/Lot</u>	<u>Nassau Rd Frontage</u>	<u>Combined FAR sq. ft.</u>
Corner E. Greenwich Ave	483/333	88 feet	5,227 sq ft
Corner W. Pennywood Ave	431/ 73	105 feet (est)	8,966 sq ft
Corner E. Roosevelt	438/593	118 feet	11,431 sq ft
Bet. W. Roosevelt/Henry St.	427/201,203,205, 207,437,438	233 feet	15,094 sq ft
Bet. E. Roosevelt/Lakewood	435/1018,1019,1020, 1021,1022,1023	431 feet	46,572 sq ft
One Lot South of Henry St.	K/262	28 feet (est)	1,491 sq ft
Bet. Henry St/Whitehouse Av	K/84 (deep lot)	28 feet	38,478 sq ft
Lots South of Whitehouse	418/11-16,21,132,141	170 feet (est)	20,815 sq ft
Bet. Wood Ave/Debevoise	416/35	47 feet	2,694 sq ft
Debovoise/W. of Nassau Rd	415/1,2	0 feet	9,900 sq ft
Corner Taylor Ave	402/352	<u>67 feet</u>	<u>4,009 sq ft</u>
Total		<u>1,230 feet</u>	<u>164,677 sq ft</u>

Uses of Town Owned Properties In Support of Roosevelt Business District Revitalization Strategies

While there are smaller parcels that could accommodate retail, office and possibly housing, there are three prime parcel groupings on Nassau Road that could accommodate a multi-use project that could include a business incubator and a daycare center. The first, 364 and 396 Nassau Road between East Roosevelt and Lakewood Avenue, has approximately 431 feet of frontage on Nassau Road, with over 46,500 square of developable space, 23,250 on each of two levels. Known as 380 Nassau Road, a recently proposed use for the parcel was conversion to medical uses. The next, between 391 and 411 Nassau Road, located between West Roosevelt and Henry Street, has approximately 233 feet of frontage on Nassau Road and over 15,000 of developable space, 7,500 on each level. Another parcel grouping with approximately 170 feet of Nassau Road

frontage, just south of Whitehouse Street, has over 20,800 square feet of developable space, 10,400 square feet on each of two levels. The last is a deep parcel located between Henry Street and Whitehouse Avenue with over 38,000 of developable space, 19,000 on each level, yet has only approximately 28 feet of frontage on Nassau Road.

Business Incubator and Daycare Center

Successful incubators are affiliated with either government or academic institutions. This is necessary because the resources critical to an incubator's success are beyond the ability of a community to absorb. An example of such a relationship is the 6,000 square foot light-manufacturing incubator at SUNY, Farmingdale. Of the 6,000 square feet in the SUNY Farmingdale incubator, 4,200 square feet is allocated for 7 companies, with the remaining 1,800 square feet consisting of common space including conference rooms. This incubator, operated by the Long Island Forum for Technology (LIFT), recently moved its operations to Main Street in Bay Shore where it now occupies a 10,000 square foot building. This new space was designed for six companies, with each occupying 1,000 square feet, and common areas of 4,000 square feet. In Briarcliff College located in Bethpage is another incubator. Operated by LISTnet, this incubator houses 17 companies, each occupying approximately 500 square feet. The total usable space is approximately 8,500 square feet with nearly 4,000 square feet for common areas. Whereas a 6,000 square foot facility may not create a critical mass of economic activity able to impact a community, a 20,000 square foot facility could. Such a facility, providing 250-500 square feet of space for emerging companies, with expansion potential to 1,000 square feet, could be accommodated in several properties identified above.³² A good illustration is the State University at Stony Brook, which operates the Long Island High Technology Incubator originally built with 48,000 square feet, and the 20,000 square foot Software Incubator with 2,000 square feet for common areas and 18,000

³²Pat Howley Personal Interview.

square feet for companies. Stony Brook is also about to begin construction of the 20,000 square foot Calverton Incubator, which will have 18,000 square feet available for companies with 2,000 square feet of common area.³³

As previously discussed, an example of how a daycare center can be used to help revitalize a community is in North Amityville, where the community, with support from the Town of Babylon and Suffolk County, redeveloped a building at the intersection of Albany Avenue and Great Neck Road. The 12,000 square foot building is home to a 10,500 square foot day care center, a police substation of 500 square feet, and a 1,000 square foot retail store. Other daycare centers can be as small as 4,000 square feet. Where as the size of daycare centers are dependent on the mix of children, with infants requiring more space per child, as compared to kindergarten age children requiring less square footage of space, beginning with 12,000 square feet would be appropriate.

Housing

It takes nightlife to bring back any downtown. Riverhead understood this by allowing housing above the stores on its Main Street. People who live, work and shop on a community's main street help to reinforce revitalization efforts. To that extent, and where there is enough Nassau Road frontage, the second floor of some of the smaller parcels detailed in Tables 17 and 18 could be used for housing.

The land that the Town of Hempstead has accumulated on Nassau Road can be used to increase its entrepreneurial class by way of a business incubator, and to support the workforce with a daycare center or new housing. Whether it is the three parcel groupings previously identified, or the single parcels noted on Table 17 that could accommodate between 2,694 and 11,431 square feet of developable space, there is land available to invest in the economic revitalization of the Roosevelt Community.

³³ Carl Hanes Personal Interview.

V: CONCLUSION

Globalization and technology have changed both Nassau County's and the Roosevelt Community's job structure, and as the data presented in Section III A indicated, the Roosevelt Community lagged behind Nassau County in economic growth.

However as also presented, initiatives can be undertaken supported by incentives available from the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency. The incentives, including lower interest loans, and sales, mortgage recording and property tax abatements can contribute to new economic growth by bringing financial viability to projects that can begin addressing these workforce weaknesses and support the Roosevelt Business District Revitalization Strategies. Those strategies were:

(1) Increase the Roosevelt Community entrepreneurial class by way of a business incubator, to where entrepreneurs will approximate the same percent of the Roosevelt workforce as Nassau County entrepreneurs represent in the county workforce.

(2) Provide workforce support to those single and two wage earner household heads seeking to improve their earnings and family income by providing daycare facilities that allows them to either access higher paying jobs generated by the regional economy, or to obtain the necessary skills required of those jobs.

(3) Provide more owner occupied affordable housing in Roosevelt for the young workforce to come back and live in the community. There is a need, evidenced by owner occupied housing lagging behind that of Nassau County, with greater growth of rental housing units in Roosevelt, as compared to Nassau County.

(4) Marshall and focus resources of all levels of government on the goals and objectives of the four Town of Hempstead enacted Article 15 Urban Renewal Plans. These initiatives provide an economic development framework to work within. To that extent, it will take this coordinated governmental effort to achieve a level of success in revitalizing the Roosevelt Business District.

(5) Insure that the shared vision that Nassau County has for the Roosevelt Community is equaled by the County's use of its limited resources. Nassau County wishes to assist the revitalization effort through: greater use of Community Development Block Grants; a program that links the depositing of Nassau County funds in banks that will lend in underserved communities such as Roosevelt; and a transfer of development rights program allowing for greater building density in areas such as Roosevelt.

(6) Effectively use the Town of Hempstead owned properties on Nassau Road in Roosevelt's Central Business District. All of these properties are within the boundaries of the four enacted Urban Renewal Plans. By grouping some of these properties, three parcels emerge with sufficient square footage to accommodate a business incubator, a daycare facility, office, retail and housing. The remaining parcels, while smaller in size, have enough square footage to support projects of such as office, retail and housing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. *Technology Business Incubators and Business Development/Business Incubators*. Online. Internet, 18 December 1999. Available, http://www.narc.org/ed/art_reprt/bus_dev.html.
- Birch, Lorne. Deputy Commissioner of The Town of Hempstead Planning and Economic Development Department. *Personal Interview*. 18 September 2002.
- Camoin Associates. *New York Empire Zone Information*. Online. Internet, 31 October 2002. Available, <http://www.camoinassociates.com/clients/EZ>.
- Hanes, Carl. President and Treasure of the Long Island High Technology Incubator. *Personal Interview* 13 November 2002.
- Howley, Patricia. Executive Director of the Long Island Forum for Technology. *Personal Interview*. 13 November 2002.
- Longo, Edie M. Agency Administrator of the Town of Hempstead Industrial Development Agency. *Memorandum and Personal Interview*. 11 September 2002.
- National Council for Urban Economic Development. *Downtown Retail Revitalization: Strategies to Maximize Your Market*. Information Service Report #58. Washington, D.C. 1985
- 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.
- Town of Hempstead. Department of Planning and Economic Development. *Roosevelt Revitalization Program, A Summary Report 1978-2001*. Hempstead: 2001.
- Town of Hempstead. Department of Planning and Economic Development. *Empire Zones 2002 Application*. Hempstead: August 2002.

United States. Bureau of the Census. *1990 Census, Population of Housing Summary Tape File 1 and 3* (STF 1 and 3). Online. Internet, 21 June 2002.

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, 22 June 2002. 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.

UNUSED DATA

The Town of Hempstead, and local development agencies such as the Town of

Hempstead Industrial Development Agency, can use their bank deposits to leverage bank lending for activities. The deposits are made with the provision that the bank will make loans in support of identified community projects. Furthermore, some municipalities and agencies have foregone interest on some of these deposits so that the bank can make loans at below market lending rates. Benefits of linked deposits can be directly related to development of town owned properties in Roosevelt and to any transfer of development rights or incentive zoning programs.

Linked deposits are a relatively easy way to further economic development goals for Roosevelt. Town officials, along with lending officers, negotiate the type of businesses and locations to be assisted by the bank's lending, with normal lending and collateral practices being maintained. A linked deposit requires a constant level of cash to be deposited at the cooperating bank. Many localities use their CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funds by using the lump sum drawdown technique.

The nature of linked deposit program agreements varies greatly on the credit worthiness of the applying businesses, and the aggressiveness of the cooperating bank in making the loans. An example of a successful program is the Montana Economic Development Board (MEDB) which placed a long term linked deposit with their bank. The linked deposit agreement stipulated that primarily small businesses engaged in basic industries, as well as retail and wholesale distribution of Montana made products would be eligible. Interest rate earned by the MEDB deposits were set at 105 percent of the U.S. Treasury bond interest rate. The maximum lending rate a participating bank could earn from borrowers under the linked deposit program was 3 percent above the MEDB rate. In Kalamazoo, Michigan, the city deposited its CDBG funds at several local financial institutions earning 0 percent interest. The resulting lending interest rate to eligible borrowers who measured up to normal credit and review criteria was reduced by 3 to 4 percent.

3: TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

The town owned parcels in Roosevelt's business district provides an opportunity for the Town of Hempstead to attract economic development investment to Roosevelt by enacting innovative zoning incentives and fast tracking building permits. Incentive zoning allows developers to receive bonuses, usually to building at a higher density or floor area ratio (FAR), in exchange for offering certain types of public facilities, infrastructure, amenities or developing the project to meet certain goals for the area.

Incentive zoning, widely used in New York City since the early 1970's, stipulated that in order to construct new development in higher income neighborhoods, developers also had to build low income housing. The same principle can be effectively used for the town owned parcels. The Town of Hempstead would enact greater density allowances for parcels of property located within the Town but outside of Roosevelt, in exchange for developers committing to develop the town owned parcels in Roosevelt. Linkages between development and social or other community goals has been instituted in large and smaller communities including San Francisco, Boston, Seattle, Richmond, Hartford, Shreveport, Santa Monica and Princeton.³⁴

Incentive zoning is most effective in communities with a competitive market such that developers are willing to negotiate to build in a particular location. However it has also been instituted in less competitive environments, often combined with other public incentives.³⁵

In recent years incentive zoning has been utilized in downtowns seeking to improve the retail flow. Many downtowns have a discontinuous retail flow with ground floor space devoted to office, blank walls and other uses which fragment the pedestrian flow and hurt the physical ambiance. Local officials in these locales have used incentive zoning to encourage the development of ground floor space for retail and other uses

³⁴ National Council for Urban Economic Development

³⁵ Ibid

which encourage pedestrians to shop and stay in the downtown.³⁶

Incentive zoning, enacted through local zoning ordinances, can either delineate the amount and type of bonus the developer can achieve either in increased height, FAR, or other density, or in some cases, it is negotiated as part of a package of incentives. Density zoning and bonuses can be either for specific actions by the developer, such as providing ground floor retail, physical amenities, infrastructure, or affordable housing, or as a matter of right in specifically created zoning districts, such as urban renewal areas as discussed above. New York City and New Haven have special zoning districts that were created to leverage special types of development. Communities utilizing zoning and density bonuses to guide development with special review and permitting procedures governing facades and architectural style.³⁷

An example of successful use of incentive zoning is the Orlando, Florida business district, which had a downtown with a discontinuous retail flow with ground floor on the primary retail corridor punctuated by vacant and non-retail uses. The city adopted use requirements and density bonuses available for projects providing retail frontage for eligible projects, such as personal services, entertainment services and restaurants in the downtown core area. In these areas at least 50 percent of street frontage had to be for retail. If the retail frontage were increased by the developer to 70 and 90 percent respectively, he would be allowed increased ratios of 1.5 to 2.0 of the 50 percent street frontage FAR. Combined with this program is a facade and business loan programs.³⁸

³⁶ Ibid

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ Ibid